

# **Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy**

## **Proposed Core Strategy Modifications**

**November 2013**



Chapter 1: Introduction

| Mod Ref No | Chapter 1 | Modification  | Comment   |
|------------|-----------|---|---|
| M001       | Para 1.4  | <p><u>Before</u><br/>                     The Local Plan Core Strategy provides the local perspective on future development consistent with the current statutory development plan system. The Council has responded to the expected abolition of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) by publishing its Local Strategy Statement (2011) setting a locally distinct strategic context for future development. This context reflects several stages of preparation and consultation from early 2009 to late 2011. Details of this process, its regulatory compliance and, most importantly, how the Local Plan Core Strategy has been shaped by consultation responses are given in the Local Plan Core Strategy Consultation Statement.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>                     The Local Plan Core Strategy provides the local perspective on future development consistent with the current statutory development plan system. <b>The Council responded to the expected</b> abolition of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) by publishing its Local Strategy Statement (2011) setting a locally distinct strategic context for future development. This context reflects several stages of preparation and consultation from early 2009 to late 2011. Details of this process, its regulatory compliance and, most importantly, how the Local Plan Core Strategy has been shaped by consultation responses are given in the Local Plan Core Strategy Consultation Statement. <b>The Yorkshire and Humber RSS was finally revoked in February 2013. The Council consulted on the impact of this change in its Development Target Review (August 2013) and respondents agreed that the final revocation had little impact on the Council's development strategy.</b></p> | <p>Factual Change to reflect Regional Spatial Strategy revocation in February 2013 and results of Development Target Review (August 2013)</p> |

|      |          |   |  |
|------|----------|---|--|
| M002 | Para 1.7 | <p><u>Before</u><br/> Richmondshire shares many issues with its neighbouring districts. A North Yorkshire Community Plan 2011 – 2014 has been produced by Local Government North Yorkshire and York, which focuses on three countywide priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling stronger local communities</li> <li>• Protecting and supporting vulnerable people</li> <li>• Supporting economic growth and employment</li> </ul> <p>Darlington Borough and County Durham also neighbour the plan area. The approach to identifying and addressing strategic issues affecting these wider areas is set out in the Consultation Statement.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/> <b>Richmondshire has many local growth issues in common with its neighbouring districts. The introduction of York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) has created a strong focus on the key drivers to change and the resources required to secure them. This is captured in the LEP's 5 priorities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Profitable and ambitious small and micro businesses</b></li> <li>• <b>A global leader in food manufacturing, agri-tech and biorenewables</b></li> <li>• <b>Inspired people</b></li> <li>• <b>Successful and distinctive places</b></li> <li>• <b>A well connected economy</b></li> </ul> <p>Darlington Borough and County Durham also neighbour the plan area. The approach to identifying and addressing strategic issues affecting these wider areas is set out in the Consultation Statement.</p> | <p>To reflect the new perspective on sub-regional issues introduced by the Local Enterprise Partnership. Draft Economic and Investment Strategy 7/10/13.</p> |
|------|----------|---|--|

|      |                       |  |  |
|------|-----------------------|--|--|
| M003 | Para 1.8              | <p><u>Before</u><br/>The Core Strategy is the first part of the Council's Local Plan and will be followed shortly by these additional key planning documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivering Development Local Plan – dealing with site allocations and the definition of Development Limits for the larger settlements on the Proposals Map</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning Documents – covering detailed guidance on the implementation of policies in the Core Strategy relating to Providing Affordable Housing and Responding to Climate Change.</li> </ul> <p><u>After</u><br/>The Core Strategy is the first part of the Council's Local Plan, <b>which needs to be supplemented by further detailed policies and guidance, covering:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Climate Change Guidance</b></li> <li>• <b>Detailed land availability policies and guidance</b></li> <li>• <b>Affordable Housing Guidance</b></li> <li>• <b>Heritage Design Guidance</b></li> </ul> <p><b>The timetable for their production will be published in the Council's Local Development Scheme.</b></p> | Update to reflect expectations for additional guidance documents and as a consequence of other changes in this table                     |
| M004 | Chapter 1<br>Para 1.9 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Minerals and waste planning issues, including the location, safeguarding and extraction of minerals, are dealt with through North Yorkshire County Council's Minerals and Waste Local Plans.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>Minerals and waste planning issues are dealt with through North Yorkshire County Council's Minerals and Waste Local Plans. <b>The Coal Authority defines local Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA) to ensure that development proposals consider the impact of past, current and future mineral extraction.</b></p>   | Representation – 9146 - Coal Authority Include reference to and role of Mineral Safeguarding Areas. This is detailed in Core Policy CP2. |

Chapter 2:Richmondshire's Challenges

| Mod Ref No | Chapter 2                          | Modification   | Comment   |
|------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| M005       | Settlements<br>Para 2.4<br>Line 14 | <p><u>Before</u><br/><b>'The Catterick Garrison Strategic Transport Assessment (2010)...'</b></p> <p><u>After</u><br/><b>'The Catterick Garrison Strategic Transport Assessment (2011)...'</b></p>   | Factual Correction  |
| M006       | Population<br>Para 2.7<br>and 2.8  | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>Population change occurs mainly through migration to and from Richmondshire. This is driven by a mix of higher education, housing market options, military policy and rural attractiveness. Research through the North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011) indicates that current mid 2008 sub national population projections, prepared by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) have overestimated the level of growth because of problems with the calculation of international migration. The Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population Estimates and Projections (2012) provides a revision to the mid 2008 based projections which addresses the overestimate using improved ONS methodology. The results show that a revised mid 2011 population estimate for the District should be 50,360 compared to the 52,840 expected using previous ONS methods. When this change in the calculation of international migration trends is projected forward it reduces the level of expected growth from 60,110 to 52,820. The Core Strategy adopts this revised, but more realistic, level of growth for strategic development.</p> <p>The population of the plan area is estimated to be 43,310 (mid 2011 revised), which is 86% of the District total. Two thirds of this population live in the seven largest settlements, with estimated populations of Catterick Garrison 14,600, Richmond 8,140, Catterick Village (including Marne Barracks) 2,785, Leyburn 2,110 and Brompton on Swale 1,800. Both Catterick Garrison and Catterick Village have large numbers of personnel living in communal accommodation.</p> | Impact of main 2011 Census results and Development Target Review August 2013. |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>Despite the presence of a large military population, the population age structure tends to be older than regional and national profiles. The retirement age population accounts for 18.1% of the District total, but this proportion will be smaller for the plan area, because of the military population. The plan area can expect an increase in its age profile as the 'baby boom' generation reaches retirement age during the plan period. 94.6% of the local population is white, which is greater than regional and national levels.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/><b>Population change occurs mainly through migration to and from Richmondshire. This is driven by a mix of higher education, housing market options, military policy and rural attractiveness. The small size of the plan area population combined with its very large military component presents a methodological challenge for both population estimation and projection. The ONS series of projections based on 2001 Census were inflated through an error affecting the calculation of international migration (Development Target Review, August 2013). Although main 2011 Census results have been published at the time of writing, the first set of projections based on the full Census results has not been prepared. The interim mid-2011 based population and household projections are not considered suitable for strategic planning (DTR, 2013). But, in projecting prevailing recessionary trends they do indicate reduced local prospects in the absence of development. The Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population Estimates and Projections (2012) provided a revision to the mid 2008 based projections which addressed the migration overestimate using improved ONS methodology. These results showed a reduction in the level of expected growth over the plan period. The Core Strategy has adopted this revised, but more realistic, level of growth for strategic development which is greater than the depressed growth indicated by the mid-2011 interim projections.</b></p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|

|      |                             |  |   |
|------|-----------------------------|--|---|
|      |                             | <p>The population of the plan area is estimated to be 44,690 (Census, 2011), which is 86% of the District total. Two thirds of this population live in the seven largest settlements, with estimated populations of Catterick Garrison 16,180, Richmond 8,410, Catterick Village (including Marne Barracks) 3,155, Leyburn 2,550 and Brompton on Swale 1,880. Both Catterick Garrison and Catterick Village have large numbers of personnel living in communal accommodation. Despite the presence of a large military population, the population age structure tends to be older than regional and national profiles. <b>The retirement age population accounts for 17.5% of the District total</b>, but this proportion will be smaller for the plan area, because of the military population. The plan area can expect an increase in its age profile as the 'baby boom' generation reaches retirement age during the plan period. <b>95.4% of the local population is white, which is greater than regional and national levels.</b></p>   |   |
| M007 | Housing Para's 2.9 and 2.10 | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>There are about 19,150 (2010) dwellings in the plan area, of which just over 80% are owner occupied or privately rented, which is higher than regional and national levels. The mix of tenures in the plan area includes nearly 1,600 military homes or 9% of total dwelling stock. There is a much lower proportion of social rented housing (10%) compared to regional and national levels. The vacancy rate, including holiday homes and second homes, is 7.7%. This falls to 2.1% when only market properties are included (Empty and Underused Property Research, 2009).</p> <p>There are two distinct Housing Market areas in Richmondshire. The central and northern parts of the plan area fall mainly into the Darlington and the Tees Valley area. The remaining, predominantly rural area, participates in much wider high value and leisure markets characterised by affluent commuters, quality of life, second and holiday homes. In-migration and rural attractiveness are strong drivers of the housing market. The ratio of lower quartile house price to lower quartile earnings has varied between 9.97 in 2005 and 8.44 in 2010 (CLG, 2012).</p> | Update with 2011 Census results and additional SHMA reference.. |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>The North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NYSHMA 2011) confirms the ongoing affordable housing issue, with an estimated need for 260 affordable dwellings per annum over the next five years based on both the existing and emerging demand. The lower average household income of £22,100 in the District is a barrier to owner-occupation for many families. The average lower quartile house price is £145,000 and requires a household income of £58,500 to purchase it (assuming a maximum mortgage spend of 20% of income and no other equity). The private rented sector has been buoyant, but affordability issues place increased pressure on the available stock. Rents were comparatively low compared with more urban markets in North Yorkshire. Social housing waiting lists accounted for 7% of households.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/> <b>There are about 19,600 (2011) dwellings in the plan area, of which just over 85% are owner occupied or privately rented, which is higher than regional and national levels. The mix of tenures in the plan area includes nearly 1,750 military homes or 10% of total dwelling stock. There is a much lower proportion of social rented housing (11%) compared to regional and national levels. The vacancy rate, including holiday homes and second homes, is 7.7%. This falls to 2.1% when only market properties are included (Empty and Underused Property Research, 2009).</b></p> <p>There are two distinct Housing Market areas in Richmondshire. The central and northern parts of the plan area fall mainly into the Darlington and the Tees Valley area. The remaining, predominantly rural area, participates in much wider high value and leisure markets characterised by affluent commuters, quality of life, second and holiday homes. In-migration and rural attractiveness are strong drivers of the housing market. The ratio of lower quartile house price to lower quartile earnings has varied between 9.97 in 2005 and 8.44 in 2010 (CLG, 2012). The North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NYSHMA 2011) confirms the ongoing affordable housing issue. <b>It estimated an annual need for 260 affordable dwellings per annum over the next five years based</b></p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|



