



Housing



This suite of Housing policies sets out the expected number of homes required, how these homes will be distributed across the district's settlements, the number of affordable homes required and the expected housing mix (such as size, type and tenure). Also included are housing policies on Rural Workers' Dwellings, the conversion of existing rural buildings, replacement dwellings and Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.





Housing

Policy H1 - Scale and Distribution of Housing

This policy sets out the expected number of homes required during the Plan period (2018-2039) in order to meet current and future demand.

The preferred policy reads

Policy H1 - Scale and Distribution of Housing

1. The Council, housing providers and developers will together seek to achieve the completion of 160 homes per year in Richmondshire. The new dwellings will be distributed between the Sub Areas and Settlement Hierarchy as follows

	Central Richmondshire		Lower Wensleydale		North Richmondshire		Total	
Catterick Garrison	1915	57%	-	-	-	-	1915	57%
Richmond	168	5%	-	-	-	-	168	5%
Leyburn	-	-	302	9%	-	-	302	9%
Primary Service Villages	336	10%	67	2%	135	4%	538	16%
Secondary Service Villages	-	-	67	2%	135	4%	202	6%
Smaller Villages	17	0.5%	101	3%	50	1.5%	168	5%
Elsewhere	17	0.5%	25	0.75%	25	0.75%	67	2%
Total	2453	73%	562	16.75%	345	10.25%	3360	100%

Please note that the numbers within this table are subject to change once completions from the start of the plan period (2018/19) until present have been taken into account - this will be available for public consultation at the submission stage of the local plan review

2. Housing trajectory

As above this will be available for public consultation at the submission stage of the local plan review once completions have been taken into account



Justification

Scale of Housing

Increasing military numbers, operations and infrastructure at Catterick Garrison alongside increased economic development along the A1(M) corridor and in Richmondshire generally are the main drivers behind a changing population and demand for housing.

The current Local Plan Core Strategy (2012-2028) contains a housing requirement of 180 homes per annum which takes account of need across the whole district. Since this requirement was calculated the government has significantly changed the method which Local Planning Authorities are required to use in establishing their housing requirement with the introduction of a new standard method. Using the government's standard method for calculating housing need there is an annual requirement for 12 new dwellings each year. This figure is very low because the mid-2014 Sub-National Population Projections which the Government require to be used have been affected by military unit movements at Catterick Garrison which has resulted in an overly negative migration trend being projected across the whole population over the new plan period.

As a result of this the Council commissioned the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017) and Update (2019) to create a bespoke population projection for Richmondshire and to calculate a housing requirement for Richmondshire where the migration assumptions are unaffected by the military movements.

National Planning Policy and Guidance does also allow Local Planning Authorities to increase their housing requirement over the standard method where they are planning for higher economic growth and where past delivery is significantly above the standard method figure. As a result of this, through the SHMA a housing requirement scenario was calculated that took into account the high economic growth scenario of 151 jobs per annum which was calculated in the Employment Land Review Update (2019). This generated a housing requirement of 160 homes per annum over the revised Local Plan period to accommodate the high economic growth scenario and a small uplift for vacancy in the existing housing stock.

The preferred policy therefore adopts this housing requirement (160 per annum), which equates to 3,360 dwellings in total over the plan period (2018-2039). Whilst this is a reduction of 20 homes per annum from the current housing requirement this is a figure that takes account of the amended 2014 population projections we are required to use, the high economic growth proposed, and also makes an uplift for affordability and vacancy rates. It can be justified and has been calculated through a robust methodology in accordance with National Planning Policy and Guidance.

This 'High Scenario' target of 160 homes each year is not a ceiling for the level of expected growth, but an aspirational minimum. It is considered to be a realistic, deliverable and achievable target to address current and future needs.

Yorkshire Dales National Park

The Yorkshire Dales National Park (YDNP) covers approximately 60% of Richmondshire's area but only accommodates 12% of the population (SHMA, 2019). The proposed target of 160 homes per annum is a district-wide target and so includes the housing requirements for the population of Richmondshire within the YDNP. Although the YDNP will have their own housing target, this emerging Local Plan does not discount those numbers, and therefore the district-wide figure will aim to be delivered within the Richmondshire Plan Area. This is the same approach taken in the currently adopted Local Plan Core Strategy.



Distribution of Housing

This preferred policy aims to direct new dwellings to specific sustainable locations in accordance with Policies SP1 (Sub-Areas) and SP2 (Settlement Hierarchy). This reflects the roles and potentials of the individual settlements in each tier and their location across the Plan Area. Development is prioritised in locations close to existing facilities and infrastructure subject to its feasibility in terms of a range of constraints, infrastructure capacities, the availability of developable land and its impact on the local environment.

Most of the development to meet civilian and military related need is expected to proceed in Catterick Garrison. The MoD anticipates an approximate increase of 5,000 service personnel and dependants and expects the military housing requirement to be met on sites owned by MoD. The military housing requirement is additional to the targets set out below.

Richmond performs the role of a principal town, but physical constraints around it are a major limit to future development extensions. Leyburn has an important role as Lower Wensleydale's Local Service Centre and modest growth is encouraged. Primary and Secondary Service Villages require an appropriate scale of development to meet local needs and support local services, like primary schools and shops. Small scale and limited development is appropriate in Smaller Villages and elsewhere to support rural sustainability subject to environmental and policy considerations.

The current Local Plan Core Strategy sets out housing development distribution by sub area and settlement hierarchy, with the percentage distributions being

Sub Area Distribution (Spatial Principle SP1)

- Central Richmondshire - 79%
- Lower Wensleydale - 12%
- North Richmondshire - 9%

Settlement Hierarchy (Spatial Principle SP2)

- Catterick Garrison - 62%
- Richmond - 8%
- Leyburn - 7%
- Primary Service Villages - 13%
- Secondary Service Villages - 5%
- Elsewhere in the plan area - 5%

In summary, the preferred distribution as outlined above in preferred Policy H1 sees the following revisions in housing distribution from the current Local Plan

- By sub area, an overall reduction in Central Richmondshire (79% to 73%) and an increase in Lower Wensleydale (12% to 16.75%) and North Richmondshire (9% to 10.25%).
- By settlement hierarchy
 - A reduction in Catterick Garrison (62% to 57%)
 - A reduction in Richmond (8% to 5%)
 - An increase in Leyburn (7% to 9%)
 - An increase in the Primary Service Villages (13% to 16%)
 - An increase in Secondary Service Villages (5% to 6%)
 - With the addition of the Smaller Villages Tier (which takes 5% housing distribution), the remaining Elsewhere settlements accommodate 2%, so an overall increase (from 5% to 7% in total).



For clarity, the preferred H1 policy therefore shows a slight reduction in Catterick Garrison (with the settlement still accommodating the largest percentage of housing growth) and small proportionate increases across all other settlements in the settlement hierarchy, except in Richmond. The changes in distribution are generally reflective of capacity and availability of developable sites and opportunities.

The numbers illustrated in the table as set out in preferred policy H1 will be subject to change. It is likely that the total numbers will decrease once completions from the start of the plan period (18/19) until present have been taken into account. The table therefore illustrates the absolute total housing numbers for the plan period (2018-2039). An updated version of the table will be available for public consultation at the Submission Stage of the Local Plan review.

