



## **Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy**

# **National Planning Policy Framework Compatibility Self-Assessment**

**August 2012**



## 1A: Achieving sustainable development

The presumption in favour of sustainable development and core planning principles (para 6-17)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p><i>Policies in local plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and guide how it should be applied locally (15).</i></p>	<p><i>Does the plan positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area?</i></p> <p><i>Does the plan meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, (subject to the caveats set out in para 14)?</i></p> <p><i>Do you have a policy or policies which reflect the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development? A <a href="#">model policy</a> is provided on the Planning Portal in the Local Plans section, as a suggestion (but this isn't prescriptive).</i></p>	<p>Yes – the Central Richmondshire Spatial Strategy enables the plan to respond flexibly to military choices.</p> <p>Core Policy CP0 (the model policy) explicitly seeks to positively meet development opportunities and denotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Core Policy CP2 extends and elaborates on this approach.</p> <p>Core Policy CP4 enables a flexible approach to development proposals so as to meet needs and pending the <i>Delivering Development</i> document.</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>

The presumption in favour of sustainable development and core planning principles (para 6-17)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
The NPPF sets out a set of 12 core land-use principles which should underpin plan-making (and decision-making) (17)		<p>The five Spatial Principles (SP1 – SP5) of the Local Plan strategy provide the context and overall approach to plan-making which reflect the principles set out in paragraph 17 of NPPF.</p> <p>The Core Policies combine with the Spatial Principles to provide a framework which underpins the plan-making and decision-taking processes and reflects those principles set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>Indeed, the Local Plan Core Strategy document should be read as a whole to address these issues.</p>	Not considered significant.

## 1B: Delivering sustainable development

1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Set out a clear economic vision for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21).	<i>Is there an up to date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, to justify their long-term protection (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that purpose) para (22)?</i>	Spatial Principle SP5 and its supporting text presents a realistic assessment of local economic conditions identified in the Employment Land Review and recognises that growth comes from a range of sectors outside traditional employment (B1, B2 and B8) land uses. The plan area is predominantly rural in character requiring a facilitative rather than prescriptive approach with a focus maintained on existing key employment areas without retaining an excess of land.	Not considered significant.

2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-27)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period (23).	<p><i>Have you undertaken an assessment of the need to expand your town centre, considering the needs of town centre uses?</i></p> <p><i>Have you identified primary and secondary shopping frontages?</i></p>	<p>The relevant Sub Area Strategies for Central Richmondshire and Lower Wensleydale set out the context for town centre management and growth over the plan period (i.e. Leyburn, Richmond, Catterick Garrison).</p> <p>In addition to this, several Core Policies (inc. CP4, CP7 and CP9) seek to encourage town centre development. The restrictions of Richmond Town as a District retail centre are recognised as requiring an alternative strategy. Richmond and Catterick Garrison are complementary towns which, as joint principal towns, offer a flexible local strategy that combines the strengths of both.</p> <p>Primary and secondary shopping frontages will be identified in the Delivering Development plan and they are defined and saved in the old Local Plan (Policy 83) in Richmond town centre.</p>	Not considered significant.

3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development (28).	<i>Do your policies align with the objectives of para 28?</i>	<p>Yes – Spatial Principle SP3 and Core Policies CP8 and CP10 seek to support economic growth in most rural areas. The Spatial Strategies for the sub areas also seek to do this.</p> <p>It is important to note that the RDC plan area comprises predominantly rural and very rural areas and therefore such policies will apply in effect to the whole area.</p>	Not considered significant.