|      |                             |   |   |
|------|-----------------------------|---|---|
|      |                             | <p><b>on both the existing and emerging demand. But this includes households seeking adaptations and emerging households which may look outside the District for their housing needs. It is also based on assumptions concerning access to housing finance products available at the time of writing.</b> The lower average household income of £22,100 in the District is a barrier to owner-occupation for many families. The average lower quartile house price is £145,000 and requires a household income of £58,500 to purchase it (assuming a maximum mortgage spend of 20% of income and no other equity). The private rented sector has been buoyant, but affordability issues place increased pressure on the available stock. Rents were comparatively low compared with more urban markets in North Yorkshire. Social housing waiting lists accounted for 7% of households.</p>   |   |
| M008 | Military Para's 2.11 & 2.12 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>There are two substantial military sites in the plan area. The Catterick Garrison main site has grown within the parishes of Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn since it was established in 1915, while Marne Barracks is at Catterick Village by the A1. The military population, following the complete 4 Brigade relocation from Germany, is estimated to be nearly 10,500 personnel and dependants, which is nearly a quarter of the plan area population.</p> <p>The Catterick Garrison Long Term Development Plan (CGLTDP, MoD 2008) identified sites to enable the Garrison to expand to accommodate a maximum of a further five units, equivalent to an estimated 3,000 military personnel. The Defence Secretary announced in summer 2011 that the overall size of the regular army would be decreased and that units currently based in Germany would relocate mainly to Scotland. As a result of these announcements little change is now expected in the size of the Garrison. National policy is for military personnel to stay at a home base for most of their career and to be deployed from there, aiming for personnel and their families to settle near to their base. In support of this, CGLTDP also aims to make Catterick Garrison an attractive home for soldiers and their families, and meet the aspirations of the wider local</p> | Update as a result of Army Basing Plan and Catterick Garrison town centre approval. |

|      |  |   |  |
|------|--|---|--|
|      |  | <p>community. Central to this aim is the development of a modern town centre in Catterick Garrison.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/> There are two substantial military sites in the plan area. The Catterick Garrison main site has grown within the parishes of Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn since it was established in 1915, while Marne Barracks is at Catterick Village by the A1. The military population, following the complete 4 Brigade relocation from Germany, is estimated to be nearly 10,500 personnel and dependants, which is nearly a quarter of the plan area population.</p> <p><b>The Army Basing Plan (MoD, 2013) presented the overall movements in military units required to return the Army from Germany and modernise it. This plan identifies major unit movements in to and out of Catterick Garrison up until 2017. The net impact of these movements is not expected to change the overall size of the military presence in Richmondshire. National policy is for military personnel to stay at a home base for most of their career and to be deployed from there, aiming for personnel and their families to settle near to their base. The development of a modern town centre contributes to the objective to make Catterick Garrison an attractive home for soldiers and their families, and meet the aspirations of the wider local community.</b></p> |  |
| M009 | Transport & Accessibility<br>Para 2.18 | <p><u>Before</u><br/> The recent A1 motorway upgrade between Dishforth and Leeming Bar has improved access to existing employment and residential areas, and this will be improved further if the proposed A684 Bedale bypass is also built. The northern section of the proposed A1 upgrade from Leeming Bar to Barton has been cancelled. Proposed A1 junction upgrades in the Catterick Village area would have substantially improved access to the plan area. The Catterick Garrison Strategic Transport Assessment (2011) identified a number of road junctions along the A6136, which are near to or approaching capacity. Potential mitigation measures to enable future development were also identified.</p>  | Update reflecting changed circumstance of A1 upgrade |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p><u>After</u><br/>The A1 motorway upgrade between Dishforth and Leeming Bar has improved access to existing employment and residential areas, and this will be improved further <b>when</b> the proposed A684 Bedale bypass is also built. <b>The completion of the northern section of the proposed A1 upgrade from Leeming Bar to Barton is expected by 2017. The proposed Catterick Central junction upgrade will substantially improve access to the plan area.</b> The Catterick Garrison Strategic Transport Assessment (2011) identified a number of road junctions along the A6136, which are near to or approaching capacity. <b>Mitigation measures to enable future development were also identified and funding for these is being sought.</b></p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|

### Chapter 3: The Strategic Approach

| Mod Ref No | Chapter 3                          | Modification  | Comment  |
|------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| M010       | Vision, para 5 line 5              | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Richmond has built on its heritage and increased its economic importance to the surrounding area.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>Richmond has <b>realised the potential offered by its heritage</b> and increased its economic importance to the surrounding area.</p>  | Representation – 2282 - English Heritage – Text clarification        |
| M011       | SP4 Para's 3.1.25, 3.1.26 & 3.1.27 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Population and household forecasts are the normal starting point when considering the scale of housing development. The Richmondshire population has proved difficult to project consistently and household projections have fluctuated widely in the past 10 years. The Regional Spatial Strategy proposed an annual target of 200 additional new houses each year. The ONS/CLG mid-2006 based household forecasts increased this to 400, which was subsequently decreased to 250 each year by the mid-2008 household forecasts.</p> <p>The North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NYSHMA, 2011) identified the risk that population estimates and projections produced by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) were inflated and recommended the production of a local population projection. The Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population Estimates and Projections (2012) presented a local population projection based on the mid-2008 ONS population projection, but with revised international migration estimates based on a methodology developed by ONS for future projections. This approach was also applied to mid year estimate calculations back to 2006 to ensure that the problems identified with ONS overestimation of international migration did not artificially inflate the projected population. This work removed the incorrect expectations for international migration from the Richmondshire population and indicated a more realistic housing target of an average of 180 houses each year. The future population is expected to change shape with an increasing proportion of ageing households.</p> | Updated as a result of Development Target Review (2013) publication. |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>The housing target is based on change in the whole Richmondshire population, but is related to development in the area outside of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. This recognises the national park's policy to address locally defined housing needs, the limited capacity for new housing development in this area and the district wide roles of the main towns.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>Population and household forecasts are the normal starting point when considering the scale of housing development. The Richmondshire population has proved difficult to project consistently and household projections have fluctuated widely in the past 10 years. The Regional Spatial Strategy proposed an annual target of 200 additional new houses each year. The ONS/CLG mid-2006 based household forecasts increased this to 400, which was subsequently decreased to 250 each year by the mid-2008 household forecasts. <b>The first household projection following publication of the main 2011 Census results indicate a much reduced target of 80 homes per annum.</b></p> <p><b>The reasons for this variation stem from incorrect assumptions concerning international migration and the impact of the large military population. This problem was addressed by ONS in recent improvements to population projection methodology. The latest interim population and household forecasts present a different problem tantamount to the population standing still over the whole plan period, with any household growth accounted for by decreasing household size. This is a product of the projection of severe recessionary trends over the preceding five years being projected forward. These issues have been reviewed in detail in the Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population Estimates and Projections (2012) and the Development Target Review (August, 2013). Together these conclude that the growth expectations projected in the Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population Estimates and Projections (2012) presented the most realistic growth trend and indicated a housing target of an average of 180 houses each year. The future population is expected to change shape with an increasing proportion of ageing households.</b></p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

|      |                 |   |                          |
|------|-----------------|---|--------------------------|
|      |                 | <p><b>This</b> housing target is based on change in the whole Richmondshire population, but is related to development in the area outside of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. This recognises the national park's policy to address locally defined housing needs, the limited capacity for new housing development in this area and the district wide roles of the main towns <b>in the plan area. Monitoring of delivery against this target will, therefore, include net new housing development in the National Park area.</b></p>  |                          |
| M012 | SP4 Para 3.1.30 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Ministry of Defence (MoD) policy changes and the range of potential requirements are a source of continuing uncertainty for local development planning. The likely scale of service families' housing required for military personnel at Catterick Garrison needs to be dealt with separately and planned for flexibly to account for changing national priorities. The Catterick Garrison Long Term Development Plan (CGLTDP, 2008) indicated that space is available on MoD sites to accommodate major expansion. MoD estimated a maximum requirement for 1,440 service families' homes (MoD, 2010) plus military work areas for up to four additional units on the defence estate. The Defence Secretary (July 2011) announced that Catterick Garrison was expected to remain about the same size, but detailed plans had not been produced. This makes it necessary to retain military expansion capacity in the Core Strategy to ensure reasonable options for national defence policy can be addressed in the local context.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/><b>The implementation of the Army Basing Plan (MoD 2013) will not be complete until 2017.</b> The likely scale of <b>additional</b> service families' housing required for military personnel at Catterick Garrison needs to be dealt with separately and planned for flexibly to account for changing national priorities. The Catterick Garrison Long Term Development Plan (CGLTDP, 2008) indicated that space is available on MoD sites to accommodate a large amount of new military housing. <b>Current expectations for additional accommodation are</b></p> | Army Basing Plan update. |