All in all, the preferred H1 policy provides a balanced approach which seeks to prioritise development in Catterick Garrison, the most sustainable settlement in the district, as well as split development proportionately across the rest of the settlement hierarchy. The policy therefore enables all settlements to develop and grow sustainably.

What you have told us?

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF states (paragraph 60) that 'To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance - unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for'.

Paragraph 65 states that 'Strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. Once the strategic policies have been adopted, these figures should not need retesting at the neighbourhood plan examination, unless there has been a significant change in circumstances that affects the requirement'.

Issues and Options Consultation

As part of the Issues and Options consultation, three options for the scale of housing were considered. These were 15 (Low Growth Scenario), 120 (Medium Growth Scenario) and 160 (High Growth Scenario) homes per annum. The preferred housing requirement (160) was supported by over half of the respondents in the Issues and Options paper.

The intention of the strategy is to focus the majority of development at Catterick Garrison with reasonable proportions in Richmond, Leyburn and the Primary settlements. Development would not be restricted in any smaller settlement but again be reasonable to its size both in terms of built area and population. The provision outside of Catterick Garrison and Richmond was to assist in maintaining the sustainability of the rural nature of the Plan area. The high amount in Leyburn, although it has a relatively small population, reflects its role in serving a wide hinterland, including that area which lies in the National Park.



With regards to the distribution of housing, seven potential options were put forward for the Issues and Options consultation. Three of the options offered were to increase housing at Catterick Garrison and reduce numbers elsewhere. These options combined were only supported by 30% of respondents.

The majority of respondents backed Options 2-4 which offered a reduction in housing at Catterick Garrison and redistributed in different ways across the hierarchy. Option 4 to increase the numbers at Richmond, Leyburn and Primary Service Villages, and not in Secondary or Smaller Villages, was clearly the most popular option.

Alternatives Considered

Scale of Housing

Standard Method - 12 per annum

An alternative option would be to use the figure calculated through the government's standard housing method, which for Richmondshire equates to 12 dwellings per annum. This figure is based on the 2014 sub national population projections with an uplift in affordability, however these projections take account of 2014-based population estimates which were significantly affected by population changes associated with military unit movements out of the district, in particular in 2013-14. This decline in population was reversed by further military related unit movements in 2016, after the base date for the population projection, meaning the 2014 projections forecast a negative migration trend and as a result a lower population total than what is likely to occur in reality. It is therefore considered that this option would not be reflective of actual current and future demand for housing and so for these reasons has been discounted.

Low Growth Scenario - 15 per annum (as per the Issues and Options Consultation)

Please see the above the explanation for 12 dwellings per annum, as the same reasonings for discounting this option applies.

Medium Growth Scenario - 120 per annum

Another alternative option considered in the Issues and Options consultation was to adopt a target of 120 dwellings per annum. This figure was based on a projection again using the mid-2014 sub national population projections but where the outward migration trend in 2013-14 had been recalculated. The figure also includes for a 20% uplift for affordability. This figure would accommodate the medium economic growth scenario identified in the Employment Land Review (Update 2019) of 57 jobs per year.

It is considered that given the potential positive impacts that will be generated in the future by economic drivers a higher growth scenario than 120 could be adopted. The high growth scenario of 160 as set out in the Preferred H1 policy above has been calculated to accommodate the high economic growth scenario. Economic drivers include the completion of the A1(M) upgrade, the expansion at Catterick Garrison and the development of the Designer Outlet at Scotch Corner. Further information on this can be found in Preferred Policy E1.

For these reasons, it is considered that the preferred policy is the most appropriate option with regards to the proposed scale of housing and so this option has been discounted.



Distribution of Housing

Retain existing distribution contained within Spatial Principle SP4 of the adopted Local Plan

An alternative option to the distribution of housing could be to retain the existing distribution as set out in the current Local Plan. A strength with this option would be that the largest amount of housing development would be distributed across the most sustainable settlements with the greatest range of facilities and services. Development would then also be distributed to reflect a settlement's location in the hierarchy, accounting for its ability to accommodate the scale of development proposed.

A weakness of this option is that most of the anticipated future housing development would only be distributed to a single settlement (Catterick Garrison) which may affect maintaining the amount of services and facilities in other settlements. Focusing new development solely in Catterick Garrison could mean that significant investment in infrastructure would be required to accommodate it.

The changes in distribution from what is currently adopted are generally reflective of capacity and availability of developable sites and opportunities. The preferred policy seeks to provide a balanced approach by still prioritising development in Catterick Garrison but enabling further sustainable development across the rest of the settlement hierarchy. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

Reduce development in Catterick Garrison and redistribute proportionately across the settlement hierarchy

Another alternative option would be to reduce the housing numbers in Catterick Garrison (more significantly than what the preferred policy proposes) and redistribute proportionately across the rest of the Settlement Hierarchy. This option would, similarly to the preferred H1 policy, result in more housing across the rest of the settlement hierarchy. However a weakness of this option is that a higher amount of development would be distributed away from the largest settlement in the area and in less sustainable locations including remoter villages and settlements where there are limited facilities and services.

It is considered that the balance of preferred housing distribution as set out in the preferred H1 policy is the most suitable in terms of ensuring the majority of development is prioritised in Catterick Garrison and then proportionally distributed across the settlement hierarchy, taking into account capacity and availability of developable sites and opportunities. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

Reduce development in Catterick Garrison and redistribute increasing numbers in the Secondary Service Settlements and Smaller Villages

Another option would be to reduce housing development in Catterick Garrison and redistribute in settlements only in the Secondary Service Settlements and Smaller Villages tiers. This option would spread development further across these settlements and may assist in maintaining the sustainability of these smaller settlements. However, this option would mean that it would significantly increase development in the least sustainable settlements in the area with the least amount of facilities and services. It would also undermine the purpose of the Settlement Hierarchy whereby settlements are distinguished by their size and role in serving local people. This option would, for example, mean there would be more development distributed to smaller settlements than in the Primary Service Villages. For these reasons it is considered that this option is not suitable and has therefore been discounted.



Reduce development in Catterick Garrison and increase numbers in Richmond, Leyburn and Primary Service Villages

Another alternative option would be to reduce development in Catterick Garrison and increase numbers in Richmond, Leyburn and the Primary Service Villages. Again this option would spread development further across these settlements and, unlike the previous option, would do so in a way which reflects the Settlement Hierarchy (focuses development in the larger settlements in the area as opposed to the smallest ones). However, this option would increase the amount of development distributed to Richmond where the current Local Plan concluded that physical constraints around it are a major limit to future development extensions.

All in all, the preferred H1 policy is similar to this option to some extent but seeks to spread development proportionately across the whole of the settlement hierarchy, taking into account physical constraints as identified in Richmond which would limit future development extensions. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

Share development equally across Catterick Garrison and Richmond and split the remainder proportionately across the settlement hierarchy

Another option would be to share development equally across Catterick Garrison and Richmond and split the remainder proportionately across the settlement hierarchy. As outlined above in previously discounted options, Catterick Garrison is the largest and most sustainable settlement in the Plan Area and can accommodate further housing development. Richmond, on the other hand, is physically constrained and future development opportunities are therefore majorly limited. It is considered that, for these reasons, this option is not suitable and has therefore been discounted.

