

Scale and Distribution of Development



A Local Development Framework Issues and Options Consultation Paper

November 2009



Foreword

What will your town or village be like by 2026? It's not an easy question, but it is one that we need to try and answer with your help. Richmondshire's Local Development framework (LDF) will help shape future development across all parts of the District outside of the National Park. This includes Richmond, Leyburn, Catterick Garrison and the villages to the north and south. The National Park Authority is responsible for development in the rest of Richmondshire.

The LDF will be a set of policy documents that shape an overall direction for development in these places. These policies will help determine future planning applications for, amongst other things, housing, economic or green energy developments, once the LDF is adopted. Before we can write these policies we must understand local conditions. We need to find out about where people live and work and how they travel. We also need to recognise the sensitivity of the local environment and our local heritage to development.

This consultation report is one in a series of ten:

1. Achieving Sustainable Communities - Settlement Hierarchy
2. Achieving Sustainable Communities in the Central Area
3. Achieving Sustainable Communities in Lower Wensleydale
4. Achieving Sustainable Communities in the A66 North Richmondshire Area.

5. Scale and Distribution of Development
6. Economy
7. Environmental Assets
8. Housing
9. Infrastructure
10. Climate Change

Each report asks a series of questions about issues we need to debate. For example, how should we treat small villages in terms of development? Or how should Richmond and Catterick Garrison grow? You can make detailed responses to any of the questions using the on-line form on our website or by writing to us using the contacts below. Or simply get in touch with us to talk about the LDF.

Please ask if you would like this document in a different format or language.

John Hiles 01748 827025,
Emma Lundberg 01748 827026

Email: LDF@richmondshire.gov.uk

Write LDF, Richmondshire District Council,
Swale House, Frenchgate, Richmond, DL10 4JE

Richmondshire District Council Website:
www.richmondshire.gov.uk



Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	The Scale and Distribution of Development	2
	Scale of Housing Development	2
	Military Related Housing Development	3
	Total Housing Development	4
	Employment Related Development	4
3.	The Distribution of Development	5
4.	Taking these options forward	14



1. Introduction

- 1.1 This consultation paper addresses some of the most fundamental strategic issues for the area of Richmondshire covered by the Local Development Framework (LDF). It seeks to introduce a debate about the appropriate scale and distribution of development and change for which the LDF should make provision. This debate will be developed and elaborated as the Core Strategy evolves. Our intention with this paper is to start to identify and seek your views on some of the key strategic choices which might be involved.
- 1.2 The content of this discussion draws from the analysis in many of the other papers, and is best understood once you have read the other papers, in particular, those referring to the settlement hierarchy and the three sub areas.
- 1.3 Section 2 of this paper addresses the overall scale of new development which we need to provide for. It mainly concentrates on housing, but also refers to employment-related development, which is considered in the Economy Topic Paper.
- 1.4 Section 3 considers alternative ways that the total amount of growth expected by the targets set in the Regional Spatial Strategy might be distributed around the District. This includes using the structure advanced in the spatial consultation papers - the sustainable settlement hierarchy and the sub-areas - as “building blocks” to develop alternative approaches. It also highlights the need to address the appropriate balance of development between the Catterick Garrison area, which includes Colburn, Scotton, Hipswell and the main military site, with the rest of the District and Richmond in particular.



2. The Scale of Development

- 2.1 One of the primary roles of the LDF Core Strategy is to give strategic guidance on the way that the plan area should develop and change, over the whole plan period. While the area may be subject to many different pressures for change, the most significant will be providing for the number of new houses and employment-related development like industry and offices.
- 2.2 Before we can look at this we need to seek your views on the length of time we should be planning for Government guidance on the production of LDFs (Planning Policy Statement 12: “Creating strong, safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning”, PPS12, June 2008) indicates that plans should look to a time horizon of at least 15 years from the adoption of the plan. Assuming that the Core Strategy is adopted, following independent Examination, in late 2011, this suggests that it would be appropriate to look to make provision for the period up to 2026. This date would also coincide with the end-date of the recently approved Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS): the Yorkshire and Humber Plan (May 2008).
- provision be made for new houses during the LDF period. The scale of development in the District is largely determined at the regional level by the Yorkshire and Humber RSS (June 2008) and the LDF should be in “general conformity” with it. The RSS sets the context both for new general housing in Richmondshire (outside the National Park), and also addresses the implications should the Catterick Garrison military base be developed to increase its capacity.
- 2.4 In terms of *general housing*, RSS Policy H1 indicates that the LDF should “ensure the delivery of average net additions to the dwelling stock” in the case of Richmondshire of 200 per year for the period 2004 to 2026. It is recognised that that one source of new housing will be the reinstatement of vacant dwellings. The RSS estimates that this could possibly amount to an average rate of 30 dwellings per year in Richmondshire. But research indicates that this is unlikely to be achieved and the main source of new dwellings will be from new build, although reinstatement of vacant property will need to be monitored (RSS Table 12.3).

