

Richmondshire District Council

Examination of the Local Plan: Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Schedule of Matters and Issues for the Examination

Inspector: Simon Berkeley BA MA MRTPI

Programme Officer: Emma Lundberg
Programme Officer
Swale House
Frenchgate
Richmond
DL10 4JE
01748 901036
programmeofficer@richmondshire.gov.uk

Draft timetable for the Hearing sessions

Date	Morning session 10am	Afternoon session 2pm
Day 1 Tuesday 17 December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspector's opening • Matter 1 • Matter 2 <p><i>Attendance – to be confirmed</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 9 <p><i>Attendance – to be confirmed</i></p>
	Morning session 9.30am	Afternoon session 2pm
Day 2 Wednesday 18 December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 3 • Matter 4 <p><i>Attendance – to be confirmed</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 6 • Matter 7 <p><i>Attendance - to be confirmed</i></p>
Day 3 Thursday 19 December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 8 • Matter 10 <p><i>Attendance – to be confirmed</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matter 5 <p><i>Attendance – to be confirmed</i></p>
Day 4 Friday 20 December	Reserve day	

As set out in the accompanying Guidance Note, if you have any comments on this draft timetable please contact the Programme Officer by **15 November 2013**.

The starting point for the examination is the submitted version of the Core Strategy ('the Plan'). However, the Council now proposes a number of modifications to the Plan as originally submitted. These are set out in a schedule produced by the Council. Along with a new Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), this has been published on the website and is available in the Council's community offices. Comments on these modifications and the new GTAA are now invited alongside the opportunity to respond to the questions set out in this paper.

Where respondents answering the following questions identify a deficiency in the Plan they should make clear how it should be changed.

Matter 1 – Basis for the overall approach

Issues

- 1.1 Overall, has the plan been prepared in accordance with the legal requirements, including the 'duty to cooperate' imposed by Section 33A of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)?
- 1.2 Has the plan been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and met the minimum consultation requirements in the Regulations?
- 1.3 Has the formulation of the Plan been based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal and testing of reasonable alternatives?
- 1.4 How have the possible effects on European wildlife sites influenced the Plan and the assessment of alternative options?
- 1.5 How has the Plan been influenced by the Sustainable Community Strategy for the district?

Matter 2 – The strategy

Issues

- 2.1 What are the strategic, cross-boundary issues of relevance to the Plan? How does the strategy address them?
- 2.2 Will the Plan deliver the homes, jobs and services required to meet the needs of the whole district? How have needs in the National Park and other adjacent authority areas been taken into account?
- 2.3 The Plan focuses growth in the central sub-area, and limits growth in the northern sub-area and southern Wensleydale sub-area. In broad terms, is this the most appropriate spatial strategy?
- 2.4 Is it the intention that the needs of each sub-area in terms of homes, jobs and services will be met within that sub-area, where the need arises?

- 2.5 What is the justification for the settlement hierarchy proposed? What evidence led to the inclusion of each of the settlements within each category? What alternatives were considered, and why were they rejected?
- 2.6 Are the strategic approach in Spatial Principle SP1 and the settlement hierarchy in Spatial Principle SP2 complimentary? How will the latter deliver the former?
- 2.7 Is the settlement hierarchy based on robust evidence and sound reasoning? Will this hierarchy lead to the most sustainable spatial distribution of new development? In this respect, are the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal founded on robust evidence and sound reasoning?
- 2.8 Overall, is the distribution of development sought the most appropriate strategy, and what alternatives have been rejected?
- 2.9 How has the risk of flooding been taken into account? Has the sequential, risk based approach required by the NPPF been followed? How has this issue influenced the Plan's formulation and the spatial approach ultimately proposed?
- 2.10 Has the financial cost of any requirements on new development been taken into account? What evidence is there to demonstrate that such costs would not threaten the delivery of the development planned for?
- 2.11 To deliver the strategy, is it the Council's intention to allocate land for development in a future Local Plan document, and to identify land for other purposes (for example, to prevent development on it) on a Policies Map? Should the Core Strategy be clearer about this, and set out the commitments to be addressed?
- 2.12 Is the monitoring framework sufficiently robust? Is it sufficiently clear how progress towards delivering the strategy's aims and objectives will be measured, and how and when any contingency plans would be triggered?

Matter 3 – Housing

Issues

- 3.1 The Plan aims to deliver 3,060 new homes between 2011 and 2028, representing an annual average of 180 homes. The submitted Plan also proposes an additional 1,440 homes for military service families at Catterick Garrison.
 - a. Is the 3,060 figure supported by reliable evidence?
 - b. Is the Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population Estimates and Projections (2012) 'migration led revision' the most appropriate projection upon which to base the Plan?
 - c. What regard has been had to the Government's household interim projections for 2011 to 2021?
 - d. The Council has proposed modifications in the light of the MoD's 2013 Army Basing Plan. What degree of certainty accompanies the Army Basing Plan? Considering these factors, is 500 now the most appropriate level of homes to provide for military service families? Is the Core Strategy sufficiently flexible to adapt if present MoD plans should alter during the plan period?