Increase development in Catterick Garrison and reduce development proportionately across the rest of the settlement hierarchy

Another option would be to increase development in Catterick Garrison and reduce development proportionately across the rest of the settlement hierarchy. This would increase development in Catterick Garrison, which is the largest settlement in the area and one of the settlements with the most facilities and services in the area, but to the potential detriment of all other settlements in the district. Another weakness with this option is that distributing most of the anticipated future development to one single settlement may affect the survival and amount of services and facilities in other settlements and in turn require significant investment in infrastructure in Catterick Garrison to accommodate it. It is considered that this option is not appropriate and would not be successful in ensuring proportionate and sustainable development across all settlements in the Plan Area. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

Increase development in Catterick Garrison and reduce from the Secondary and Smaller Villages

Another option would be to increase housing in Catterick Garrison and reduce numbers in the Secondary Service Villages and Smaller Villages tiers. Similarly to the previous option, this would increase development in Catterick Garrison however to the detriment of the smallest settlements in the Plan Area. In doing this it would significantly impact on the survival and provision of services and facilities in these settlements and as a result their sustainability as a settlement. This option limits sustainable development in smaller settlements and does not take into account capacities and opportunities for growth and has therefore been discounted.



Increase development in Catterick Garrison and reduce in Richmond, Leyburn and the Primary Service Villages

Another option would be to increase housing in Catterick Garrison and reduce in Richmond, Leyburn and the Primary Service Villages. Again, this would increase development in Catterick Garrison but to the detriment of the larger settlements in the Plan Area. In doing this it would significantly impact on the survival and provision of services and facilities in these settlements and as a result their sustainability as a settlement. This option limits sustainable development in these settlements and does not take into account capacities and opportunities for growth and has therefore been discounted.

Prioritise development in the Primary, Secondary and Smaller Villages

Another option would be to prioritise development in the Primary and Secondary Service Villages as well as those identified in the Smaller Villages Tier. This option is considered as unsustainable and would be to the detriment of the larger settlements of Catterick Garrison, Richmond and Leyburn where there are more facilities and services. These larger settlements have the most facilities and services which in turn support these smaller settlements and so directing development away from these larger settlements would not only impact on their sustainability but to all the settlements in the Plan Area. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.



QUESTIONS

Do you agree with the preferred approach to the Scale of Housing?

High Growth Scenario of 160 homes per annum based on recommendations set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Do you agree with the preferred approach to the Distribution of Housing?

Catterick Garrison 57%, Richmond 5%, Leyburn 9%, Primary Villages 16%, Secondary Villages 6%, Smaller Villages 5%, Elsewhere 2%.

Are there any other considerations or options which should be taken into account?



Policy H2 - Allocations and Location of Housing Development

This policy sets out the preferred location of housing development, including allocations, directions of growth and development limits.

The preferred policy reads

Policy H2 - Allocations and Location of Housing Development Allocations

1. In Catterick Garrison, 27 sites have been allocated for housing

SHLAA site ID	Site name	Type of Allocation	Potential no. of dwellings
26	Land East of Cookson Way, Colburn	Housing	107
121	Gough Road	Housing	29
157	Colburn Park phase 2	Housing	201
401	Colburndale III	Housing	12
13	Glencroft, Hipswell	Housing	17
122	Coronation Park	Housing	50
420	Land East Walkerville (2)	Housing	117
185	Land adjacent to Lidl	Housing	24
357	Land off Downholme Road	Housing	20
359	Land North of Haigh Road	Housing	88
364	Former Civil Service Club	Housing	49
372	Former Careers Offices	Housing	68
373	Former Dental Care	Housing	10
375	West Scotton Road	Housing	126
379	Land West of Harley Crescent	Housing	12
380	Welfare Unit Offices	Housing	22
384	Harley Hills	Housing	630
361	Land opposite Haigh Road	Housing	145
362	Land East of Richmond Road	Housing	86
363	Land South of Jutland Road	Housing	60
371	Duchess of Kent Hospital	Housing	122
376	West Scotton Road	Housing	150
378	Land North of Le Cateau School	Housing	170
383	Pinhill Mess	Housing	53
386	Land North East of Somme Barracks	Housing	170
403	TMP (Horne Rd/Catterick Rd)	Housing	48
404	Land South of Loos Rd	Housing	150
		TOTAL	2,806



2. In Catterick Garrison, housing development will be delivered through the Allocated sites. Where allocations no longer come forward development will only be permitted within, or if opportunities do not exist within, adjacent to the Development Limits.

Directions of Growth

3. Directions for Housing Growth will be identified in Leyburn (Local Service Centre) and the Primary Service Villages, comprising

Central Richmondshire - **Brompton on Swale, Catterick Village and Scorton;**

Lower Wensleydale - **Middleham**

North Richmondshire - **Barton, Melsonby and Middleton Tyas**

Preferred directions of growth

Subject to further consultation

Development Limits

4. Housing developments resulting in a net gain in new dwellings, will only be permitted within or adjacent to the Development Limits for the following settlements (by Ward) -

- **Catterick and Brompton**

Bolton-on-Swale, Brompton-on-Swale, Brough with St Giles, Catterick Village, Easby, Ellerton on Swale, Gatherley Road, Scorton. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

- **Catterick Garrison**

- **Colburn**

- **Croft and Middleton**

Comprising - Barton, Cleasby, Croft-on-Tees, Dalton on Tees, Eryholme, Manfield, Middleton Tyas, Moulton, North Cowton, Stapleton

- **Gilling West**

Comprising - Dalton, Gayles, Gilling West, Kirby Hill, Newsham, Ravensworth, Skeeby, Whashton. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

- **Hipswell**

Comprising - St. Martins. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

- **Leyburn**

Comprising - Bellerby, Leyburn, Preston-under-Scar, Redmire, Wensley. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

- **Lower Swaledale**

Comprising - Hudwell, Marske. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

- **Lower Wensleydale**

Comprising - Barden, Constable Burton, East Hauxwell, Finghall, Harmby, Newton-le-Willows, Patrick Brompton, Spennithorne, Thornton Steward. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.



- **Melsonby**

Comprising - Aldbrough, Stanwick St. John, Caldwell, East Layton, Eppleby, Forcett, Melsonby, Croft-on-Tees, West Layton. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

- **Middleham**

East Witton, Middleham

- **Richmond**

Comprising - Richmond East, Richmond North, Richmond West. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

- **Scotton**

Comprising - Arrathorne, Hornby, Hunton, Tunstall. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

5. All development in the first instance should be located within development limits. Where deliverable opportunities do not exist within development limits, development should be adjacent to development limits and within the identified Direction of Growth (where applicable).
6. In all cases development should
 - a. be accessible and well related to existing facilities, and
 - b. be within the capacity of existing infrastructure network or it can be demonstrated that necessary additional infrastructure will be provided.