Issue SD1: Time period of the LDF

SD1a

Do you agree that 2026 is an appropriate end-date to adopt for the LDF?

Scale of Housing Development

- 2.3 The Government’s key housing policy goal is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home (PPS3 - Housing). This requires that
- 2.5 626 houses have been built in Richmondshire in the first 5 years covered by the RSS from April 2004. This leaves a total net additional requirement to be achieved of 3,774 dwellings for the remaining 17 years until 2026. RSS sets this as a minimum target and is therefore not a reasonable option to provide for less. It is possible that more housing could be provided, perhaps as a way of securing more affordable housing. The housing topic paper discusses the demand for affordable housing. We are talking about the possible implications about overall provision in this paper.



Issue SD2: the overall scale of provision for general housing

SD2a

Apart from provision for military related development, should the LDF aim to provide for an additional net 3,774 dwellings up to 2026, reflecting the RSS requirements precisely, or should a higher target be set, perhaps with the objective of securing more affordable houses in the area?

Phase 1: 2004-2011	750 (500 SFA & 250 civilian) To meet requirements for 4 Mech Brigade
Phase 2: 2011-2016	750 (500 SFA & 250 civilian) To meet requirements for two further major Units
Phase 3: 2016-2021	750 (500 SFA & 250 civilian). To meet potential longer-term requirements

Source : Catterick Garrison Strategic Housing Market Assessment, David Cumberland Assocs. 2007
Note SFA is Service Families Accommodation

Military Related Housing Development

- 2.6 The second main issue about the scale of new housing relates to making appropriate provision for the potential development of the Catterick Garrison main military site. The general housing figures in the RSS do not include provision for MoD related housing development. RSS expects that "additional provision in the region of 2,250 additional dwellings in the period to 2021... are matters that will need to be taken forward through the Richmondshire LDF" (RSS Table 12.1 footnote 21).
- 2.7 The figure of 2,250 is based on the evidence supplied by the MoD to the RSS Examination in Public and relates to the Garrison's Administrative Area and offers further clarification about the expected nature of this requirement:
- 2.8 However, the Garrison Administrative Area covers the two main sites in Richmondshire and other sites at Dishforth, Topcliffe and Ripon, which are well outside the District. Despite this the RSS puts the responsibility for provision solely within the Richmondshire LDF.
- 2.9 How the LDF should respond to this issue, given the passage of time, the extent of uncertainty about likely requirements, new military housing policy and the differing ways in which this requirement could be met within and outside of the plan area. Section 3 of this paper will attempt to offer a simple route through this complexity - considering the maximum amount and location of new housing related to the potential military development at the Garrison. This will give us a starting point, which we will need to review as more detailed information becomes available.



2.10 As discussed in the Central Area Paper, there is continuing uncertainty about the eventual size of the Catterick Garrison military base and the timing of increases in personnel. We are unlikely to receive confirmation about the scale of growth of the Garrison during the preparation of the LDF and probably well beyond. Therefore, the LDF must seek to manage change under considerable uncertainty. This suggests that the LDF should make provision for the maximum likely growth up to the RSS maximum figure of 2,250 units. But, development and change should be managed to ensure that when and what level of growth does materialise, it can be achieved as sustainably as possible. The location of this provision, whether in the Garrison area or elsewhere in the LDF area, is considered in Section 3 below.

Issue SD3 : Housing provision for military related growth

SD3a

Do you agree that the LDF should provide for 2,250 dwellings in the period to 2021 to accommodate the potential growth of the Garrison as identified in the approved RSS (2008), in addition to those identified for general housing?