4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>Policies that facilitate sustainable development but also contribute to wider sustainability and health objectives (29).</p> <p>Different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas (29).</p>	<p><i>If local (car parking) standards have been prepared, are they justified and necessary? (39) (The cancellation of PPG13 removes the maximum standards for major non-residential development set out in Annex D. PPS4 allowed for non-residential standards to be set locally with Annex D being the default position. There is no longer a requirement to set non-residential parking standards as a maximum but that does not preclude lpas from doing so if justified by local circumstances).</i></p> <p>Has it taken into account how this relates to other policies set out elsewhere in the Framework, particularly in rural areas? (34).</p> <p><i>Have you worked with adjoining authorities and transport providers on the provision of viable infrastructure?</i></p>	<p>Spatial Principle SP2 sets out and Core Policy CP3 supports the settlement hierarchy which maximizes the main transport nodes within the plan area.</p> <p>However, there is limited capacity for development to create a step change in alternative, more sustainable transport modes in most rural areas. No local parking standards have been prepared.</p> <p>The Council has liaised with neighbouring authorities and transport providers (e.g. NYCC, Highways Agency) to discuss whether any cross boundary issues existed in relation to highways infrastructure and sustainable transport solutions.</p> <p>It is considered that there are no such issues given that development is proposed too far removed from the district boundary to impact in the overall strategy.</p>	<p>Whilst the Local Plan Core Strategy has no specific transport policies (as this falls within the remit of the County LTP), reference is made within several core policies to the necessity to consider sustainable transport modes in delivering development proposals such as CP2, CP9, CP11 and CP13.</p>

**5.Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)**

<p>There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.</p>		<p>Yes – Core Policy CP14 on Promoting and Delivering Infrastructure applies to high quality communications infrastructure as well as wider infrastructure needs.</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>
--	--	---	------------------------------------



**6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paras 47-55)**

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements; this should include an additional buffer of <i>5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land (47).</i></p>	<p><i>What is your record of housing delivery?</i></p> <p><i>Have you identified:</i></p> <p>a) five years or more supply of specific deliverable sites;</p> <p><i>b) an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period), or</i></p> <p><i>c) If there has been a record of persistent under delivery have you identified a buffer of 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period)? [Para 47].</i></p> <p><i>Does this element of housing supply include windfall sites; if so, to what extent is there 'compelling evidence' to justify their inclusion (48)?</i></p>	<p>Table 3 within Spatial Principle SP4 of the Local Plan Core Strategy identifies the required number of dwellings and includes non-allocated housing delivery.</p> <p>The Strategic Directions of Growth identified in the Local Plan Core Strategy Spatial Strategies (at Catterick Garrison and Leyburn) will guide the location of major development proposals.</p> <p>The five year housing land supply is identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2010 and delivery is being monitored annually through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).</p> <p>Further updates are required for the last financial year 2011/12 and will be presented in the next AMR.</p> <p>All future development sites are windfall sites until an Allocations document is prepared</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>

**6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paras 47-55)**

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
		<p><i>(Delivering Development)</i> and will be considered through Core Policy CP4. The delivery of these sites will be monitored through the updating of sites in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) due in 2012 and through the AMR.</p> <p>Based on previous trends and future projections for windfall delivery, it is expected that the <i>Delivering Development</i> document will include a policy allowance for 'windfalls'.</p> <p>Regarding the 5% or 20% additional buffer, it is unclear what is meant by "persistent under delivery". Therefore, this has not yet been considered fully.</p>	
<p>Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained (47).</p>	<p><i>To what extent does the removal of national and regional brownfield targets have an impact on housing land supply?</i></p>	<p>The proposed SHELAA (2012) will deal with these issues.</p> <p>A Housing Trajectory is required but the housing market and building rate is difficult to predict with any confidence at present.</p> <p>The removal of national and</p>	<p>A Housing Trajectory is required.</p>

6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paras 47-55)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
		regional brownfield targets will have no impact on housing land supply in the RDC Plan Area.	
Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50), and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand (para 159)	<i>Does the plan include policies requiring affordable housing? Do these need to be reviewed in the light of removal of the national minimum threshold? Is your evidence for housing provision based on up to date, objectively assessed needs</i>	Yes – based on the findings of recent study reports: Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and the Economic Viability Assessment (EVA)  Also, based on the scrutiny of recent population projections and correction of ONS errors.	Not considered significant.
In rural areas be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate (54).	<i>Have you considered whether your plan needs a policy which allows some market housing to facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs?</i>	Yes – through Spatial Principles SP3 and SP4 and Core Policies CP3, CP6 and CP8.  Core Policy CP6 allows for rural exceptions with some market housing in certain circumstances.	Not considered significant.
	<i>Have you considered the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens? (This is discretionary)(para 53)</i>	Such a policy is not considered necessary in the Local Plan Core Strategy.	Not considered significant.