Justification

Allocations

The Local Plan considers the need for new homes along with the infrastructure required to support sustainable growth, including shops, transport, community facilities, utilities, sport and recreation, open space, and health and education. As a part of this consideration, the Local Plan identifies sites in line with the spatial strategy for the Plan Area, providing greater certainty to developers, local people and infrastructure providers about where development will take place and the likely amount in a specific location.

Policy H1 sets out the proposed amount and location of housing development required within the Local Plan area of Richmondshire outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park up to 2039. This preferred policy H2 therefore sets out the sites identified for allocation specifically within Catterick Garrison, which is proposed to be the main focus for growth for residential, military and economic uses in the Richmondshire Plan Area.

The Site Allocations Assessment Report (March 2021) summarises how sites have been identified and considered for allocation, the Council's approach to site selection and how these sites have been subsequently assessed through a six-stage process. This policy sets out the sites that are suggested to be suitable for allocation.

A likely development capacity has been established for each of the sites as per the methodology established in the report. It is again reiterated that this figure is not a maximum requirement and is the likely capacity based on the information available through the allocations assessment process. It is acknowledged the actual amount delivered may be slightly less or more where more detailed assessments are undertaken as part of the planning application process.



Directions of Growth

Directions of Housing Growth will be identified in the settlements as listed in Policy H2. These proposed directions of growth areas will be subject to a further consultation after this Preferred Options consultation but prior to the Submission draft consultation stage scheduled to take place at the end of this year.

The Directions of Growth are intended to work alongside Development Limits to identify and guide opportunities for housing development, in line with the housing numbers apportioned to each settlement in H1. For background, the Directions of Growth assessment will be based on work previously carried out under the Settlement Development Assessment in 2015. This previous assessment included profiling each settlement and identifying important aspects in relation to history, landscape, heritage, population, development and local services as well as any opportunities and constraints including heritage and landscape designations, access, landform, infrastructure, flooding and drainage.

Further information on the separate consultation regarding Directions of Growth will be available on our website shortly.

Development Limits

The Council's preferred approach is to ensure a balanced approach to the location of development. The approach offers sufficient flexibility to enable development to come forward whilst maintaining the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It also gives certainty to local communities, the development industry and infrastructure providers of the suitable locations for development. It is considered that identifying development limits around settlements supports this.

The development limits currently adopted were saved from Policy 23 of the old Local Plan (1999-2006) which was adopted in 2001. These were then modified by the current adopted policy CP4 - Supporting Sites for Development, enabling proposals adjacent to development limits to be brought forward. This approach was an interim measure until the development limits could be fully reviewed and updated. These development limits have now been reviewed as part of this Local Plan review and Preferred Options consultation. For the purposes of this policy, the definition of 'adjacent' is directly next to and sharing a common boundary. For clarity, for a development site to be considered adjacent it must share a common boundary with the defined development limit.

In reviewing Development Limits, to ensure consistency across all settlements, the following approach was taken

- To include domestic curtilage (including gardens, garages)
- To include new housing developments where completed
- To include development sites where full or reserved matters permission had been granted (and generally exclude outline permissions)
- To exclude modern farm buildings but include traditional (stone) buildings
- To include hard standing areas at schools but exclude playing fields
- To exclude playing field areas where they are on edge of settlement but to include, for example, village greens/green spaces where they are within the built confines
- To exclude playgrounds unless they are incorporated within the built confines
- To include churchyards and graveyards unless they are far removed from the core of the settlement
- To exclude allotments unless within the built confines.



The revised development limits are around all settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy. All development in the first instance should be located within development limits (and on allocated sites in the case of Catterick Garrison). Where deliverable opportunities do not exist within development limits, development should be adjacent to development limits and within the identified Direction of Growth (where applicable).

What you have told us?

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF states (paragraph 23) that 'Broad locations for development should be indicated on a key diagram, and land use designations and allocations identified on a policies map. Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the area (except insofar as these needs can be demonstrated to be met more appropriately through other mechanisms, such as brownfield registers or non-strategic policies).'

Issues and Options Consultation

It was suggested that in villages and hamlets considered as 'Elsewhere' settlements a positive flexible approach to growth should be employed by not defining development limits and/or allocations so smaller settlements could grow naturally, reducing the pressure for them to grow beyond their means and that this should be assessed on a case-by-case basis against pre-defined criteria which takes minimum account of the proposals relationship with the settlement both physically and in terms of scale.

Alternatives Considered

No Allocations

An alternative option would be to not allocate any sites for development. Sites for housing have only been allocated in Catterick Garrison, the largest and most sustainable settlement in the district, where over half of proposed future housing growth is anticipated to go. As stated, it is a requirement of national policy to allocate sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the Plan Area. It is therefore essential that sites are allocated in order to meet the requirements of national policy. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

In terms of the allocations themselves, the reasoning behind why specific sites have been allocated and others have not, can be found in the Site Allocations Assessment Report (March 2021) which forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan review.

No Directions of Growth

Another option would be to not identify any Directions of Growth in Leyburn and the Primary Service Villages. It is considered that identified Directions of Growth would work alongside Development Limits and guide development to the most suitable and sustainable locations adjacent to settlements (where opportunities do not exist within). Directions of Growth are only being identified in Leyburn and Primary Service Villages as they will see a greater level of housing development than that in Secondary Service Villages, Smaller Villages and Elsewhere settlements, as set out in policy H1. This approach is to ensure certainty as to where development will go in these settlements and that it will be in the most sustainable location. For these reasons, it is considered that having Directions of Growth in these settlements will help to guide and ensure development is sustainable and so this option has been discounted.



No development limits

An alternative option would be to not identify any development limits around any settlements. This option is not considered appropriate as the intention of development limits is to ensure settlements can expand and grow in a sustainable manner. Relying only on the broad principles set out in national policy and other local policies in relation to the location of housing development would potentially result in ribbon development and the disproportionate expansion of settlements which would in turn significantly alter the shape of existing settlements. It is considered that identifying development limits avoids such scenarios and allows for a locally tailored approach to be set by development coming forward in suitable and appropriate locations. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

Identify development limits around all settlements in settlement hierarchy and restrictive approach only enabling development within the limits

Another alternative option would be to identify development limits around all settlements but adopt a restrictive approach which only enables development within established limits. This option is similar to the preferred policy as, in the first instance, all development proposals should be located within identified development limits. It is only where there are no suitable, available, and developable site opportunities within these limits that proposals for sites adjacent will be considered. It is considered that this option of only allowing development within identified limits would limit flexibility to consider sites where none are available within and potentially impact upon the overall delivery of the housing target, thus not complying with national policy and requirements. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

Identify development limits around settlements that are Principal Towns, Local Service Centre and Primary Service Villages and restrictive approach in Secondary Service and Smaller Villages

An alternative option would be to identify development limits only in settlements that are Principal Towns, Local Service Centre and Primary Service Villages and have a restrictive approach to housing development in the Secondary Service Villages, Smaller Villages and Elsewhere settlements. It is considered that this option would be detrimental to the smaller settlements in the district and would likely impact on their overall sustainability. Again, adopting a restrictive approach would mean there would be less flexibility to consider sites where none are available within and therefore potentially restrict settlements expanding in a sustainable manner. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.