|       |                 |  |                         |
|-------|-----------------|--|-------------------------|
|       |                 | <p><b>more modest and flow from an expectation to consolidate this type of accommodation. Initial estimates suggest that, subject to military housing policy, between 300 and 500 homes could be built. Although plans have not been confirmed for this development, it is necessary</b> to retain military expansion capacity at this level in the Core Strategy to ensure reasonable options for national defence policy can be addressed in the local context.</p>  |                         |
| MM013 | SP4 Para 3.1.31 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>The most recent evidence indicated a very low level of need for additional provision for the Gypsy and Traveller community (NYGTAA 2008). This amounted to three additional pitches. There has been no pressure for growth since this assessment and further need will be dealt with in the development management process, consistent with national policy, rather than strategic allocations.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/><b>The most recent evidence indicates a high level of vacancy in current provision for the Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and no expected demand (GTAA 2013). This is reflected in the lack of unauthorised encampments, enforcement action or applications for additional sites in Richmondshire, which does not call for strategic allocations. Any identified need can be met on existing sites and applications for further sites will be dealt with in the development management process, consistent with Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG 2012) using Core Policy CP4.</b></p> | GTAA Update             |
| M014  | SP4 Policy      | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Provision is also made for the development of up to 1,440 homes for military service families' accommodation at the Catterick Garrison main military site by 2028 if required and will be additional to the general housing requirement in Catterick Garrison.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>Provision is also made for the development of up to <b>500 homes</b> for military service families' accommodation at the Catterick Garrison main military site by</p>  | Army Basing Plan Update |

|      |                 |   |  |
|------|-----------------|---|--|
|      |                 | <p>2028 if required by national defence strategy and will be additional to the general housing requirement in Catterick Garrison.</p> <p>Additional Gypsy and Traveller accommodation requirements will be met through Core Policy CP4a.</p>  |  |
| M015 | SP5 Para 3.1.35 | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>The Richmond Swale Valley Community Initiative (RSVCI) Strategic Framework (2009 – 2014) prioritises economic diversification and attracting new business. Richmond’s important tourism offer and scope for creative industries is recognised, as is the need for complementary growth in Catterick Garrison to address the limited capacity for development in Richmond. The Economic Impact of the Military Presence in North Yorkshire (February 2010) looked at the economic impact of the military and its likely future growth. This study showed that military related employment accounts for 44% of total employment in Richmondshire. Military procurement is expected to continue on a predominantly national basis with few local growth opportunities apart from smaller local supply-chain contracting opportunities. The cancellation of the A1 motorway upgrade (October 2010) through the District and loss of associated junction improvements altered the longer term potential of areas adjacent to it and also lost the opportunity for improved access to and from much of Richmondshire.</p> <p><u>After</u></p> <p>The Richmond Swale Valley Community Initiative (RSVCI) Strategic Framework (2009 – 2014) <b>prioritised</b> economic diversification and attracting new business. Richmond’s important tourism offer and scope for creative industries is recognised, as is the need for complementary growth in Catterick Garrison to address the limited capacity for development in Richmond. <b>The Local Enterprise Partnership has recognised that Catterick Garrison offers the greatest potential for economic growth in this part of North Yorkshire.</b></p> | A1 upgrade update and reference to LEP |



|      |                 |   |                   |
|------|-----------------|---|-------------------|
|      |                 | <p>The Economic Impact of the Military Presence in North Yorkshire (February 2010) looked at the economic impact of the military and its likely future growth. This study showed that military related employment accounts for 44% of total employment in Richmondshire. Military procurement is expected to continue on a predominantly national basis with few local growth opportunities apart from smaller local supply-chain contracting opportunities. <b>The upgrade of the A1 to motorway standard through the District and its associated junction improvements will promote the longer term potential of the local economy as a whole through better connectivity particularly for the key employment areas in Richmond, Catterick Garrison and at Gatherley Road. It also introduces the prospect of appropriate development related to the Catterick Central junction, but subject to the known flood risk, archaeological and natural constraints and the feasibility of any connection to the strategic road network and links to the local road network.</b></p>                                     |                   |
| M016 | SP5 Para 3.1.37 | <p><u>Before</u><br/> North Richmondshire is predominantly rural, but also has major trunk road junctions at Scotch Corner and Barton. There are a few employment locations in the area. The Aske Hall development provides a range of employment units within former estate buildings near to Richmond. Dalton Gates is a small industrial estate is on the site of a former wartime airfield five miles from Darlington. Although well located for both the A1 and A66, only a small amount of employment development has taken place at Scotch Corner. Planning permission was first granted for a major 7 hectare employment development next to Scotch Corner twenty years ago and remains a planning commitment but development has not yet started and little interest has been forthcoming.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/> North Richmondshire is predominantly rural, but also has major trunk road junctions at Scotch Corner and Barton. There are a few employment locations in the area. The Aske Hall development provides a range of employment units within former estate buildings near to Richmond.</p> | A1 Upgrade update |

|      |   |  |                   |
|------|---|--|-------------------|
|      |   | <p>Dalton Gates is a small industrial estate is on the site of a former wartime airfield five miles from Darlington. Although well located for both the A1 and A66, only a small amount of employment development has taken place at Scotch Corner. Planning permission was first granted for a major 7 hectare employment development next to Scotch Corner twenty years ago and remains a planning commitment but development has not yet started. <b>The A1 upgrade improves prospects for this site and motorway related development at both Scotch Corner and Barton junctions.</b></p>   |                   |
| M017 | <p>SP5 Para's<br/>3.1.43 &amp;<br/>3.1.44</p> | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>Further employment development can also be encouraged within, or if opportunities cannot be found, close to the town centres to help maintain a closer relationship between local homes and work places. This could include refurbishments or more intensive developments making better use of upper floors while respecting the quality of the town centres. Neither of the northern A1 junctions at Scotch Corner and Barton relate well to the Spatial Principle SP2 settlement hierarchy, therefore further development will not be supported here beyond that already committed.</p> <p>Small scale economic development in Primary and Secondary Service Villages which meets local needs will be supported reflecting the role of these settlements in Spatial Principle SP2. Beyond these villages, again reflecting the intentions of Spatial Principle SP3, small scale limited development would be appropriate to support rural sustainability subject to satisfying important environmental considerations in these areas.</p> <p><u>After</u></p> <p>Further employment development can also be encouraged within, or if opportunities cannot be found, close to the town centres to help maintain a closer relationship between local homes and work places. This could include refurbishments or more intensive developments making better use of upper floors while respecting the quality of the town centres.</p> | A1 Upgrade update |

|      |   |   |  |
|------|---|---|--|
|      |   | <p><del>Neither of the northern A1 junctions at Scotch Corner and Barton relate well to the Spatial Principle SP2 settlement hierarchy, therefore further development will not be supported here beyond that already committed.</del></p> <p><b>In addition to appropriate motorway related development and existing key employment areas, small scale economic development in Primary and Secondary Service Villages which meets local needs will be supported reflecting the role of these settlements in Spatial Principle SP2. Beyond these villages, again reflecting the intentions of Spatial Principle SP3, small scale limited development would be appropriate to support rural sustainability subject to satisfying important environmental considerations in these areas.</b></p> |  |
| M018 | SP5 Policy<br>New Para at end           | <b>Appropriate economic development opportunities related to the A1 upgraded junctions at Catterick Central, Scotch Corner and Barton will be considered subject to a detailed appraisal of their requirements to link directly with the strategic road network, the feasibility of this link and local conditions that exist in these locations.</b>   | A1 Upgrade update                              |
| M019 | CRSS Para<br>3.2.1,<br>3.2.2 &<br>3.2.3 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Central Richmondshire is defined by the River Swale and higher ground rising to the north and south; and has a population of around 31,040 people, which is about two thirds of the plan area.</p> <p>Richmond is the historic centre of Richmondshire with an estimated population of 8,140.</p> <p>Catterick Garrison is a complicated place where the three villages of Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn, plus the Catterick Garrison main site have coalesced. It has a total population of nearly 15,000.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>Central Richmondshire is defined by the River Swale and higher ground rising to the north and south; and has a population of around <b>31,000</b> people, which is about two thirds of the plan area.</p>                            | Factual update to include 2011 Census Results. |