SD3b

If you do not agree that the LDF should provide for the 2,250 dwellings, what alternative amounts of housing for military related growth should we provide for in the LDF? Please give your reasons

Total Housing Development

2.11 Taking these two elements of housing requirements together, it is proposed that the LDF will make provision for a total of 6,024 additional dwellings for the period to 2026. The alternative approaches to the distribution of these dwellings, including the nature and location of dwellings related to the expansion of the Garrison, are considered in Section 3.

Employment Related Development

2.12 There are currently 48.4 ha of gross employment land remaining in the Richmondshire plan area (Source: Employment Land Review 2006). Of this, 60% of the available land is located in the Garrison area but a significant proportion of this land is under pressure for residential development. This issue is considered fully in the economy topic paper, which reviews the RSS context. Views are sought in that paper on the amount of employment land the Core Strategy should provide for. It suggests requirement for an additional net area of employment land between 8.66 ha and 12.06 ha for this Plan area to 2021.



3. The Distribution of Development

3.1 There are a number of ways we could put options together for the distribution of development in Richmondshire and assess them. The situation is particularly complex because we need to address the range of possibilities resulting from the potential development of the military base at Catterick Garrison. The range of permutations could be considerable, and does not lend itself to easy assessment.

3.2 We therefore propose to identify four different dimensions about which views will be sought separately. These cover the distribution of growth:

- between levels of the Settlement Hierarchy
- between the three sub areas of the Central area, Lower Wensleydale and A66 North Richmondshire
- arising from military related growth
- between Richmond and the Garrison area.

On the basis of this early discussion we will develop a more focused set of alternatives including a preferred approach at the next stage, early next year.

3.3 The four spatial consultation papers have developed the concept of a sustainable hierarchy of settlements in the plan area, and explained the proposal to sub-divide the plan area into three Sub-Areas for individual consideration. Both the hierarchy and the Sub-Areas represent building blocks for a strategy on the distribution of development. The spatial topic papers explain how the hierarchy relates to regional guidance contained in RSS, explore the roles which each tier

might perform, and consider the issues for the settlements in each of the three sub-areas. RSS advises that the top tier of the proposed hierarchy - the joint Principal Town of Richmond and Catterick Garrison - should be the “main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.” RSS also intends that development should be focused in the Principal Towns in this part of the region. It also indicates that “an appropriate scale of affordable and market housing and employment opportunities to meet local needs”. should be provided in these towns and in the lower order Local Service Centres like Leyburn.

3.4 We need to think about how great a “focus”, or concentration, of development expected by the RSS is appropriate to the upper tiers of the hierarchy, as we work towards the LDF Core Strategy. We also need to take account of what significance the emerging hierarchy might have as the basis for distributing development according to the roles and potentials of the individual settlements in each tier. To establish a view on the most sustainable distribution of development will need to consider:

- the benefits of locating development close to existing facilities and using existing infrastructure
- the feasibility of development, reflecting infrastructure capacities and the existence of potentially suitable developable land, and its consequences in terms of the local environmental impact of development.



3.5 Preparation of the LDF is intended to allow a logical and sequential approach to be taken to these matters. The Core Strategy will be prepared first, to establish the strategic approach. The detailed identification of sites for development will follow, through the preparation of a subsequent Allocations Development Plan Document. It will be important for the feasibility of the Core Strategy’s strategic approach to be assessed by having an appropriate level of detailed knowledge. The assessment of development opportunities, through the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) is a key element of this local knowledge. The SHELAA is now being completed, and initial conclusions will be indicated below.

A. Distribution using the hierarchy

3.6 At this stage in our work to develop the Core Strategy, we are seeking your views on the basic application of the settlement hierarchy concept. We expect to look at differences between housing and employment land as the strategy is developed. But, at this stage, it is

suggested that achieving a balanced provision of both housing and employment means that the options treat each the same, and view the issue as the distribution of development in general. Three options are suggested here, which might form the distribution of growth based solely on the settlement hierarchy:

Option A1:

concentrate growth on the top of the hierarchy (in the Joint Principal Towns of Richmond and Catterick Garrison, and to a lesser extent in Leyburn)

Option A2:

give greater emphasis to the lower order settlements, particularly the proposed Service Villages, and allow some development in at least some of the smallest settlements

Option A3:

distribute growth according to the current proportions in each tier of the hierarchy, but exclude smaller settlements