QUESTIONS

Allocations

Do you agree with the approach to allocating land?

Only making allocations for housing development in Catterick Garrison.

Do you agree with the sites proposed for allocation?

Please provide any further comments.

Directions of Growth

Do you agree with the approach to Directions of Growth?

Establishing Directions of Growth for Leyburn and the Primary Villages.

Please provide any further comments.

Development Limits

Do you agree with the approach to Development Limits?

Retaining and reviewing the Development Limits for all settlements.

Do you agree with the proposed Development Limits?

Please provide any further comments.



Policy H3 - Affordable Housing

This policy sets out the expected number of affordable homes required during the Plan period (2018-2039) in order to meet current and future demand.

The preferred policy reads

Policy H3 - Affordable Housing

1. The Council will work with private developers and registered providers to achieve a target of 35% affordable housing where viable.
2. In the Catterick Garrison Lower Value Zone (LVZ) the Council will work with private developers and registered providers to achieve the following targets for affordable housing in developments with a net gain in dwellings, subject to economic viability assessment

Greenfield Sites.....	25%
Brownfield Sites.....	15%
Strategic Site.....	35%
3. Affordable housing contributions will not be sought from developments in the LVZ for specialist older persons accommodation, barn conversions or sites of less than 10 dwellings.
4. In the Higher Value Zone (HVZ) a 35% target for affordable housing will be sought from all developments with a net gain in dwellings. No contribution will be sought from barn conversions.
5. Contributions towards affordable housing will be sought from all developments, with a net gain in dwellings, in parishes which are designated as 'rural' under Section 157 of the Housing Act 1985.
6. Contributions towards affordable housing will be sought from all major developments (developments of 10 dwellings or more or where the site area is 0.5 hectares or more), with a net gain in dwellings, in the parishes of Richmond, Colburn, Hipswell, Scotton, Brompton on Swale, Catterick Village, St Martins and Caldwell'.
7. In general, the affordable housing contribution will be met on site unless off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified, and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities.
8. The affordable housing contribution will be waived on small scale schemes whose purpose is to meet a proven local affordable housing need. Where the contribution is waived the dwellings must remain affordable in perpetuity. The contribution will be payable should the dwellings be sold on the open market.
9. An affordable housing contribution will only be sought on any floorspace created that is additional to what already exists where vacant buildings (including barns), which have not been abandoned, are being reused or redeveloped.



10. On major development a minimum of 10% of the affordable housing should be for affordable home ownership except where the resulting housing is solely for Build to Rent, those providing specialist accommodation for groups with specific needs such as elderly or students; those for Self or Custom Build or those for 100% affordable housing.
11. Small scale Local Needs Housing Schemes may be permitted on suitable sites where development would not normally be permitted. These schemes must meet a local affordable housing need and the dwellings must remain affordable in perpetuity. Their suitability for development will be assessed through Core Policy CP4. The Council may accept an element of on-site market housing to help subsidise the delivery of the affordable homes.

Justification

Current policy

For permissions granted between 2014/15 and 2018/19, affordable housing contributions agreed from sites of 5 dwellings or less add up to approximately £1.29M and there was a single dwelling provided as an on-site contribution. New build dwellings provide a greater proportion of contributions (approximately 72%) than conversions which is due to the cost of this type of development.

Affordable Housing Threshold

Affordable housing contributions from developments of 10 units and under in parishes which are not designated as 'rural'. Under Section 157 of the Housing Act 1985 these parishes are understood to be Richmond, Colburn, Hipswell, Scotton, Brompton on Swale, Catterick Village, St Martins and Caldwell. All other parishes in the Richmondshire Plan Area are designated as 'rural' under Section 157 of the Housing Act 1985 where the revised NPPF states we can set a lower threshold for affordable housing contributions from developments of 5 units or fewer. In theory this would allow us to continue with the current adopted approach in Core Policy CP6 of a zero threshold requiring affordable housing contributions (where viable) from all developments generating a net additional dwelling.

Analysis suggests that the previous policy has proved viable and therefore the retention of seeking affordable housing contributions on all development in rural areas will remain. In line with national policy, affordable housing contributions will be sought from developments of more than 10 dwellings in the non-rural parishes.

Affordable Housing Target

From the SHMA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) an affordable housing target of 35% is derived. That is, the number of dwellings required for rent or purchase by those in housing need each year, as a percentage of the annual housing target.

It concluded that 35% affordable housing was viable on all developments except for barn conversions and development in the Lower Value Zone, recommending reduced proportions of affordable housing accordingly.

What you have told us?

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF states (in paragraphs 62-64) that 'Where a need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing required, and expect it to be met on-site unless

- a) off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified, and
- b) the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities.



Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount.

Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups. Exemptions to this 10% requirement should also be made where the site or proposed development

- a) provides solely for Build to Rent homes
- b) provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for the elderly or students)
- c) is proposed to be developed by people who wish to build or commission their own homes, or
- d) is exclusively for affordable housing, an entry-level exception site or a rural exception site.'

Issues and Options Consultation

Responses on affordable housing were related to the Strategic Objectives, but suggested that an appropriate level of market housing was needed to provide affordable housing in turn. Comments also advocated community consultation on the type of affordable housing and ensuring the quality was higher.

Alternatives Considered

No Local Policy and rely on the national policy 10% affordable home ownership requirement

An alternative option would be to have no local plan policy on affordable housing and rely on national policy which has a 10% affordable home ownership requirement. This option is not considered appropriate as it does not allow for a locally tailored approach for providing affordable housing to be set. This option would not enable the required scale or type or need, as set out in the SHMA, for affordable housing to be met. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

A Policy which sets out same requirement across the Plan Area

Another alternative option would be to have a policy which sets out the same affordable housing requirement across the Plan Area. This option is not considered appropriate as it again does not allow for a locally tailored approach to be set. The preferred policy takes into account the findings set out in the SHMA and WPVA and so reflects the differing levels of need across the Plan Area and the nuances of local market conditions and viability factors. The preferred policy is therefore considered to be robust in the way that it sets out different affordable housing requirements for the sub areas and by type of land, reflecting viability. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.



QUESTIONS

Do you agree to preferred policy H3 - Affordable Housing?

If not, do you agree with the general approach to policy H3 but have any suggested changes?

Please provide any further comments.



Policy H4 - Housing Mix

This policy sets out the expected housing mix required during the Plan period (2018-2039) in order to meet current and future demand.