|      |                         |  |  |
|------|-------------------------|--|--|
|      |                         | <p>Richmond is the historic centre of Richmondshire with an estimated population of <b>8,410</b>.</p> <p>Catterick Garrison is a complicated place where the three villages of Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn, plus the Catterick Garrison main site have coalesced. It has a total population of nearly <b>16,200</b>.</p>   |  |
| M020 | CRSS Para 3.2.4 & 3.2.5 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>The Catterick Garrison main military site was established in 1915 and is now home to over 7,500 personnel and their families, giving a total military population of about 10,500. This population is unusual in rural North Yorkshire. Its age structure is younger as a result of the significant military presence and large numbers of personnel live in communal military accommodation. National military policy seeks to enable personnel and their families to settle near to their base, and in support of this the Catterick Garrison Long Term Development Plan (CGLTDP, 2008) aims for:</p> <p>“a community which integrates military and civilian communities in an environmentally sustainable way, and which encourages social and economic development. “</p> <p>Military related development in Catterick Garrison is driven by national defence policy and is, to a large extent, independent of local conditions apart from the local capacity for development. CGLTDP identifies the potential for the military presence to expand in Richmondshire by a maximum of five units. The circumstances under which it was written have changed with the national Security and Defence Review (SDR, 2010) and detail plans arising from this will still need to reflect the local context when published.</p> <p>The Central Richmondshire Spatial Strategy (CRSS) addresses the challenges facing this area: sustaining and strengthening Richmond; improving Catterick Garrison to create a modern vibrant centre; accommodating growth; adapting to</p> | Update to include reference to Army Basing review and assimilate military requirements |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>military change and creating a wider range of more integrated opportunities in Central Richmondshire for work, housing, leisure and shopping which reduce the need to travel to more distant centres. It takes its direction from the Core Strategy's Spatial Principles (figure 7) as the sub area for the largest amount of new development. Most of this will take place in Catterick Garrison, reflecting the opportunities for growth and constraints in the two Principal Towns. Some 79% of housing development (2,410 houses) in the plan area is expected to be delivered in this sub area. In addition, provision is made for expansion of military related facilities and 1,440 service families' houses, to enable military development (if required) to accommodate an additional four military units above the current complement in 2011.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>The Catterick Garrison main military site was established in 1915 and is now home to over 7,500 personnel and their families, giving a total military population of about 10,500. This population is unusual in rural North Yorkshire. Its age structure is younger as a result of the significant military presence and large numbers of personnel live in communal military accommodation. National military policy seeks to enable personnel and their families to settle near to their base, and in support of this the Catterick Garrison Long Term Development Plan (CGLTDP, 2008) aims for:</p> <p>“a community which integrates military and civilian communities in an environmentally sustainable way, and which encourages social and economic development. “</p> <p><b>Military related development in Catterick Garrison is driven by national defence policy and is, to a large extent, independent of local conditions apart from the local capacity for development. CGLTDP has been superseded by the Army Basing Plan (2013) which envisages a set of unit movements contributing to overall army modernisation up to 2017, but with no significant change in the overall military presence.</b></p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|      |                       |  |   |
|------|-----------------------|--|---|
|      |                       | <p>The Central Richmondshire Spatial Strategy (CRSS) addresses the challenges facing this area: sustaining and strengthening Richmond; improving Catterick Garrison to create a modern vibrant centre; accommodating growth; adapting to military change and creating a wider range of more integrated opportunities in Central Richmondshire for work, housing, leisure and shopping which reduce the need to travel to more distant centres. It takes its direction from the Core Strategy's Spatial Principles (figure 7) as the sub area for the largest amount of new development. Most of this will take place in Catterick Garrison, reflecting the opportunities for growth and constraints in the two Principal Towns. Some 79% of housing development (2,410 houses) in the plan area is expected to be delivered in this sub area. <b>Provision is also made for the development of military related facilities and 500 additional service family homes if required to enable the implementation of national military strategy locally.</b></p>   |   |
| M021 | CRSS –<br>Para 3.2.10 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>The roles of the town centres of Richmond and Catterick Garrison are further defined in Core Policy CP9: Supporting Town and Local Centres and the scale and type of town centre developments in the Garrison Area will be determined in the Delivering Development Plan. Prior to the preparation of that Plan, planning applications for commercial development in both the Garrison Area and Richmond will be expected to address the potential consequences upon the other centre in line with Core Policy CP9.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/><b>The roles of the town centres of Richmond and Catterick Garrison are further defined in Core Policy CP9: Supporting Town and Local Centres. and the scale and type of town centre developments in the Garrison Area will be determined in the Delivering Development Plan. Prior to the preparation of that Plan, planning applications for Commercial development in either Catterick Garrison or Richmond will be expected to address the potential consequences upon the other centre in line with Core Policy CP9.</b></p> | Replacement of policy 83 and update to reflect inclusion of town centre maps in Core Policy CP9 |

|      |             |  |                   |
|------|-------------|--|-------------------|
| M022 | CRSS Policy | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Development in the Primary Service Villages of Brompton on Swale, Catterick Village and Scorton which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. maintains and enhances the Primary Service Village roles of these three villages;</li> <li>b. facilitates the continued development of the Gatherley Road residential area and its integration with Brompton on Swale</li> <li>c. consolidates and enhances the Gatherley Road employment area particularly for general industry and logistics, reflecting its location in relation to the A1 and the growth areas of the plan and secures improvements to the stock and condition of existing premises and infrastructure;</li> <li>d. enables the operation of existing or future military units and provides for military personnel and their families at Marne Barracks;</li> <li>e. enhances the tourism and recreational potential of Catterick Racecourse subject to ensuring that it respects the character and heritage value of the Catteractonium Scheduled Ancient Monument;</li> <li>f. protects and enhances the provision of local facilities;</li> <li>g. is of an appropriate scale, location and design; and</li> <li>h. is on existing vacant and previously developed sites in the built-up area as far as reasonably practicable.</li> </ul> <p>Development outside of the settlement hierarchy, which meets identified local needs in accordance with the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>Development in the Primary Service Villages of Brompton on Swale, Catterick Village and Scorton which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. maintains and enhances the Primary Service Village roles of these three villages;</li> </ul> | A1 Upgrade update |
|------|-------------|--|-------------------|

|      |                    |  |                   |
|------|--------------------|--|-------------------|
|      |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. facilitates the continued development of the Gatherley Road residential area and its integration with Brompton on Swale</li> <li>c. consolidates and enhances the Gatherley Road employment area particularly for general industry and logistics, reflecting its location in relation to the A1 and the growth areas of the plan and secures improvements to the stock and condition of existing premises and infrastructure;</li> <li>d. enables the operation of existing or future military units and provides for military personnel and their families at Marne Barracks;</li> <li>e. enhances the tourism and recreational potential of Catterick Racecourse subject to ensuring that it respects the character and heritage value of the Catteractonium Scheduled Ancient Monument;</li> <li>f. protects and enhances the provision of local facilities;</li> <li>g. is of an appropriate scale, location and design; and</li> <li>h. is on existing vacant and previously developed sites in the built-up area as far as reasonably practicable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Development will be considered at the new Catterick Central junction on the upgraded A1 subject to Spatial Principle SP5.</b></p> <p>Development outside of the settlement hierarchy, which meets identified local needs in accordance with the Core Strategy.</p> |                   |
| M023 | NRSS<br>Para 3.4.7 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Employment within the area is predominantly agricultural. The tourism sector includes a number of high quality hotels and Croft Circuit motor racing track. There are few employment centres. The development of the Aske Hall business units near to Richmond and other smaller units across the sub area take advantage of the area's good communications and this has promoted diversification in this rural area. Dalton Gates is a small industrial estate on the site of a former wartime airfield five miles from Darlington.</p>  | A1 Upgrade update |



|      |                 |  |                    |
|------|-----------------|--|--------------------|
|      |                 | <p>Although well located for both the A1 and A66, only a small amount of employment development has taken place at Scotch Corner. Planning permission was first granted for a major 7 hectare employment development next to Scotch Corner twenty years ago and remains a planning commitment but development has not yet started and little interest has been forthcoming.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/> Employment within the area is predominantly agricultural. The tourism sector includes a number of high quality hotels and Croft Circuit motor racing track. There are few employment centres. The development of the Aske Hall business units near to Richmond and other smaller units across the sub area take advantage of the area's good communications and this has promoted diversification in this rural area. Dalton Gates is a small industrial estate on the site of a former wartime airfield five miles from Darlington. Although well located for both the A1 and A66, only a small amount of employment development has taken place at Scotch Corner. Planning permission was first granted for a major 7 hectare employment development next to Scotch Corner twenty years ago and remains a planning commitment but development has not yet started and little interest has been forthcoming. <b>The A1 upgrade improves prospects for this site and motorway related development at both Scotch Corner and Barton junctions.</b></p> |                    |
| M024 | LWSS Para 3.3.2 | <p><u>Before</u><br/> Its main settlements are Leyburn and Middleham, which provide a central focus for several smaller villages. Leyburn is identified as a Local Service Centre, serving a population of approximately 7,000 people, of which about 2,110 reside in Leyburn itself (2011 population estimates). It is a market town, central to the local agricultural economy and also a popular stop for travellers on the route across the northern Pennines. This traditional role has now evolved into the town becoming a visitor gateway to Wensleydale and the neighbouring dales within the Yorkshire Dales National Park.</p>  | Census 2011 update |

|      |                         |   |                      |
|------|-------------------------|---|----------------------|
|      |                         | <p><u>After</u><br/> Its main settlements are Leyburn and Middleham, which provide a central focus for several smaller villages. <b>Leyburn is identified as a Local Service Centre, serving a population of approximately 8,000 people, of which about 2,550 reside in Leyburn itself (2011 Census).</b> It is a market town, central to the local agricultural economy and also a popular stop for travellers on the route across the northern Pennines. This traditional role has now evolved into the town becoming a visitor gateway to Wensleydale and the neighbouring dales within the Yorkshire Dales National Park.</p>   |                      |
| M025 | NRSS Para 3.4.3 & 3.4.4 | <p><u>Before</u><br/> About 7,400 people live in this area. Their age profile is older than the District as a whole, and has been influenced by migration from the Tees Valley and the loss of younger people through education, work and housing opportunities.</p> <p>Settlements in this area are more closely aligned to Tees Valley from Barnard Castle to Darlington along the A66, A1 and A167 routes. The largest settlements are Barton (810), Melsonby (760) and Middleton Tyas (560), but there is no clear local service centre for the whole area. The recently revised Settlement Facilities Study (RDC, 2011) shows that none of the villages in the North Richmondshire sub-area have more than one shop each, but this area does have seven primary schools and eleven village halls, suggesting a dispersed pattern of active settlements.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/> <b>About 7,600 people live in this area.</b> Their age profile is older than the District as a whole, and has been influenced by migration from the Tees Valley and the loss of younger people through education, work and housing opportunities.</p> <p>Settlements in this area are more closely aligned to Tees Valley from Barnard Castle to Darlington along the A66, A1 and A167 routes. <b>The largest settlements are Barton (840), Melsonby (735) and Middleton Tyas (580), but there is no clear local service centre for the whole area.</b></p> | Census (2011) update |