**6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paras 47-55)**

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p>	<p><i>Examples of special circumstances to allow new isolated homes listed at para 55 (note, previous requirement about requiring economic use first has gone).</i></p>	<p>Spatial Principle SP3 – promotes priority and support for appropriate rural housing schemes to achieve sustainable communities. Spatial Principle SP4 - identifies a target for development in areas considered as 'Elsewhere' or outwith the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>A settlement hierarchy, defined in Spatial Principle SP2 promotes most development in the towns and larger villages.</p> <p>Secondary Service Villages in most rural areas have been identified as clusters where development in any of the clustered settlements identified would be considered to benefit all of the clustered settlements.</p> <p>Core Policy CP8 allows for housing in the countryside in accordance with the major exceptions in para. 55 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>

**7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)**

**6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paras 47-55)**

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.		Yes. Core Policy CP13 on Promoting High Quality Design.	Not considered significant.

8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-78)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<i>Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).</i>	<i>Does the plan include a policy or policies addressing community facilities and local services? To what extent do policies plan positively for the provision and integration of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; safeguard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernize; and ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to key services and infrastructure?</i>	<p>Spatial Principle SP2 sets out the sustainable settlement hierarchy which guides the scale and distribution of development across the plan area. This has been informed in part by a settlement facilities study which identifies available services and facilities in each settlement and priority is given to where development can reasonably be expected to meet this aim. The provision of community facilities and services assists in delivering sustainable development and supports and enhances those services.</p> <p>The complementary role of the joint-principal towns of Richmond and Catterick Garrison provides an example of shared community facilities and services across the local area.</p> <p>Core Policy CP2 identifies that development should, as far as possible, be accessible and located close to local services and facilities so as to minimise</p>	Not considered significant.

<b>8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-78)</b>			
<b>What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
		<p>the need to travel.</p> <p>Core Policy CP11 supports proposals which protect, retain or enhance existing community and recreational assets. It also states that where proposals involve the loss or alternative development of existing community and recreational assets they will only be supported if they are no longer required, are no longer viable, there is a satisfactory alternative available and where a new proposal is for new provision which outweighs that of the existing facilities.</p> <p>All new development will be expected to plan positively with regard to the provision of new community and recreational facilities.</p>	

8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-78)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<i>Enable local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them – 'Local Green Space' (76-78).</i>	<i>Do you have a policy which would enable the protection of Local Green Spaces and manage any development within it in a manner consistent with policy for Green Belts? (Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The designation should only be used when it accords with the criteria in para 77).</i>	<p>The proposed <i>Delivering Development</i> document identified in the Local Development Scheme, will address the policy position relating to the protection of local green spaces.</p> <p>Core Policy CP11 provides a policy context for designating Local Green Space. This is also supplemented by para. 4.11.7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy.</p> <p>Core Policy CP12 (criterion 12(d)) covers the conservation and enhancement of green open spaces which impact on environmental and historic assets.</p>	Not considered significant.



9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances (82)</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy (83).</p> <p>Boundaries should be set using 'physical features likely to be permanent' amongst other things (85)</p>	<p>If you are including Green Belt policies in your plan, do they accurately reflect the NPPF policy?</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>LPA should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. <i>Beneficial uses are listed in para 81.</i> PPG2 set out that 'Green Belts have a positive role to play in fulfilling objectives. Para 1.6 of PPG2 set out the objectives – some of these have been rephrased/ amended and 'to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses' has been omitted.</p> <p>Ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development (85).</p> <p>Does it allow for the extension or alteration of a <i>building,</i></p>	<p>Not applicable. No Green Belt is necessary.</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>

9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
	<p>provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building? (89). <i>PPG2 previously referred to dwelling. Original building is defined in the Glossary.</i></p> <p>Does it allow for the replacement of a <i>building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces? (89) PPG2 did not have a separate bullet point – replacement related to dwellings rather than buildings.</i></p> <p><i>Does it allow for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development? (89)</i> (PPG2 referred to 'major existing developed sites')</p>		

9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
	Change from 'Park and Ride' in PPG2 to <i>local transport infrastructure</i> and the inclusion of ' <i>development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order</i> ' in relation to other forms of development that are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. (90).		

10. Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<i>Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations (94).</i>	<p><i>Have you planned new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions?</i></p> <p><i>Does your plan actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings?</i></p> <p><i>When setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, have you done so in a way that is consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards? (95)</i></p>	Yes – Spatial Principles SP2 and SP4 concentrate new dwellings in two areas, maximising potential for economic development solutions delivered through Core Policy CP1 which addresses these relevant issues.	Not considered significant.
Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy (97).	<p><i>Do you have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources?</i></p> <p><i>Have you considered identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources (see also NPPF footnote 17)</i></p>	As above.	Not considered significant.

11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (para 117).</p> <p>Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117).</p>	<p><i>If you have identified Nature Improvement Areas, have you considered specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these areas (para 117)?</i></p>	<p>Core Policy CP4 states that development should not lead to the loss of, or adverse impact on, important nature conservation, biodiversity or geodiversity sites.</p> <p>Core Policy CP12 (2c) deals with the maintenance, enhancement and, where appropriate, restoration of biodiversity and geodiversity of the plan area.</p> <p>Consideration of biodiversity matters has been undertaken more widely and has included reference to the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Biodiversity Strategy and the North Yorkshire Biodiversity Action Plan as well as the Richmondshire Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <p>The Richmondshire Plan Area and its adjoining areas have no Nature Improvement Areas within them.</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>

**12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126 – 141)**

There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.		Yes – Core Policy CP12 on Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets addresses these requirements.	Not considered significant.
---	--	--	-----------------------------

### 13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)

What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>It is important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation (142).</p>	<p><i>Does the plan have policies for the selection of sites for future peat extraction? (143) (NPPF removes the requirement to have a criteria based policy as peat extraction is not supported nationally over the longer term).</i></p>	<p>These matters are dealt with in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan which is the responsibility of North Yorkshire County Council and is currently being undertaken.</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>

## Plan-making

Local Plans (paras 150-157)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
Each local planning authority should produce a Local Plan for its area. Any additional DPDs should only be used where clearly justified. SPDs should be used where they help applicants make successful applications/aid infrastructure delivery/not be used to add unnecessarily to financial burdens on development (153)	<i>Are you able to clearly justify the use of additional DPDs if this is the approach that you are pursuing?</i>	<p>Yes – Spatial Principles SP4 and SP5 provide the scale and distribution framework for development and Core Policy CP4 provides the criteria to be met to deliver sustainable development. This approach is considered suitable and appropriate to act as an interim measure for determining development. However, to plan positively for development, site allocations are necessary and this will be best achieved through a subsequent Delivering Development plan. The adoption of that plan, which will include detailed allocations and other development policies, is anticipated to take a long period (see discussion at Core Policy CP4).</p> <p>Also, annual housing and employment land availability assessments will inform delivery of development land through the Local Plan Core Strategy.</p>	Not considered significant.



Local Plans (paras 150-157)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
		There will likely be a need for an SPD on affordable housing which will place a necessary burden on developments, where financially viable.	
<b>Local Plans should:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan positively (para 157)</li> </ul>	<i>Have you objectively assessed development needs and planned for them? If you can't meet them in your area, have you co-operated with others on meeting them elsewhere? (para 182)</i>	<p>Yes – there are a number of supporting documents which evidence the assessment of development needs in the Plan Area used to inform the strategy (Employment Land Review, SHMA, Population / Household Projections).</p> <p>Core Policy CPO is about planning positively to secure development.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken extensive communication and co-operation with adjoining authorities and other partner organisations to ensure that development needs are met.</p> <p>Housing growth in the Yorkshire Dales National Park has been taken into account in meeting needs in the plan area.</p> <p>The plan is concerned with</p>	Not considered significant.