The preferred policy reads

Policy H4 - Housing Mix

1. **Proposals for housing must take account of the local housing requirements across all sectors of the community in terms of size, type and tenure, and also the accessibility and adaptability of dwellings.**
2. **All new housing developments should adopt the Nationally Described Space Standards or any subsequent government standard.**
3. **On developments of 5 dwellings or more, 20% of all new dwellings should be constructed to M4 (2) of Part M of Building Regulations accessible and adaptable dwellings standard.**
4. **On developments of 100 dwellings or more, 1% of all new dwellings should be constructed to M4 (3) of Part M of Building Regulations accessible and adaptable dwellings standard.**
5. **Where a need is identified development which seeks to provide specialist older persons accommodation will be encouraged in sustainable locations.**
6. **The Council will work with developers, registered providers, landowners and relevant individuals and groups to address identified local demand for self and custom build homes as identified in the Richmondshire Self and Custom Build Register.**

Justification

Providing an appropriate housing mix is essential in helping to meet the needs of local people. It enables residents to stay in their community and creates more mixed communities. The preferred policy H4 clearly sets out the considerations for which proposals should take into account with regards to housing mix and what requirements are necessary to be provided on-site. The preferred policy is evidenced by the SHMA (2017) and SHMA Update (2019) and so is considered robust and justified in its requirements.

Richmondshire has an ageing population, with a marked increase in the number and proportion of older residents. It is anticipated that there will be a 36.8% increase in residents aged 65 plus over the Plan period. However, the population is expected to decline by 3.6%. The proportion of young people is skewed by the military component at Catterick Garrison but there is also general decline in the number of younger families once the military is factored out.

The SHMA identifies an increase in demand for bungalows and level access accommodation, this being as a result of the increase in the older population. Demand was further highlighted for two and three-bed homes by younger families and households. The SHMA also identifies a requirement for specialist older persons (C3) and residential care (C2) accommodation. This identified demand has therefore been incorporated into the preferred H4 policy.



The proposed mix of housing set out in Tables 1 and 2 below are the results of the most recent evidence and will be under constant review as new evidence emerges and therefore may be subject to change during the lifetime of the plan. As a result these tables will not be directly included in the policy but will form part of the supporting text.

Table 1 - Housing Type by Tenure

	Market 65%		Affordable Rented 17.5%		Affordable Home Ownership 17.5%		Total	
House	64	61.5%	17	61%	17	61%	98	61%
Flat	12	11.5%	7	25%	3	10%	22	14%
Bungalow	27	26%	4	14%	8	29%	39	24%
Other	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Total	104	100%	28	100%	28	100%	160	100%

Table 2 - Housing size by Tenure

	Market		Affordable Rent		Affordable Home Ownership		Total	
1 bed	5	5%	8	28.5%	2	7%	15	9%
2 bed	34	33%	10	36%	10	36%	54	34%
3 bed	44	42%	8	28.5%	15	54%	67	42%
4+ bed	21	20%	2	7%	1	3%	24	15%
Total	104	100%	28	100%	28	100%	160	100%

Optional accessibility standards were introduced by the Government in 2015 to provide a mechanism for improving accessibility of housing for those with additional needs. The SHMA recommends, because of Richmondshire's ageing population and level of disability, that accessibility in new homes is improved. National standards are contained in Building Regulations but the categories of 'Accessible and adaptable dwellings' (M4(2) and Wheelchair user dwellings' M4(3) are optional standards. The M4(2) dwelling standard has replaced the 'Lifetime Homes' standard.

The SHMA proposes that 20% of all new dwellings are constructed to M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings standard and 1% are constructed to M4(3) wheelchair user dwelling standard. These requirements have therefore been incorporated into the preferred H4 policy.



As well as incorporating the recommendations of the SHMA, the preferred H4 policy ensures all new housing development adopts the Nationally Described Space Standards as set by government. These were published in March 2015 in Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (DCLG, 2015). Table 3 below sets out the minimum sizes for dwellings of various sizes and types.

Table 3 - Nationally Described Space Standards

Number of bedrooms (b)	Number of bed spaces (persons)	1 storey dwellings	2 storey dwellings	3 storey dwellings	Built-in storage
1b	1p	39 (37) *	-	-	1.0
	2p	50	58	-	1.5
2b	3p	61	70	-	2.0
	4p	70	79	-	
3b	4p	74	84	90	2.5
	5p	86	93	99	
	6p	95	102	108	
4b	5p	90	97	103	3.0
	6p	99	106	112	
	7p	108	115	121	
	8p	117	124	130	
5b	6p	103	10	116	3.5
	7p	112	119	125	
	8p	121	128	134	
6b	7p	116	123	129	4.0
	8p	125	132	138	

‘Space’ is considered an important factor when people are choosing a home and influences how they live. A lack of space can compromise basic lifestyle needs and ultimately impact on the health and well-being of occupants. Providing homes which are of a sufficient size with the ability to be adapted and change to lifestyles and individual requirements over time is vitally important. It is also key in contributing towards creating sustainable communities and so the requirement of adopting national space standards as a minimum has been included within the preferred policy.

The preferred H4 policy also seeks to address identified local demand for self and custom build homes as identified in the Richmondshire Self and Custom Build Register. Development of self and custom-build homes is an alternative way for individuals and community groups to provide housing to meet particular needs, either individually or for local communities. Under the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016), the Council is required to maintain a register of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in their area in order to build homes for those individuals to occupy.



Furthermore, the Council, through the Local Plan, is seeking to maximise the sustainability measures in new housing. The Government restricts those measures to a 19% reduction in emissions beyond that which is currently expected through existing Building Regulations. As this would likely incur more design/construction costs the policy proposal was tested through the WPVA and found to be viable. This requirement is set out in Policy CC1 (Sustainable Design (2a)).

What you have told us?

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF states (paragraph 61) that 'within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes)'.

Issues and Options Consultation

Respondents highlighted the importance of providing a framework for policies on areas including affordable housing and housing mix to ensure they reflect localised needs.

Alternatives Considered

No Housing Mix Policy and rely on national policy and the market

An alternative option would be to have no Local Plan policy on Housing Mix and rely on national policy and the housing market. This is not considered an appropriate option as it would not enable the scale or types or need identified locally to be met and would rely solely on the market. It is considered that the proposed policy ensures housing development addresses local and different needs, as reported in the SHMA, and is in accordance with national policy. For these reasons this option has been discounted.

A Policy which sets out housing mix

Another alternative option would be to adopt a policy which sets out the required housing mix but does not take into account space standards or the requirement for adaptable and accessible homes. This option would help in ensuring some of the locally identified need for housing is met but would seek to achieve to achieve space standards or provide adaptable and accessible housing to meet these identified needs. It is considered that this option would not completely reflect local needs for specialist types of accommodation, unlike the preferred policy, and for these reasons has been discounted.



QUESTIONS

Do you agree to preferred policy H4 - Housing Mix?

If not, do you agree with the general approach to policy H4 but have any suggested changes?

Please provide any further comments.



Policy H5 - Rural Workers Dwellings

This policy sets out the preferred approach to the sustainable development of dwellings for rural workers.