|      |             |   |                   |
|------|-------------|---|-------------------|
|      |             | The recently revised Settlement Facilities Study (RDC, 2011) shows that none of the villages in the North Richmondshire sub-area have more than one shop each, but this area does have seven primary schools and eleven village halls, suggesting a dispersed pattern of active settlements.  |                   |
| M026 | NRSS Policy | <p><u>Before</u><br/>North Richmondshire Spatial Strategy (NRSS)</p> <p>Growth in North Richmondshire will be modest and development will be small in scale, reflecting the role of the Sub Area and its relationship to Darlington.</p> <p>In the Primary Service Villages of Middleton Tyas, Barton and Melsonby support will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Primary Service Village roles of these three villages, which whilst relatively separate share a close geographical relationship to the A1 and A66, and to the limited employment opportunities associated with these routes;</li> <li>• consolidation of the existing and committed employment development at Scotch Corner, with no further expansion onto undeveloped land;</li> <li>• the approved A1:Barton junction Service Area proposal only.</li> </ul> <p>In the Secondary Service Villages of Newsham – Ravensworth – Dalton (cluster), Eppleby – Caldwell – Aldbrough (cluster), North Cowton and Gilling West:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small scale and a modest level of development may be acceptable where it supports the social and economic needs and sustainability of the local community.</li> </ul> <p>Elsewhere in the rural parts of the Sub Area, sustainable development in accordance with Spatial Principle SP3 will be supported.</p> | A1 Upgrade update |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p><u>After</u><br/>North Richmondshire Spatial Strategy (NRSS)</p> <p>Growth in North Richmondshire will be modest and development will be small in scale, reflecting the role of the Sub Area and its relationship to Darlington.</p> <p>In the Primary Service Villages of Middleton Tyas, Barton and Melsonby support will be given for their Primary Service Village roles, which whilst relatively separate share a close geographical relationship to the A1 and A66, <del>and to the limited employment opportunities associated with these routes;</del></p> <p><b>In the Secondary Service Villages of Newsham – Ravensworth – Dalton (cluster), Eppleby – Caldwell – Aldbrough (cluster), North Cowton and Gilling West:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>small scale and a modest level of development may be acceptable where it supports the social and economic needs and sustainability of the local community.</b></li></ul> <p><b>Elsewhere in the rural parts of the Sub Area, sustainable development in accordance with Spatial Principle SP3 will be supported.</b></p> <p><b>At junctions on the upgraded A1 motorway:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>priority will be given to:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>consolidation of the existing and committed employment development at Scotch Corner, with no further expansion onto undeveloped land</b></li><li>• <b>the approved A1:Barton junction Service Area proposal only</b></li></ul></li><li>• <b>appropriate motorway related development will be considered subject to Spatial Principle SP5.</b></li></ul> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

Chapter 4: Core Policies

| Mod Ref No | Chapter 4     | Modification  | Comment  |
|------------|---------------|---|--|
| M027       | CP0           | Renumber CP1 and renumber paragraphs 4.0.1 – 4.0.4 to 4.1.1 to 4.1.4  | Changes due to combination of current CP3 and CP4  |
| M028       | CP1           | Renumber CP2 and renumber paragraphs 4.1.1 – 4.1.21 to 4.2.1 to 4.2.21  | Changes due to combination of current CP3 and CP4  |
| M029       | CP1 Policy 2b | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>b. New Development</p> <p>All new residential development will be expected to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4;</p> <p><u>After</u></p> <p>b. New Development</p> <p>All new residential development will be expected to meet <b>the highest viable level of the Code for Sustainable Homes or equivalent rating prevailing at the time and viable on site</b></p>   | Insert Code for Sustainable Homes requirement subject to financial viability and ensure that the stretching target remains when rating schemes change. |
| M030       | CP1 Part 3    | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>3 Climate Change Adaptation</p> <p>All new buildings will be expected to be adaptable to climate change in terms of the design and layout of both buildings and associated external spaces. Accordingly, developers should have regard to the following:</p> <p>a. How their design, orientation, materials and construction will minimise mechanical cooling needs and risk of overheating;</p> <p>b. How development will incorporate green infrastructure, including tree planting, green roofs and walls, and soft landscaping, where possible;</p> | Representation – 9112 - Environment Agency – To improve wording regarding climate change adaptation  |

- c. How development will be designed to minimise flood risk on-site and downstream of the development and
- d. How development will incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to minimise surface water flood risk, protect waterways and provide aesthetic and ecological benefits.

After

3. Climate Change Adaptation

All new **development** will be expected to be adaptable to climate change in terms of **both its location and the specific** design and layout of buildings and associated external spaces. **Development proposals should:**

- a. **Demonstrate** how their design, orientation, materials and construction will minimise mechanical cooling needs and risk of overheating;
- b. **Demonstrate how green infrastructure will be incorporated**, including tree planting, green roofs and walls, and soft landscaping, where possible;
- c. **Be steered away from flood risk areas by adopting a sequential approach as set out in prevailing national guidance;**
- d. Be designed to minimise flood risk on-site and **elsewhere, by:**
  - **Incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) unless they are demonstrated to be impracticable or they will pose an unacceptable pollution risk. SuDS should minimise surface water flood risk, protect waterways and provide aesthetic and ecological benefits;**

|      |                 |  |   |
|------|-----------------|--|---|
|      |                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Not building over or culverting watercourses unless it is to facilitate essential access and;</b></li> <li>- <b>Encouraging the opening of existing culverts.</b></li> </ul> <p>e. <b>Show how development will seek to minimise waste production.</b></p>   |   |
| M031 | CP1 Para 4.1.13 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>New development across Richmondshire will add to energy demands and could have wider environmental consequences. Sustainable development and good environmental performance is a priority for Richmondshire, and all new development will be expected to meet a minimum of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 or equivalent. Similarly, for non-domestic buildings the Local Planning Authority will expect BREEAM (2011) Very Good (and Defence Related Environmental Assessment Methodology (DREAM) for MoD development). In addition to providing a framework for assessing the energy credits, the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM will also driver wider sustainability performance of buildings. The Richmondshire Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (2011) demonstrates that there is likely to be capacity in property values to maintain viability while incorporating cost uplifts associated with higher standards. In addition during the seven year period 2004 – 2011, 23% of planning permissions granted were on sites for single dwellings, with an average of 57 per annum. The majority of these were in the villages and smaller settlements. If it is considered that the application of these standards would make development unviable, the developer will be expected to demonstrate this through an open-book approach.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>New development across Richmondshire will add to energy demands and could have wider environmental consequences. Sustainable development and good environmental performance is a priority for Richmondshire, and all new development will be expected <b>to exceed the minimum level of the Code for Sustainable Homes or equivalent prevailing at the time of submission.</b> Similarly, for non-domestic buildings the Local Planning Authority will expect BREEAM (2011) Very</p> | Insert Code for Sustainable Homes requirement subject to financial viability and ensure that the stretching target remains when rating schemes change |

|      |     |  |   |
|------|-----|--|---|
|      |     | <p>Good (and Defence Related Environmental Assessment Methodology (DREAM) for MoD development). In addition to providing a framework for assessing the energy credits, the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM will also driver wider sustainability performance of buildings. The Richmondshire Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (2011) demonstrates that there is likely to be capacity in property values to maintain viability while incorporating cost uplifts associated with higher standards. In addition during the seven year period 2004 – 2011, 23% of planning permissions granted were on sites for single dwellings, with an average of 57 per annum. The majority of these were in the villages and smaller settlements. If it is considered that the application of these standards would make development unviable, the developer will be expected to demonstrate this through an open-book approach.</p>   |   |
| M032 | CP2 | <p>Renumber CP3 and renumber paragraphs 4.2.1 – 4.2.3 to 4.3.1 to 4.3.3</p>  | <p>Changes due to combination of current CP3 and CP4</p>  |
| M033 | CP2 | <p><b>Core Policy CP3: Achieving Sustainable Development</b><br/>Support will be given for sustainable development which promotes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the efficient use of land and infrastructure including developments with a sustainable and complementary mix of uses;</li> <li>b. the conservation of scarce resources and reduction of their use, and encouragement of the use and re-use of sustainable resources;</li> <li>c. the health, economic and social well-being, amenity and safety of the population;</li> <li>d. a reduction in social inequalities and disadvantages within the community;</li> <li>e. the quality of natural resources including water, air, land and biodiversity and minimises the impacts of airborne pollution;</li> <li>f. the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land;</li> <li>g. the natural drainage of surface water mitigating the effects of flash flooding of rivers, drains and drought;</li> <li>h. the vitality of the area;</li> <li>i. a high quality and adaptability of development;</li> </ul> | <p>Representation – 9112 - Environment Agency - Additional point to address waste minimisation<br/>Representation – 9117 - Natural England - Clarification of value of brownfield land<br/>Representation – 9146 Coal Authority - To ensure remediation of former mineral workings and include reference to and role of Mineral Safeguarding Areas.</p> |



|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j. the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside;</li> <li>k. the distinctiveness, character, townscape and setting of settlements;</li> <li>l. the historic, environmental and cultural features of acknowledged importance;</li> <li>m. the provision of essential services to the public.</li> <li>n. <b>the reduction of waste, the promotion of recycling and the provision of suitable and accessible sites which foster sustainable waste management.</b></li> </ul> <p>Development proposals will be expected to prioritise the reuse or adaptation of existing buildings. Where this is not practicable or is shown to be a less sustainable solution, proposals should seek to reuse existing materials, where possible.</p> <p>Development should utilise previously developed land first (brownfield land), where that land is in a sustainable location <b>and is not of high environmental value</b> in preference to greenfield sites. The use and development of land will be assessed against the community's housing, economic and social requirements. The sustainability and enhancement of the natural and built environment, minimisation of energy consumption and the need to travel will also be key factors. Development that would significantly harm the natural or built environment, or that would generate a significant adverse traffic impact, without appropriate mitigation, will not be permitted.</p> <p><b>Development Proposals will be expected to provide an appropriate remediation strategy that addresses any issues of land contamination or land instability arising from past uses or activities.</b></p> <p><b>Where non-mineral development is proposed within Mineral Safeguarding Areas defined by the Coal Authority, the local planning authority will expect consideration to be afforded to the extraction of the mineral resource prior to development'.</b></p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