<b>Local Plans (paras 150-157)</b>			
<b>What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects</b>	<b>Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?</b>
		meeting local needs in the Plan area and there is no evidence that this places demands on neighbouring areas. In this very rural area, the District Centre (Richmond and Catterick Garrison) is well insulated from neighbouring centres.	

Using a proportionate evidence base (paras 158-177)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
<b>Defence, national security, counter-terrorism and resilience</b>	See para 164	<p>Spatial Principles SP4 (Housing) and SP5 (Economy) and the Central Richmondshire Spatial Strategy deal with the presence of the military in the plan area in terms of military-related development and meeting their needs and have been developed in partnership with the MoD.</p> <p>Core Policy CP8 refers to defence training areas.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with local advisors (MoD) and others to ensure that the impact of any national security, counter-terrorism and defence-related activity in the area is taken into account.</p>	Not considered significant.
<p><b>Ensuring viability and deliverability</b></p> <p>The sites and scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened (173)</p>	<p><i>To what extent has your plan been assessed to ensure viability, taking into account the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements?</i></p> <p><i>In so doing to what extent has it</i></p>	<p>The Local Plan Core Strategy has been informed by the supporting Economic Viability Assessment (EVA) which justifies the affordable housing policy (CP6). Core Policy CP6 seeks a financial appraisal on individual sites as well as general levels of viability.</p> <p>The viability work being</p>	Not considered significant.

Using a proportionate evidence base (paras 158-177)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
	<i>taken into account the normal cost of development and on-site mitigation and provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable (173)?</i>	<p>undertaken for the development of a CIL Charging Schedule will also identify a reasonable rate of return for landowners and developers on the majority of development proposals whilst at the same time balancing the need to deliver required infrastructure to enable development to be built. Both approaches to the EVA and CIL use the Residual Land Value calculation in their assessments of viability.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Core Policy CP14 will seek to ensure that financial policy burdens do not threaten viability of development where possible.</p>	

Using a proportionate evidence base (paras 158-177)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
	<p><i>To what extent have the likely cumulative impacts on development in your area of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards been assessed to ensure that the cumulative impact of these standards and policies do not put implementation of the development plan at serious risk, and facilitate development throughout the economic cycle (174)?</i></p>	<p>Assessment of viability as addressed above.</p> <p>The cumulative impacts have been taken into account through the supporting Three Dragons report on viability.</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>

Examining Local Plans (para 182)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
Authorities should submit a plan for examination which it considers is sound, including being ....	<i>Positively prepared</i>	The Local Plan Core Strategy meets these requirements through its strategic approach to development (Spatial Principles SP1, SP2 particularly and its Core Policies which relate to the presumption in favour of sustainable development (CPO and CP2).	Not considered significant.

# Planning Policy for Traveller Sites

The CLG 'Planning policy for traveller sites' was published in 23 March 2012 and came into effect on 27 March 2012. Circular 01/06: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and Circular 04/07: Planning for Travelling Showpeople have been cancelled. 'Planning policy for travellers sites' should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, including the implementation policies of that document.

The government's aim in relation to planning for traveller sites is:

'To ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic life of travellers which respecting the interests of the settled community'.

Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are:

- That local planning authorities (LPAs) make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning
- That LPAs work collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites
- Plan for sites over a reasonable timescale
- Plan-making should protect green Belt land from inappropriate development
- Promote more private traveller site provision whilst recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites
- Aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective.