The preferred policy reads

Policy H5 - Rural Workers Dwellings

1. Proposals will be permitted contrary to Policy SP2 (Settlement Hierarchy) for new dwellings for workers engaged in farming, forestry or other essential land management activities where it has been demonstrated that the accommodation is essential to support the enterprise or activity. In all cases it must be demonstrated that
 - a) There is a clearly established existing functional need for a specialist full-time worker or one who is primarily employed in agriculture to live on the landholding, and that labour requirement does not relate to part-time employment
 - b) The agricultural business is financially sound and viable with a clear prospect of remaining so, the activity and landholding units concerned having been established for at least 3 years
 - c) The functional need could not be fulfilled by any existing dwelling on the landholding unit or any other existing accommodation in a nearby village, which is suitable (including by means of refurbishment or appropriate extension) and potentially available for occupation by the workers concerned
 - d) The proposed location is well related to existing buildings, and
 - e) The proposal would comply with other relevant Local Plan policies.
2. Any application to remove an existing agricultural or rural workers occupancy condition will only be permitted where
 - a) The dwelling has been occupied in accordance with the agricultural occupancy condition for 5 years or more
 - b) it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for the accommodation on the holding
 - c) it can be demonstrated that there is no demand from another rural worker meeting the conditions by proof of marketing the property for at least 12 months
3. In all cases, the agricultural condition will be substituted with a condition limiting the dwelling to use as either affordable housing, economic use or tourism use.

Justification

Housing should be located in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy in order to enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. It will often be more sustainable for workers to live in nearby towns or villages or in suitable existing housing. However, in certain limited circumstances it is justified to make an appropriately-sized new dwelling in the countryside for a full-time worker to support the reasonable operational needs of a rural enterprise.



In order to avoid speculative building in unsustainable locations, several criteria have been set out in the policy to ensure there is an essential function and the enterprise is financially sound.

Rural enterprise will be considered as farming, forestry or other essential land management activities. The protection of livestock from theft or injury by intruders may contribute to the need of an agricultural dwelling, but is not sufficient reasoning to justify one alone. Examples that do justify a functional need may be for a worker to provide essential care at short notice to animals or agricultural processes, or to deal quickly with emergencies that could cause serious loss of crops or products from frost or failure of automatic systems. Criteria is also required to ensure this policy is not used to construct a dwelling which is then converted and used for another use. A limited range of uses will be acceptable and encouraged to keep the building in use after its original purpose expires. However, this policy will actively discourage conversion to a residential use as this can be unsustainable in terms of access, services and proximity to facilities.

What you have told us?

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF states that the development of isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless one or more circumstances apply. Specifically in relation to this policy, one of the circumstances includes where 'there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside' (Paragraph 79a).

Issues and Options Consultation

No representations were made which specifically relate to this preferred policy.

Alternatives Considered

No Rural Workers Dwellings Policy

An alternative option would be to have no Local Plan policy on Rural Workers Dwellings. This is not considered an appropriate option and that the proposed policy is designed to permit dwellings for rural workers where appropriate, but mitigate the use of this policy to create isolated homes in the countryside, contrary to national policy. For these reasons this option has been discounted.



QUESTIONS

Do you agree to preferred policy H5 - Rural Workers' Dwellings?

If not, do you agree with the general approach to policy H5 but have any suggested changes?

Please provide any further comments.



Policy H6 - Conversion of Rural Buildings for Housing

This policy sets out criteria to enable the sustainable conversion of existing rural buildings into a residential dwelling.

The preferred policy reads

Policy H6 - Conversion of Rural Buildings for Housing

1. The conversion of rural buildings to residential use, in principle, is supported, where proposals meet the following criteria
 - a. the building is of permanent and substantial construction, structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for substantial extension, alteration, or reconstruction
 - b. the scale, form and general design of the building and its proposed conversion are in keeping with its surroundings, local building styles and materials
 - c. any proposed alterations are of a high design quality, contributing positively to the character and appearance of the building
 - d. it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not adversely impact on the historic environment, natural environment and biodiversity, and the character of the local landscape and its immediate and wider setting.
2. Any extension to a rural building (either being converted or which has previously been converted) must be of a scale and design which is subservient and complementary to the existing building and would not detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the existing building.
3. To avoid any detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider landscape setting, permitted development rights will be withdrawn on proposals for the conversion of rural buildings.
4. Applications for the conversion of rural buildings should be accompanied with a Structural Survey Report, detailing the condition of the building and demonstrating the building is capable of conversion.

Justification

Rural buildings form an important part of the history and landscape of Richmondshire. Changing circumstances may mean many buildings have outlived their original purpose. The Local Plan aims to facilitate change of use where it helps to conserve the interest of these buildings. A number of dwellings have been created through conversions helping to meet the housing need in Richmondshire.

When converting a rural building it is essential to ensure that the new use and its potential impacts do not undermine the integrity of the building and the surrounding landscape. It is also important that rural buildings proposed to be converted are in locations suitable and appropriate for occupation as a residential dwelling and that the building itself is structurally sound and physically capable of being converted. A Structural Survey by a suitably qualified and experienced person will be required to accompany proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to identify the current structural condition of the building and the method by which it is proposed to be converted to the new use in order to assess whether it is of substantial construction, structurally sound and capable of conversion without the need for substantial extension, alteration or reconstruction.

Rural buildings proposed for conversion should be done so without substantial alteration, reconstruction or extension (substantial extension being more than an additional 50% of the original footprint of the building).



It is considered that limiting 'substantial extension' to 50% of the original footprint of the building is reasonable, and proportionate in ensuring a balance is achieved in enabling further space in a building, which may make it more suitable, and preventing over-development which could adversely impact on the building's interest and the landscape. For clarification, the term and definition of 'substantial extension' also applies to extensions to rural buildings already converted.

Furthermore, any extension and/or alteration to a rural building should be of a high-quality design and, with regards to extensions, of a scale and design subservient and complementary to the existing building. This is to ensure that rural buildings (along with any additional extensions and alterations) remain in keeping with their surroundings and that there is no adverse impact on the historic environment and on the local landscape setting. Permitted development rights will also be removed from proposals for the conversion of rural buildings to further ensure there is no adverse impact caused.

Preferred policy H6 therefore seeks to support the re-use and re-purposing of existing rural buildings where proposals meet the relevant criteria as set out in the policy. This preferred policy will work closely with Design policy (D1) and the Sustainable Development policies (SD1-4) when considering proposals for the conversion of rural buildings.

What you have told us?

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF states (paragraph 148) that 'the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience, encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings, and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure'.

Issues and Options Consultation

No responses were received relating specifically to this topic.

Alternatives Considered

No policy on Rural Conversions to Housing and rely on national policy

An alternative option would be to have no Local Plan policy on rural conversions to housing and rely only on national policy. This is not considered an appropriate option and that the proposed policy above sets out clear guidance in terms of what development will be considered as acceptable and consistent with rural sustainability. The preferred policy also enables for a locally tailored approach to be set with regards to the conversion, extension and/or alteration of rural buildings. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

A policy with a restrictive approach to conversions and extensions

Another alternative option would be to adopt a policy with a more restrictive approach to conversions and extensions. This is not considered an appropriate option as the preferred policy allows for a locally tailored approach to be adopted when considering proposals for the conversion of rural buildings. The criteria as set out in the preferred policy are reasonable and robust and it is considered that being overly restrictive would negatively impact on the ability of otherwise suitable rural buildings being brought forward for conversion. An overly restrictive policy in this regard would also be potentially inconsistent with national policy, and so for these reasons has been discounted.



QUESTIONS

Do you agree to preferred policy H6 - Rural Conversions?