|      |  |   |   |
|------|--|---|---|
| M034 | CP3 and CP4  | Amalgamation of two policies and addition of criterion based policy relating to Gypsy and Traveller windfall sites. See Appendix 1  | Inspector Comment / National Traveller Sites Policy Requirement. Removes duplication between CP3 and 4. Gives greater clarity on the use of CP4 and supporting Settlement Development Guidance and 5 year Land Availability Assessment. |
| M035 | CP6 Affordable Housing                             | Policy revision to include sufficient detail from draft SPD to ensure regulatory compliance. See Appendix 2.  | Inspector comment   |
| M036 | CP7: Promoting a Sustainable Economy – Para 4.7.11 | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>Through engagement with key infrastructure providers and consultation the following transport projects are considered to be key to improving sustainable links and local accessibility across the District and support economic performance and growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved access along the Richmond–Catterick Garrison–A1 Corridor (the A6136)</li> <li>• Potential for upgrading the A1 to motorway and a new connection to the Central Richmondshire sub-area</li> <li>• Improved accessibility along the Dales-Leyburn-A1 Corridor (the A684)</li> <li>• Sustainable access improvements to Gallowfields Industrial Estate, Richmond</li> <li>• Development of the Wensleydale Railway.</li> </ul> | A1 Upgrade update   |

|      |                |   |                    |
|------|----------------|---|--------------------|
|      |                | <p><u>After</u><br/>Through engagement with key infrastructure providers and consultation the following transport projects are considered to be key to improving sustainable links and local accessibility across the District and support economic performance and growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved access along the Richmond–Catterick Garrison–A1 Corridor (the A6136)</li> <li>• <b>A1 upgrade to motorway standard including the new Catterick Central junction</b></li> <li>• <b>A684 Bedale bypass improving accessibility along the Dales-Leyburn-A1 Corridor.</b></li> <li>• Sustainable access improvements to Gallowfields Industrial Estate, Richmond</li> <li>• Development of the Wensleydale Railway.</li> </ul>  |                    |
| M037 | CP9 Para 4.9.7 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>To enable the retention of some of this spend and support the achievement of a sustainable rural economy (Spatial Principle SP3) there is a need to provide opportunities for larger format comparison goods stores. The Garrison area provides the District with such opportunities in the Gough Road / Richmondshire Walk / Shute Road / Richmond Road area. It is capable of supporting larger format stores (over 200 m2), particularly for comparison and discount retailers, which are difficult to provide for within the constraints of Richmond. The Garrison town centre currently has an important role for retail and leisure. However, as considered above, it offers significant opportunities to expand on the District’s retail offer which cannot be physically met within the District’s other town centres of Richmond and Leyburn. The role of the Garrison area is therefore to complement the role and function of Richmond and become a vibrant principal town which supplements the existing retail, leisure and commercial offer in the District, enabling the diversion of some of the trade currently being leaked.</p> <p>Footnote - 1based on typical store format/size that could currently be accommodated within Richmond, the Garrison should be seeking to accommodate stores of a size and format which cannot typically be found within Richmond, in order</p> | Update for clarity |

|      |                   |   |   |
|------|-------------------|---|---|
|      |                   | <p>to support the achievement of a complementary role rather than undermining the current role and function of the principal town of Richmond.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/> <b>Opportunities for larger format comparison goods stores are required to help retain some of this leakage and support the achievement of a sustainable rural economy (Spatial Principle SP3). Catterick Garrison town centre provides such opportunities in the Gough Road / Richmondshire Walk / Shute Road / Richmond Road area. These are capable of supporting larger format stores (over 200 m2), particularly for comparison and discount retailers, which are difficult to provide for within the constraints of Richmond and Leyburn. Catterick Garrison Town Centre’s role is therefore to complement Richmond and Leyburn Town Centres and supplement the District’s existing retail, leisure and commercial offer.</b></p>   |   |
| M038 | CP9 Policy Part 2 | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>2. Support will be given to maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of the town centres of Richmond, Catterick Garrison and Leyburn and proposals within these centres for retail and other town centre uses will be supported where either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. development is of a scale appropriate to the role of these centres, provided that development respects the character of the environment, including any special architectural and historic interest and assists in maintaining and/or enhancing its existing function; or</li> <li>b. for developments over 500 m2, it is demonstrated that they will not adversely impact on the role, vitality and viability of the District’s town centres or on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal.</li> </ul> <p><u>After</u></p> <p><b>2a. Support will be given to maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of the town centres of Richmond, Catterick Garrison and</b></p> | Replaces Local Plan policy 83. Definition of Retail and Commercial areas for Richmond, Catterick Garrison and Leyburn in policy and revised policy wording to reflect changes |

|      |                |  |                                |
|------|----------------|--|--------------------------------|
|      |                | <p><b>Leyburn (defined in figure xx). Proposals which help create, protect, retain or enhance retail and other main town centre uses within these centres will be supported where:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. development is of a scale appropriate to the role of these centres, provided that development respects the character of the environment, including any special architectural and historic interest and assists in maintaining and/or enhancing its existing function; or</b></li> <li><b>ii. for developments over 500m<sup>2</sup>, it is demonstrated that they will not adversely impact on the role, vitality and viability of the District's town centres or on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>2b. Proposals involving the loss of retail uses (A1) within the primary shopping frontages of the town centres (defined in figure xx) will only be supported where there is evidence that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. the use is no longer required and is redundant;</b></li> <li><b>ii. it is no longer, or cannot be made viable;</b></li> <li><b>iii. satisfactory alternative provision can be made that outweighs the loss; or;</b></li> <li><b>iv. the loss will not adversely impact upon the vitality and viability of the centre.</b></li> </ul> |                                |
| M039 | CP9 Para 4.9.9 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Town centre boundaries, primary and, where relevant, secondary frontages and the uses appropriate to the frontages will be defined for the centres of Richmond, Catterick Garrison and Leyburn in later planning policy documents, in line with national policy. This will be based on up-to-date surveys and analysis. The primary and secondary frontages for Richmond, identified in Policy 83 of the Richmondshire Local Plan, will be saved for the interim period until replaced by those in the proposed Delivering Development Plan.</p>  | Replaces Local Plan policy 83. |

|      |   |   |   |
|------|---|---|---|
|      |   | <p><u>After</u><br/> <b>NPPF Annex 2 defines the range of Main Town Centre Uses. Town Centre boundaries encompassing these uses and including primary and secondary frontages are defined where relevant for Richmond, Catterick Garrison and Leyburn in Figure xx. The Council will seek to prevent the loss of retail uses(A1) in the primary frontages to maintain the vitality and viability of the centres. The Primary frontage in Catterick Garrison will include units in the proposed Town Centre Development upon its completion.</b></p> |   |
| M040 | <p>CP11<br/> Policy Title<br/> – pg78<br/> Para 4.11.1,<br/> line 10<br/> Policy Title<br/> Policy Part<br/> 1, line 2<br/> Policy Part<br/> 2, line 1<br/> Policy Part<br/> 2d, line 1<br/> Para 4.11.6,<br/> lines 1,3,10</p> | <p>Amend from ‘Community and Recreation Assets’ to ‘Community, <b>Cultural</b> and Recreation Assets’.</p>  | <p>Representation – 4504 - Theatres Trust – Addition of “cultural” to wording to provide greater clarity and reflect national policy wording.</p> |
| M041 | <p>CP11 Para<br/> 4.11.2</p>  | <p>Addition of<br/> <b>Despite this a re-assessment of local sporting facilities (Settlement Facilities Sporting Supplement 2013) using established Sport England methods does not show a deficit in provision. The Settlement Facilities Study will be routinely updated to monitor the change in circumstances of all types of community assets and the extent to which they contribute to local needs.</b></p>   | <p>Representation 9127 - Sport England</p>  |
| M042 | <p>CP11 Para<br/> 4.11.3</p>  | <p>Amend to<br/> ‘Community Assets include village halls or meeting rooms, local shops and post offices, convenience stores, nurseries, care homes, places of worship, public</p>   | <p>Representation – 4504 - Theatres Trust – Addition</p>  |

|      |   |   |            |
|------|---|---|------------|
|      |   | houses, <b>cultural buildings ....</b> '  |            |
| M043 | CP11<br>Community<br>and<br>Recreation<br>Assets –<br>Para 4.11.5 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>New housing must provide sufficient quantity and quality of accessible and safe open space within the site boundary for the enlarged community, unless the Council has approved offsite provision, enhancement or funding in lieu of provision. In addition to the Settlement Facilities Study 2011 the Council has a 2010 sporting facilities audit and indoor activities record of existing play and sport facilities/activities including village halls. The Fields In Trust '<i>Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play</i>' (2008), formerly the National Playing Fields Association "Six Acre Standard", provides minimum national standards for play and recreation space. Until such time as the Council produces new planning policy or guidance setting local standards for open space, the Council will use these documents, together with any other relevant local data available at the time of assessment, including Registers of Local Green Space produced by communities through Local or Neighbourhood Plans under the Localism Act 2011, to guide the assessment of the requirements for open space. New development must also provide safe and attractive areas for the Public Right of Way network, including new links where appropriate.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/>New housing must provide sufficient quantity and quality of accessible and safe open space within the site boundary for the enlarged community, unless the Council has approved offsite provision, enhancement or funding in lieu of provision. <b>In addition to the Settlement Facilities Study 2011 the Council has a 2010 sporting facilities audit and indoor activities record of existing play and sport facilities/activities including village halls.</b> The Fields In Trust '<i>Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play</i>' (2008), formerly the National Playing Fields Association "Six Acre Standard", provides minimum national standards for play and recreation space. Until such time as the Council produces new planning policy or guidance setting local standards for open space, the Council will use these documents, together with <b>any other</b> relevant local data available at the time of</p> | Correction |