In addition local planning authorities should:

- Include fair, realistic and inclusive policies
- Increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply
- Reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and decision-taking
- Enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure
- Have due regard to protection of local amenity and local environment

Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.	Has your evidence been developed having undertaken early and effective engagement including discussing travellers accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups?	Yes – Through survey work for the Gypsy & Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) in 2007 and the Accommodation Requirements of Showmen in 2009.	Not considered significant.
Co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas.	Can you demonstrate that you have a clear understanding of the needs of the traveller community over the lifespan of your development plan?  <b>Have you worked collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities?</b>	No – Not to 2028. The evidence from the two studies doesn't cover the period to 2028. The GTAA assessed pitch requirements to 2015 but did not project a growing additional need beyond the 2008 shortfall of 3 pitches in the District. The Showmen's study looked 10 years ahead to 2019 and did not identify a need for any further yards in the District over and above the one existing.  There will be further monitoring of needs through engagement with the traveling community.  Yes – The above studies were undertaken by consultants on a sub-regional basis with neighbouring LPAs in North	Not considered significant.



<b>Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
	<p>Have you used a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of your local plan and make planning decisions?</p>	<p>Yorkshire. LPAs to the north have been engaged on Plan needs and cross-boundary issues.</p> <p>Yes – The two studies mentioned above.</p>	

Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in your area, working collaboratively with neighbouring LPAs (8)	Have you identified, and do you update annually, a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against locally set targets? Have you identified a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10, and, where possible, for years 11-15. (9)	No - The identified need for pitches and plots is too small for such arrangements to be a meaningful process at present.	Not considered significant.
Consider the production of joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites.	Have you identified constraints within your local area which prevent you from allocating sufficient sites to meet likely future need? If so have you prepared a joint development plan or do you intend to do so? Is the reason for this clearly explained?	As above. This is not considered necessary.	Not considered significant.
Relate the number of pitches and plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population size and density.		This was considered in the GTAA and Showmen's studies.	Not considered significant.

<b>Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
Protect local amenity and environment.		Policies in the Local Plan as a whole will ensure that local amenity and other environmental considerations will be properly taken into account.	Not considered significant.
Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need.	Has an up-to-date assessment of the need for traveller sites been carried out? If an unmet need has been demonstrated has a supply of specific, deliverable sites been identified based on the criteria you have set? Where there is no identified need, have criteria been included in case applications nevertheless come forward?	The studies were last undertaken in 2008-09 but cover the current periods to 2015 (GTAA) and 2019 (Showmen's Study). The need is so small that site allocations are not needed and other criteria-based policies in the Local Plan and national policy for Travellers sites will guide development.	Not considered significant.
Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.	Have your policies been developed taking into account criteria a-h of para 11 of the policy	There is no policy for Traveller sites included in our Local Plan Core Strategy.  Criteria concerning infrastructure provision are covered in the Local Plan Core Strategy (Core Policy CP14) and apply to all new developments.	Not considered significant.

<b>Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings LPAs should ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community?		Criteria in Core Policy CP4 covers this issue of proportionality and the impact on amenity and infrastructure.	Not considered significant.

<b>Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, LPAs in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable travellers sites.	If you have a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs in your rural area have you used a rural exception site policy, and if so, does it make it clear that such sites shall be used for affordable traveller sites <b>in perpetuity?</b>	We have no evidence to suggest this is an issue in Richmondshire. Therefore, this has not been included in Core Policy CP6 concerning rural exception housing.	Not considered significant.

<b>Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.	Have you made an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site? Has this alteration been done through the plan-making process and is it specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only.	Not applicable as there is no Green Belt land in the District.	Not considered significant.

Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
	<p>Have you considered including travellers sites suitable for mixed residential and business use (having regard to safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents)?</p> <p>If mixed sites are not practicable have you considered the scope for identifying separate sites for residential and for business purposes in close proximity to one another?</p> <p>Have you had regard to the need that travelling showpeople have for mixed-use yards to allow residential accommodation and space for storage of equipment?</p> <p><b>NB Mixed use should not be permitted on rural exception sites</b></p>	<p>No – This is not something which has been considered, as the need is minimal.</p>	<p>Not considered significant.</p>

<b>Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
	Do you have a major development proposal which requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site? If so has a site or sites suitable for the relocation of the community been identified (if the original site is authorised)?	No.	Not considered significant.