The following table suggests indicative proportions, expressed as percentages, which illustrate these approaches:

A. Alternative approaches to the distribution of future growth between tiers of hierarchy

Settlement type	Status Quo	Option A1:	Option A2:	Option A3:
	Proportionate to hierarchy	concentration on top of the hierarchy	greater emphasis on lower order tiers	proportionate to hierarchy (excluding smaller settlements)
	%	%	%	%
Joint Principal Town (Richmond, Catterick Garrison)	52.8%	80%	50%	69.7%
Local Service Centre (Leyburn)	4.7%	10%	7%	6.2%
Service Settlements	18.3%	10%	30%	24.1%
Smaller Settlements	24.2%	0%	13%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%



3.7 The LDF Core Strategy is likely to need to develop a policy approach based on general proportions, such as those suggested in the previous table. A policy based on proportions will be flexible, and workable whatever the total amount of development to be distributed turns out to be. But, it may be helpful to consider what actual numbers of dwellings might be involved to understand the real implications of such proportions. The following table apportions general housing growth of 3,774 dwellings (para. 2.5), and also in the shaded columns of 6,024 dwellings, which includes housing due to MoD development (para. 2.6):

A. Distribution of future growth between tiers of hierarchy: numbers

Settlement type	Status Quo		Option A1:		Option A2:		Option A3:	
	Proportionate to hierarchy		concentration on top of the hierarchy		greater emphasis on lower order tiers		proportionate to hierarchy (excluding smaller settlements)	
	NN dwellings		NN dwellings		NN dwellings		NN dwellings	
Joint Principal Town (Richmond, Catterick Garrison)	1993	3181	3020	4820	1887	3012	2630	4199
Local Service Centre (Leyburn)	177	283	377	602	264	422	234	373
Service Settlements	691	1102	377	602	1132	1807	910	1452
Smaller Settlements	913	1488	0	0	491	783	0	0
Total	3774	6024	3774	6024	3774	6024	3774	6024

3.8 Some of the relative merits of each approach are considered below and some views on their feasibility:

Option A1:

concentrate growth on the top of the hierarchy

- would maximise access to existing facilities and make best use of

infrastructure, particularly of higher order services

- economies of scale may mean that provision of additional infrastructure would be most cost effective
- would have limited environmental impacts elsewhere in the District - with reduced impact on all settlements other than Richmond, the Garrison area and Leyburn



- would increase environmental pressures to accommodate development around Richmond, the Garrison area and Leyburn
- could exceed local potential for development as being revealed by the SHELAA evidence.

Option A2:

give greater emphasis to the lower order settlements

- would lead to greater opportunities in the lower order settlements - which might help to increase the viability of their existing facilities, and might provide opportunities for affordable housing closer to where need may arise
- since the approach includes scope for some significant development in the smaller settlements (below Service Settlement level), new residents in these areas are likely to be significantly remote from most facilities with relatively poor public transport access;
- would otherwise generally reduce access to facilities, particularly higher order, and thus be less sustainable in this regard than Option A1
- would have some, potentially significant, environmental impacts around Service Settlements, and also in the smaller villages.

Option A3:

distribute growth to reflect the current proportions in the hierarchy, but excluding smaller settlements

- would represent a compromise which focuses development on the settlements with the higher order facilities, including Service Settlements
- is likely to be feasible given current emerging SHELAA indications, and be

most easily accommodated within existing infrastructure

- would remove development potential in the smaller villages. However, scope to retain viability of services in these villages must be expected to be limited in any case, given the numbers of dwellings which could be involved in the other Options, so this option might be regarded as a more realistic approach.

Issue SD4 : distribution of growth between levels of the hierarchy

SD4a

Which option (A1, A2 or A3) do you prefer?

SD4b

If you prefer none of the options we have described, can you suggest an alternative?

SD4c

What reasons do you have for your preference - and, as important, why do you not prefer the other options?