If not, do you agree with the general approach to policy H6 but have any suggested changes?

Please provide any further comments.



Policy H7 - Replacement Dwellings

This policy sets out criteria to enable the replacement of a dwelling where a building is not suitable for conversion as per Policy H6.

The preferred policy reads

Policy H7 - Replacement Dwellings

- 1) Proposals for replacement dwellings will be supported where they meet all the following criteria
 - a) The new dwelling is located on the site of, or as near as possible to, the cleared site of the original building
 - b) The new dwelling is of a similar scale, form and general design which is in keeping with its surroundings and would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area
 - c) The new dwelling would not cause an adverse impact on the historic environment, the character of the local landscape or its immediate and wider setting
 - d) The new dwelling would meet the other relevant policy requirements as set out in the Local Plan, including the policies in relation to access, use of land and materials and design.
- 2) To avoid any detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the immediate and wider landscape setting, permitted development rights will be withdrawn on proposals for replacement dwellings.

Justification

Where a replacement dwelling is required, it is essential that proposals meet all of the criteria as set out in the preferred H7 policy.

To protect existing landscape character, it is important that the location, size and design of the replacement dwelling is carefully considered. The replacement building should be located on the site of, or as near as possible to, the cleared site of the original. There may be some exceptions where a more distant location may be preferable in terms of reducing landscape impact and the potential for this would be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The replacement dwelling should be of a similar scale to that of the building being replaced and should be reflective of local architectural design and building styles, including making use of local materials.

To prevent the possibility of two dwellings being available where permission is granted, a condition or legal agreement will be required to ensure that the existing dwelling is demolished, and the site reinstated once the new dwelling is completed.

Where dwellings are replaced, permitted development rights will be withdrawn in order to control further extensions that may impact on the landscape and/or rural character of the surrounding area.



What you have told us?

National Planning Policy Framework

There are no references made in relation to replacement dwellings which would apply to Richmondshire. For reference, replacement dwellings are mentioned in relation to inappropriate construction of new buildings in the Green Belt in paragraph 145, 'with the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces' being one exception.

Issues and Options Consultation

No responses were received specifically relating to this topic.

Alternatives Considered

No Replacement Dwellings policy

An alternative option would be to have no Local Plan policy on Replacement Dwellings and rely on national policy. This is not considered an appropriate option and that the preferred policy sets out clear criteria for situations where existing buildings are unavailable or unsuitable for the specific proposed use and, as a result, are required to be replaced. National policy does not provide guidance for such proposals unless it is within the Green Belt and so is unclear for how applications for replacement dwellings outside of the Green Belt should be considered. For these reasons, this option of no policy has been discounted.



QUESTIONS

**Do you agree to preferred policy H7 - Replacement Dwellings?
If not, do you agree with the general approach to policy H7 but
have any suggested changes?
Please provide any further comments.**



Policy H8 - Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

This policy sets out how the Council will make adequate provision for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. The preferred policy reads

Policy H8 - Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

1. Provision is made for travelling groups at the existing sites of Lime Kiln Wood at Catterick Village and Blue Anchor at Scotch Corner. Where there is an identified need for additional pitches, preference will be first given to the expansion and extension of these existing sites.
2. Proposals for additional Gypsies/Travellers and Travelling show-people sites, including both for new and extensions to existing sites, should be consistent with other policies in this plan and
 - a) not dominate but respect the scale and form of the existing settlement
 - b) be well related and in proportion to accessible local service provision (including schools and healthcare), reducing the need to travel as well as avoiding undue pressure on local infrastructure and services
 - c) provide for the social and economic needs of the local community
 - d) provide a safe and healthy environment for residents and encouraging a peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community
 - e) positively enhance the environment and increase its openness through well planned landscaping which should avoid isolating the site from the rest of the community
 - f) consider the effect of the local environmental quality including noise and air quality on the health and wellbeing of travellers resulting from existing and future neighbouring proposed development uses.
3. Proposals for new traveller site development in the open countryside away from existing settlements will be strictly limited.

Justification

The Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA, 2021) shows that there is a high vacancy rate on local sites with limited further demand. This is reflected in the lack of unauthorised encampments, enforcement action or applications for additional sites in Richmondshire, which does not call for strategic allocations. It is evident that any identified need can be met on existing sites. Any applications for further sites will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and should be consistent with other relevant policies within the Local Plan as well as meet the criteria set out in preferred policy H8 part 2.

To ensure that existing Traveller needs continue to be met in perpetuity, existing authorised sites and pitches will be protected. Proposals that involve the loss of these sites and pitches will only be permitted if a satisfactory replacement can be provided. This replacement will need to be provided prior to the loss of the existing pitch or site and should meet the same policy criteria identified above relating to a new site.

What you have told us?

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 61 of the NPPF states that '...the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes)'. The NPPF states in paragraph 4 that the 'Planning Policy for Travellers Sites' document should be read in conjunction with the national planning policy framework.



Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (2015)

This specific policy document on Travellers sites was published by government in 2015. Paragraph 11 states that 'criteria should be set to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need. Where there is no identified need, criteria-based policies should be included to provide a basis for decisions in case applications nevertheless come forward. Criteria based policies should be fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community'.

Issues and Options Consultation

No responses were received specifically relating to Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.

Alternatives Considered

No Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation policy and rely on national policy

An alternative option would be to have no Local Plan policy on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation and rely on national policy. This is not considered an appropriate option and that the proposed policy above clearly identifies sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and the criteria for which proposed additional sites should adhere to. The inclusion of this robust policy ensures consistency with national policy and allows for a locally tailored approach to be set and any potential needs met. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

A policy which allocates new site(s) for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Another option would be to adopt a policy which allocated new sites for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation. This option would allow for a locally tailored approach to be set and any potential need to be met. However, as identified in the GTAA (2021), there is limited further demand for sites with there being a high vacancy rate on existing local sites. It is considered that, given there is no identified additional need, that sites are not required to be allocated and that a criteria-based policy such as that proposed in preferred policy H8 would suffice. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

A criterion-based policy for new sites

An alternative option would be to have a policy which sets out the criteria required for proposals to meet in relation to new Gypsy and Traveller accommodation sites. The preferred policy does set out criteria for this but, unlike this option, also includes guidance in relation to the expansion of existing sites. The preferred policy encompasses this option as well as allows for the expansion of existing sites, allowing for a locally tailored approach to be set which is flexible in terms of providing for any potential need to be met in appropriate locations. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.

A policy which allows for the expansion of existing sites

Another alternative option would be to have a policy which only allows for the expansion of existing sites. The preferred policy does allow for the extension of existing sites but, unlike this option, also includes the criteria to assess proposals in relation to new Gypsy and Traveller accommodation sites. The preferred policy encompasses this option as well as allows for new Gypsy and Traveller sites where required, allowing for a locally tailored approach to be set which is flexible in terms of providing for any potential need to be met in appropriate locations. For these reasons, this option has been discounted.



QUESTIONS

Do you agree to preferred policy H8 - Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation?

If not, do you agree with the general approach to policy H8 but have any suggested changes?

Please provide any further comments.