- 3.2 Does the spatial distribution of housing set out in Spatial Principle SP4 and shown in Table 3 of the Plan meet objectively assessed needs? How has the particular percentage split between the sub-areas been arrived at and what justifies this distribution?
- 3.3 Is there sufficient land available to deliver the new homes planned for?
- 3.4 Is there a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing, with an additional buffer of 5% moved forward from later in the plan period to provide choice?
- 3.5 In the light of paragraph 47 of the NPPF, should the buffer be 20%? Are there sufficient deliverable sites to provide a 20% buffer?
- 3.6 Is there a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6 to 10 of the Plan and beyond?
- 3.7 Are there sufficient sites in the right places to deliver the spatial distribution sought by the Plan?
- 3.8 What reliance, if any, is placed on windfall sites in the housing land supply?
- 3.9 What approach does the Plan take to housing density? How does this reflect local circumstances?
- 3.10 What proportion of new housing planned for is expected to be on previously developed land? How does the Plan encourage the use of brownfield land?
- 3.11 Should the expected rate of market and affordable housing delivery through the plan period be illustrated by a housing trajectory in the Plan?
- 3.12 How will the Local Plan deliver the new housing envisaged in the Core Strategy? Will land be allocated through future Local Plan documents?

Matter 4 – Affordable housing

Issues

- 4.1 What level of affordable housing does the Plan anticipate being delivered over the plan period?
- 4.2 Policy PC6 seeks a contribution of 30 to 40% affordable housing from residential developments. It includes no site size threshold and thus applies to all new dwellings. Is this a realistic expectation? Is there a risk that it will render schemes financially unviable?
- 4.3 The Council has put forward modifications to Core Policy CP6. New paragraph 4.6.10 sets out the areas intended to be covered by a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Precisely what details will the SPD cover? Should these details be in this Plan (or another Local Plan document) rather than SPD?

Matter 5 – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Issues

- 5.1 Following my letter of 24 April 2013, the Council has produced a new accommodation assessment dated October 2013. Is the new accommodation assessment based on a robust methodology? Has the Council, as required by national guidance, engaged meaningfully with traveller communities in order to prepare and maintain an up to date understanding of need? Has the new accommodation assessment been drawn up through collaborative working with neighbouring local planning authorities?
- 5.2 Does the Core Strategy comply with the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites with regard to the identification of a five year supply of deliverable sites, and developable sites or broad locations for growth thereafter?
- 5.3 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites requires criteria based policies to be fair. The Council has proposed a modification to the Plan, introducing Core Policy CP4a which, among other things, sets out the criteria for judging applications for traveller sites. Are the criteria fair and consistent with national policy?

Matter 6 – Economic development

Issues

- 6.1 Has the quantitative and qualitative needs for all foreseeable types of economic activity over the plan period, including for retail and leisure development, been assessed? What are the objectively assessed needs for land or floorspace for the various types of economic development?
- 6.2 What spatial distribution of new economic development does the Plan aim to achieve? Will this distribution meet the objectively assessed needs?
- 6.3 What does the Plan do to support the rural economy? Does it do enough?
- 6.4 How will the Local Plan deliver the economic development envisaged in the Core Strategy? Will land be allocated through future Local Plan documents?

Matter 7 – Town centres

Issues

- 7.1 Does the Plan set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the Plan period?
- 7.2 Given the proximity of Catterick Garrison to Richmond, is there a danger that the growth envisaged at the former may have negative impacts on the latter, particularly in terms of vitality and viability? How will the relationship between Richmond and Catterick Garrison be managed?

- 7.3 What does the Plan do to ensure the vitality of the centres identified in the hierarchy?
- 7.4 Will land be allocated in centres through future Local Plan documents to meet in full the needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses?

Matter 8 – Climate change/sustainable design

Issues

- 8.1 Does Core Policy CP1 provide a sufficiently positive, proactive strategy for delivering renewable and low carbon energy generation? Does paragraph 1b mean that schemes would need to cause no significant adverse visual impacts to gain the Council's support? If so, is this more onerous than national policy? What is meant by 'local communities' in paragraph 1c?
- 8.2 Is Core Policy CP1, as submitted and as proposed to be modified, more onerous than national requirements in relation to Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards? What impact will this have on viability and hence delivery of the new homes and businesses needed in the district?
- 8.3 What is the justification for requiring extensions to dwellings to exceed Part L of the Building Regulations? Who will determine what improvements to energy performance are reasonable?
- 8.4 Does the Plan do enough to deliver sustainable drainage systems?

Matter 9 – Infrastructure

Issues

- 9.1 Is the Plan based on a sound assessment of infrastructure requirements and their deliverability, including expected sources of funding?
- 9.2 What are the key infrastructure requirements for the Plan's successful delivery? What reassurances are there that these elements can and will be delivered when and where they are needed? Has the cost of these infrastructure elements been estimated, and funding sources identified?
- 9.3 Does the Plan include strategic policies to deliver the provision of infrastructure, and plan positively for infrastructure, as required by the NPPF (notably in paragraphs 156 and 157)?

Matter 10 – Open space

Issues

- 10.1 Is Core Policy CP11 supported by a robust and up to date assessment of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities as required by the NPPF

(particularly paragraph 73)? If not, is it justified and consistent with national policy?