|      |                               |   |   |
|------|-------------------------------|---|---|
|      |                               | assessment, including Registers of Local Green Space produced by communities through Local or Neighbourhood Plans under the Localism Act 2011, to guide the assessment of the requirements for open space. New development must also provide safe and attractive areas for the Public Right of Way network, including new links where appropriate.  |   |
| M044 | CP12                          | Policy restructured to provide greater clarity and consistency in presentation. Please see Appendix 3.  | Representations – 2282 – English Heritage, 9117 – Natural England and 5514 – Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| M045 | CP13<br>Design para<br>4.13.3 | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>In addition to the provisions of this policy, all those proposing development will be strongly advised to consult national design policy through the NPPF (Policy 7) and current Government guidance on design matters as well as local community guidelines such as Village Design Statements, Parish Plans, Conservation Area Appraisals and Local and Neighbourhood Plans. In accordance with national policy, the Council will require applicants to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals. The outcomes of this will be expected to be submitted within a Design Statement when making planning applications. This must also show how the proposal's design has evolved and how it responds to the context of its surroundings.</p> <p><u>After</u></p> <p><b>Development proposals should consider prevailing national and local design guidance. This should include where relevant NPPF, Neighbourhood Plans, Supplementary Planning Documents, Village Design Statements and Conservation Area Appraisals. In line with national policy, the Council expects applicants to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals. The outcomes of this will be expected to be submitted within a Design Statement when making planning applications. This must also show how the proposal's design has evolved and how it responds to the context of its surroundings.</b></p> | Replacement of Local Plan Policies 5, 12, 51, 88  |



|      |                    |  |   |
|------|--------------------|--|---|
| M046 | CP13 Policy<br>End | <u>Addition</u><br><b>Development proposals should be supported by a Design Statement.</b> | Replacement of Local Plan Policies<br>5, 12, 51, 88 |
|------|--------------------|--|---|

## **Draft Revision Core Policy CP4: Delivering Development incorporating Core Policy CP3**

- 4.4.1 Core Policy CP4 defines the general extent of development in settlements defined in the Spatial Principles where development and activities will be supported. Core Policy CP4 is essential for the plan's implementation and provides guidance to facilitate development, set a context for Neighbourhood Planning and support the preparation of future detailed land availability policies.
- 4.4.2 There is a continuing impetus to meet needs for development for housing or employment driving the need to identify specific sites. Facing this is a significant period until land availability policies can be updated and adopted. The ability to meet immediate needs, or to make pressing decisions on planning applications, should not be frustrated by the time taken to prepare future detailed policies. Therefore flexibility is needed until this is produced and adopted.
- 4.4.3 The Local Plan Core Strategy establishes the strategic principles to guide change in the plan area. Spatial Principle SP2 sets out a settlement hierarchy for the plan area and explains its justification. This gives a framework for more detailed decision making about service provision and new development reflecting roles in the hierarchy. Spatial principle SP3 recognises that the large rural area outside of the settlement hierarchy is also a living and working environment containing many villages where appropriate development will be required. Spatial Principle SP4 indicates the broad distribution for new housing in the settlement hierarchy and elsewhere in the countryside. Most new homes will be concentrated in the Principal Towns of Richmond and Catterick Garrison and the Local Service Centre at Leyburn, followed by the Primary Service Villages, the Secondary Service Villages and then elsewhere in the smallest settlements.
- 4.4.4 Settlement Development Limits were established in the Richmondshire Local Plan (1999-2006) Policy 23 and defined on the Proposals Map for most settlements, down to the very small villages, but excluded the Catterick Garrison Administrative Area. The defined boundaries sought to manage the expansion of settlements into the surrounding countryside, taking account of prevailing development needs and opportunities. They sought to ensure new development is sympathetic in scale and location to the form and character of the settlement, does not conflict with environmental and other policies and respects local infrastructure and facilities capacity. These aims remain important, but the Settlement Development Limits are fast becoming out of date and there is now increasingly limited opportunity for new development in many settlements.

- 4.4.5 The Settlement Development Limits should be reviewed to guide the location of future development to 2028. This is a time consuming task and pending their formal review the strategic approach needs to allow for ongoing growth to support local services and ensure community sustainability and wellbeing. Core Policy CP4 therefore refers to areas adjacent to Settlement Development Limits and main built-up confines until the Richmondshire Local Plan (1999-2006) Policy 23 designations on the Proposals Map are superseded. This is expected to be undertaken through the Delivering Development Plan or future revisions to the Local Plan.
- 4.4.6 The scope for development adjacent to the settlement edge depends on the application of other policies and in particular Core Policies CP1, CP3, CP4, CP8, CP12 and CP14. In all cases, development proposals must respect the scale, form and character of the settlement and its service and infrastructure provision. The settlement's position in the hierarchy and the scale of housing development established in Spatial Principle SP4 will be particularly important factors guiding the scale of development in individual settlements. The scope for development and activities in the higher order settlements will be greater than in those further down the hierarchy and will be limited in the smaller settlements.
- 4.4.7 The criteria in Core Policy CP4 guide decision making by addressing location issues including infrastructure availability, local environmental impact and any settlement and area specific guidance. Location criteria seek to ensure that development is well-related to an existing settlement and priority should be given to sites within Settlement Development Limits or main built-up confines first, where such developable opportunities still exist. They also seek that existing infrastructure either has capacity, or extra capacity or facilities will be provided, in accordance with Core Policy CP14. Environmental criteria ensure that locally important matters, such as open spaces or flooding risks, are taken into account in accordance with Core Policies CP2, CP11 and CP12. Cross reference is made to the broad locational guidance included in the Sub Area Strategies (Chapter 3) for specific settlements where significant change or pressures for change are anticipated.
- 4.4.8 Neighbourhood level planning and local ownership of decisions will require specific support and encouragement. This needs clear guidance which links the area-wide development plan to support community planning initiatives, wherever they may come forward, and encourage development and change, consistent and complementary with its wider context. Settlement Development Guidance will be produced to provide detailed Local Plan assessments of each settlement. These would provide an initial step towards Neighbourhood Planning for those communities wishing to establish locally detailed policies.

## **Core Policy CP4: Delivering Development**

**Development or activities of a scale and nature appropriate to secure the sustainability of each settlement in the hierarchy defined in Spatial Principle SP2 and elsewhere through Spatial Principle SP3 will be supported taking account of the following:**

### **1. Proposals should reflect and deliver:**

- a. the strategy for the future development of the plan area, in particular in terms of the scale and distribution of development defined by Spatial Principles SP4 and SP5;**
- b. an effective response to Climate Change in accordance with Core Policy CP2 and sustainable development in accordance with Core Policy CP3, and consistent with national planning policy relating to the achievement of sustainable development and communities;**
- c. the settlement or location specific guidance contained in the Sub Area Strategies and supplementary guidance**
- d. development which provides for the social and economic needs of the local community;**
- e. development that is proportionate to the existing settlement size, local service provision;**
- f. the expressed preferences of the local community about the type, form and location of development in each settlement, advanced through Neighbourhood Planning processes;**
- g. any future planning policy documents, including masterplans concerning detailed matters relating to the layout, design or other aspects of the development.**

### **2. The location of any development proposal should be:**

- a. consistent with the Delivering Development Plan or revised Local Plan land availability policies once published. Pending the Delivering Development Plan or revisions to Local Plan land availability policies, in, or if deliverable opportunities do not exist within, adjacent to the settlement's Development Limits as defined on the Local Plan 1999-2006 Proposals Map or main built-up confines where they do not exist;**
- b. in all cases:**
  - i accessible and well related to existing facilities;**
  - ii within the capacity of existing infrastructure, or it can be demonstrated that necessary additional infrastructure will be provided.**

- 3. Development should be consistent with the requirements of Core Policies CP11 and CP12, and should not:**
- a. impact adversely on the character of the settlement or its setting, important open spaces and views; designated and undesignated heritage assets and the character of the landscape;**
  - b. lead to the loss of, or adverse impact on, important nature conservation, biodiversity or geodiversity sites;**
  - c. result in the unacceptable loss of locally important open spaces or community facilities;**
  - d. be located in areas of flood risk or contribute to flood risk elsewhere;**
  - e. cause significant adverse impact on amenity or highway safety.**

4.4.9 The Council's updated Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (October 2013) shows that there is high vacancy rate on local sites and no expected demand for this available capacity. Planning Policy for Travellers Sites (CLG, March 2012) requires a criterion based policy to assess applications for other private sites. This approach to the release of sites is analogous to that for general development set out in Core Policy CP4, which therefore supports this purpose through Core Policy CP4a.

**Core Policy CP4a : Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.**

**Provision will be made for travelling groups at the existing site of Lime Kiln Wood at Catterick Village. Where required, additional sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling showpeople, which are appropriate to provide a safe and healthy environment for residents will be considered in accordance with CP4 1a-3e. Preference will be given firstly to locations within and then adjacent to existing settlements, and then to the re-use of brownfield land in other locations.**