B. Distribution between Sub Areas

- 3.9 Another way of looking at the distribution of growth is to consider potential variations in growth between the Sub Areas proposed in the Spatial Papers. At this stage in the development of the Core Strategy we are seeking your views on simple principles which could be explored in the same way that we have begun to look at the settlement hierarchy above. Three options are suggested here, which might form the basis of distribution for the growth of housing and employment development:



Option B1:

maintain the current population share

Option B2:

give greater emphasis to the Central Area

Option B3:

give greater emphasis to Lower Wensleydale

The following table suggests proportions, expressed as percentages, which illustrate these approaches:

B. Alternative approaches to the distribution between Sub-Areas

Sub area	Population		Option B1:	Option B2:
			greater emphasis on Central area	greater emphasis on Lower Wensleydale
	N	%	%	%
A66	7,780	17%	8%	15%
Central Area	31,100	69%	85%	65%
Lower Wensleydale	6,040	14%	7%	20%
Total	44,920	100%	100%	100%

3.10 The following comments provide an initial indication of the relative merits of each approach, and some views on their feasibility:

Option B1:

give greater emphasis to the Central Area

- since this area contains the joint Principal Towns of Richmond and Catterick Garrison, together with the large Service Villages of Catterick Village and Brompton on Swale, it consequently has the best range of facilities and existing infrastructure, as well as being very accessible to the wider area outside the District through its location in proximity to the A1 (which is being upgraded)

- would reduce opportunity in Leyburn to pursue the opportunities identified in the Lower Wensleydale study

Option B2:

give greater emphasis to Lower Wensleydale

- would encourage the further development of Leyburn and Middleham, allowing the opportunities now being identified in the Lower Wensleydale Study to be supported and sustained
- would allow some development pressure to be reduced in the Central Area.



Issue SD5 : distribution of growth between the Sub Areas

SD5a

Which option (B1 or B2) do you prefer?

SD5b

If you prefer none of the options we have described, can you suggest an alternative?

SD5c

What reasons do you have for your preference - and, as important, why do you not prefer the other options?

C. Distribution of Catterick Garrison related growth

- 3.11 We face an unusual situation in Richmondshire. The impact of the potential development of the military facilities of Catterick Garrison is likely to be a very significant factor affecting the need and scope for additional housing. The potential for the expansion of the military base is examined in detail in the Catterick Garrison Long Term Development Plan (CGLTDP 2005, refresh 2008). This considers how development of the military estate can support a range of growth scenarios and also how non-military development, like the proposed town centre, would feature.
- 3.12 A major decision for the LDF Core Strategy, concerns how much of the total development, likely to arise from the potential Garrison expansion, should be accommodated actually within or close to the Garrison's military facilities? Although this cannot easily be determined, let alone the timing of any such growth, it is fundamental that the LDF can provide an appropriately flexible and robust strategic response whatever the future outcome.
- 3.13 As the Central Area Spatial Paper indicates, the strategy for the development of the Garrison and neighbouring settlements is proposed to be advanced by the preparation of an Area Action Plan (AAP). One of the key strategic decisions which need to be made by the Core Strategy is to set the context for the AAP. This will include determination of the scale and type of development, which should be provided within the defined AAP area as opposed to elsewhere within the LDF plan area.
- 3.14 It is clear that not all additional households directly related to the expansion of the Garrison will need or wish to be located directly within the Garrison area itself. This applies to both to service and supporting civilian households. While the MoD will seek to provide a large proportion of Service Families Accommodation (SFA) close by, not all service households are likely to need or wish to be located within the proposed AAP area. Service households may well wish to purchase open market houses outside and commute to the Garrison for work. The civilian support population is even more unlikely to wish to be restricted to the Garrison AAP in searching for accommodation. MoD surveys suggest that the potential areas affected outside the Garrison could extend well beyond the LDF plan area.
- 3.15 Despite these uncertainties, it is proposed that the LDF should make provision for all the 2,250, as proposed in Section 2 within the LDF plan area. To ensure that a full response is made to the impact of Garrison growth. To ensure that the emerging LDF strategy is resilient to all likely development pressures, two optional approaches are put forward (simplifying previous assessments) for views at this stage.



Option C1 : All Military related development in the AAP area:

all 2,250 dwellings , together with whatever proportion of the plan-wide general housing requirement is considered appropriate.

Option C2 : Military related development is spread over the wider LDF area:

not all the 2,250 households will locate within the AAP area. It is particularly likely that the additional civilian support population, for which the MoD is not proposing to make any provision will locate in a much wider area

This option will be refined as work progresses, and in the light of comments received, but is currently based on the following proportions locating within the AAP:

2/3 of the service households = 1,000
 1/3 of the civilian support = 250
 Total within AAP requirement = 1,250

Both options are illustrated on the following table:

C. Distribution of Catterick Garrison related growth

Area	Option C1:		Option C2:	
	self contained growth		wider influence of Garrison	
	%	N	%	N
AAP area	100%	2250	55%	1250
rest of LDF plan area	0%	0	45%	1000
Total	100%	2250	100%	2250

3.16 In this case the options relate perhaps as much to practical realities as to policy choices. The fundamental question remains about how far can and should the LDF seek to make provision for the growth of the Garrison, in terms of new dwellings

to be provided, self-contained to the AAP area? The following comments provide an initial indication of the relative merits of each approach, and some views on their feasibility:



Option C1

full self containment, will offer opportunities to achieve economies of scale, and reduce pressures to find development opportunities elsewhere (particularly in Richmond).

Option C2

wider area, reflects the reality that, with freedom of choice, many households associated with the growth of the Garrison will choose to live elsewhere, outside the AAP area.

Issue SD6 : distribution of Catterick Garrison related growth

SD6a

Which option (C1 or C2) do you think is the most realistic to achieve?

SD6b

If you prefer neither of the options we have described, can you suggest an alternative?

SD6c

What reasons do you have for your preference - and, as important, why do you not prefer the other options?

D. balance of development between Richmond and the Catterick Garrison AAP area

3.17 The final aspect on which views are sought concerns the general balance which should be sought between development in Richmond and in the Garrison AAP area.

Both settlements are defined in the RSS as a Principal Town. RSS indicates:

“The general role of the [sub-region’s Principal Towns] is not anticipated to change during the Plan period, the exception being Catterick Garrison, where planned major expansion of the size of the army garrison is likely to support widening its range of services and facilities complementary to those in Richmond such that together they perform an enhanced Principal Town role. Development at Catterick Garrison may help reduce development pressure at Richmond which is close to the North Pennine Dales and Meadows SAC”. (RSS para. 7.3)

In these terms, the following table illustrates three general approaches:

D. Balance of development between Richmond and Garrison AAP area

Location	Option D1:	Option D2:	Option D3:
	greater emphasis on AAP	increased emphasis on Richmond	even balance
Richmond	15%	35%	50%
Garrison AAP	85%	65%	50%



- 3.18 Option D1 reflects most clearly the expectations of the RSS, but the resulting pressures to provide for development in the AAP area may be difficult to resolve. Significant development in this area may tend to reduce the existing relatively separate communities of Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn, which are intertwined with the military base.
- 3.19 The extent of development opportunities in the Garrison area may suggest that greater consideration should be given to development in Richmond, where existing facilities are greater. This might support a more sustainable balance of development between Richmond and the Garrison, provided that the environmental impact of development can be managed to acceptable levels. Whilst environmental limitations to growth around Richmond (see Central Area Topic Paper) may suggest that Option D3 would be difficult to achieve, the need to properly balance the impact and opportunities arising for

development between Richmond and the Garrison AAP area may suggest that more detailed consideration should be given to Option D2.

Issue SD7: balance of development between Richmond and the Garrison AAP area

SD7a

Which option (D1, D2 or D3) do you prefer?

SD7b

If you prefer none of the options we have described, can you suggest an alternative?

SD7c

What reasons do you have for your preference - and, as important, why do you not prefer the other options?



4. Taking these options forward

4.1 This paper has put forward four different dimensions which helps us to consider the scale and distribution of growth in the LDF area. These dimensions covered the distribution of growth:

- between levels of the Settlement Hierarchy
- between the three sub areas of the Central area, Lower Wensleydale and A66 North Richmondshire
- arising from military related growth
- between Richmond and the Garrison area.

4.2 It is likely that the we will have to consider how each of these interact with each other, as we move on towards more fully developed options in the next stage of the development of the LDF's Core Strategy. For example the distribution of growth between Richmond and the Garrison area will depend on the overall balance of growth between the sub -areas and/or the levels of the settlement hierarchy. But at this stage we need to fully understand your assessment of the viability of each dimension. This will help us to deal with the complexity of the full range of permutations available when these dimensions are combined.



Richmondshire District Council

Swale House, Frenchgate, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL10 4JE
Tel: 01748 829100 Fax: 01748 825071 Email: enquiries@richmondshire.gov.uk