## **Draft Revision to Core Policy CP6: Providing Affordable Housing**

- 4.6.1 The provision of more affordable housing to meet local needs is a key objective of the Council and Government. Core Policy CP6 sets out the threshold at which affordable housing will be required and what proportion of development should be affordable. Development conditions vary from site to site and this policy ensures that affordable housing provision is subject to thorough economic viability assessment. Most affordable homes will be provided through the strategic scale and distribution of housing planned in Spatial Principle SP4. This places affordable homes directly in relation to local service provision. This approach may not address all needs that may arise in this rural area and provision is made for the exceptional development of affordable homes where permission may not normally be granted.
- 4.6.2 The North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NYSHMA, 2011) confirmed the high level of local housing need and the severe problems of local affordability. It found that Richmondshire has experienced a rise in average house prices since 2000 peaking, in line with wider markets, at a high of £228,700 in 2007/08. The income required to purchase a lower quartile house, based on a 3.5 times multiplier of household income is £41,429. However, in the current market many lending institutions require that mortgage repayments should be less than 20% of household income. Therefore, the income level required to purchase a lower quartile property would be £58,495. This provides a stark illustration of the affordability issue in the plan area where the average median gross household income is just less than £23,000 pa. Lower quartile house prices do show some variation across the three sub areas (£123,488 in Central Richmondshire, £170,000 in Lower Wensleydale and £179,000 in North Richmondshire) although median gross household incomes remain reasonably similar. Therefore, the affordability ratio between median gross household income and a lower quartile house in the Central area is in excess of five times income which extends to over eight times in North Richmondshire.
- 4.6.3 Spatial Principle SP4 sets out the scale and distribution of housing across the plan area, providing the spatial distribution of the proposed 180 dwellings per year build rate. It is through this pattern of development that most affordable homes will be delivered. The SHMA (2011) evidence indicates that there is a gross annual affordable housing need of approximately 249 dwellings per annum over the next five years in order to both clear the existing backlog and meet future household need. It is unlikely that new development will ever meet this level demand for affordable housing, which would in theory require a substantially higher housing target to deliver it. This figure does include all households indicating that their homes did not meet their current needs, but a number of these could address the issues

identified without the need for a new home. This includes homes where adaptations would be needed and households seeking homes in other areas, for example. This level of demand is also not apparent from the parish level housing needs surveys. Although the SHMA does need to be read with care, it remains more important than ever to set the most ambitious affordable housing targets possible, whilst maintaining the viability of local development

4.6.4 The Richmondshire Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA, 2011) examined the impact of differing percentages of affordable housing on a range of sites across the plan area. In particular it considered an appropriate target and threshold in the light of the varying local market and land supply conditions. It recommended general affordable housing targets of 30% in North Richmondshire and 40% in central Richmondshire and Lower Wensleydale as viable to maximise delivery across the three sub areas. The following table demonstrates the proportion of proposed development in each sub area compared to the 'gross annual housing need' identified in the SHMA. It can be seen that affordable housing need outstrips proposed delivery across all sub areas.

**Table 5: Annual Housing Delivery and Need**

| Sub Area                     | Proposed Housing Delivery (pa) |            |            | Housing Need (pa) |            |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
|                              | Market                         |            | Affordable | %                 | No.        |
|                              | %                              | No.        |            |                   |            |
| <b>Central Richmondshire</b> | 79                             | 142        | @40% = 57  | 72                | 180        |
| Catterick                    | (62)                           | (112)      |            |                   |            |
| Garrison                     | (8)                            | (14)       |            |                   |            |
| Richmond                     | (9)                            | (16)       |            |                   |            |
| Elsewhere                    |                                |            |            |                   |            |
| <b>Lower Wensleydale</b>     | 12                             | 22         | @40% = 9   | 21                | 51         |
| <b>North Richmondshire</b>   | 9                              | 16         | @30% = 5   | 7                 | 18         |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>100</b>                     | <b>180</b> | <b>71</b>  | <b>100</b>        | <b>249</b> |

4.6.5 The AHVA did not find any evidence to suggest that a lower site size threshold would affect viability or hold sites back. It found that smaller sites can generate 'exclusivity' and hence produce higher land values. During the seven year period 2004 – 2011, some 23% of planning permissions granted were on sites for single dwellings, with an average of 57 per annum. The majority of these were in the villages and smaller settlements and a relatively high proportion were in the higher value Council Tax bands. The Council will therefore seek contributions from all housing developments regardless of size, in order to maximise the provision of affordable housing and in effect set the threshold at a single dwelling net gain.

- 4.6.6 It is most practical to deliver affordable homes on-site in larger developments. The overall sizes, types and tenures of dwellings, both market and affordable, will be negotiated and determined on a site by site basis with regard to the most up-to-date evidence on local housing need and demand in accordance with Core Policy CP5. Commuted sum contributions will also be considered when, for example sites are small and contributions would not provide a complete home. The Council expects to pool any commuted sums received to be used in support of furthering affordable housing provision across the district. Single dwellings that are built to meet an affordable housing need will not make a contribution so long as that home is retained as an affordable home in perpetuity. This enables landowners to provide local small scale housing for family members or employees on their land, subject to its suitability for development.
- 4.6.7 Local Needs Housing schemes assist to deliver housing which cannot be provided by the market and play an important role in sustaining the rural economy by providing the opportunity for local people to live and work in the same rural community. They are restricted to 100% affordable housing in perpetuity and, in most cases, their construction is subsidised through grant funding and below market land costs on sites that would not normally be granted planning permission. Such exceptional development is additional to the direct delivery of affordable housing through the development strategy. Detailed land availability policies, which would deliver the flexible approach to land supply expected by NPPF (2012), following the adoption of this Core Strategy will enable exceptions to be defined for SP2 settlements. Outside of this, exceptions will be identified when development targets have been met or commitments are failing to deliver. The criteria to be used in the selection of appropriate Local Needs Housing sites will be CP4 1b-3e, this will ensure that these sites respect their proposed settings and reflect the local capacity for this additional development.
- 4.6.8 Local Needs Housing Schemes are provided for eligible occupiers who have a 'local connection' to the settlement in which the homes are built, as their main or principal residence and have a need to reside there because they are:
- I existing residents of the relevant parish establishing a separate household; or
  - ii a head of household who or whose partner is in or is taking up permanent employment in an already established business within the relevant parish; or
  - iii householders currently living permanently in a dwelling which is either shared but not self contained, overcrowded or is otherwise unsatisfactory by environmental health standards and which is within the relevant parish; or



- iv persons having to leave tied accommodation within the relevant parish; or
- v persons currently living in accommodation which is temporary or occupied on insecure terms, or
- vi persons having a medical need for alternative accommodation; or
- vii former residents of the relevant parish with immediate relatives in the parish accepted in writing by the Council as having an exceptional need to return to the area

Categories set out in paragraphs (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi) above will apply only to persons who have resided or worked permanently in the relevant parish for the preceding three years. Housing provided through the Policy should be offered in the first instance to those who meet the local connection criteria relating to the Parish within which the need has been identified. If, no eligible occupier can be found within the Parish then those who meet the local connection criteria in the immediate neighbouring Parishes will be eligible. If no one here is available, then a third priority area would then become valid, embracing all Parishes, including those which fall within the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

4.6.9 The NPPF suggests that 'local planning authorities should in particular consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs'. Examples of such circumstances may include: where no grant is available; or, where a reduced grant rate and/or abnormal site development costs render the proposed scheme economically unviable. Cross-subsidy may be permitted where:

- i A parish housing needs survey has identified a housing need; and, a suitable site has been found but HCA grant would not be available for a minimum of two years; or,
- ii A reduced grant rate and/or abnormal site conditions make a 100% affordable housing scheme economically unviable; or,
- iii The applicant is a Community Land Trust as defined in The Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 or any successor legislation.

The maximum number of open market dwellings permitted will be the minimum required to subsidise the development of the affordable housing. The Council will expect an 'open-book' approach to any application to cross-subsidise on an exception site and will not accept

any land valuations which exceed comparable financial transactions in the Plan area.

4.6.10 An Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will support the delivery of Policy CP6 by providing detailed guidance regarding the implementation of the policy. The areas within the policy that the SPD provides further explanation and guidance on are:

- Calculating commuted payments
- Market Housing cross-subsidy
- Building your own affordable home/ Single plot exception sites
- Transfer Prices
- Safeguarding Affordable Housing
- Exempt Accommodation
- Application Negotiations
- Financial Viability

### **Core Policy CP6: Providing Affordable Housing**

**The Council will work with private developers and registered providers to achieve the following targets for affordable housing in all developments with a net gain in dwellings, subject to economic viability assessment:**

**Central Richmondshire and Lower Wensleydale.....40%**

**North Richmondshire Sub Area.....30%**

**In general, the affordable housing contribution will be met on site. Commuted sums in lieu of on-site provision will be considered where some or all of the contribution would not provide for a complete home. Commuted sums may be considered where they enable the Council to achieve greater affordable housing benefits than on-site.**

**The affordable housing contribution will be waived on small scale schemes whose purpose is to meet a proven local affordable housing need. Where the contribution is waived the dwellings must remain affordable in perpetuity. The contribution will be payable should the dwellings be sold on the open market.**

**Small scale Local Needs Housing Schemes may be permitted on suitable sites where development would not normally be permitted. These schemes must meet a proven local affordable housing need and the dwellings must remain affordable in perpetuity. Their suitability for development will be assessed through Core Policy CP4 1b – 3e. The Council may accept an element of on-site market housing to help subsidise the delivery of the affordable homes.**

## **Draft Revision to Core Policy CP12: Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets**

- 4.12.1 As the Strategic Objectives indicate, conserving and where possible enhancing the very high quality of the plan area's environmental and historic assets must be major concerns of the plan. The quality and diversity of these assets – whether the landscape, rural heritage and culture, built heritage, green infrastructure or biodiversity – are what makes the plan area truly distinctive, and essential aspects help to determine the quality of life in this part of the country. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.
- 4.12.2 The plan area's environmental and historic assets are very diverse. The environmental assets are set out within Chapter 2 of this Local Plan Core Strategy document. The plan area contains a large number of archaeological sites - over 1,200 recorded sites being within the North Yorkshire Historic Environmental Record (HER). There are 41 designated Conservation Areas, and over 1,200 listed buildings and structures. In addition to formally recognised built heritage, there are many other undesignated buildings or features of genuine quality which enrich the urban and rural environments, contributing to the special character of the plan area, such as the archaeologically sensitive historic cores of both Richmond and Middleham.
- 4.12.3 There is a strong policy context for the development of the plan's approach to these assets. Current national guidance provides the context for conserving and enhancing our environmental and historic assets. The role of the development plan is to provide local interpretation and definition of how our distinct local assets should be conserved and enhanced.
- 4.12.4 The NPPF requires the Council to set out within its Local Plan, a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. Richmondshire's strategy for the historic environment is to support development and measures which conserve and enhance our environmental and historic assets; to reject detrimental developments and activities; to secure mitigation or compensation/recording measures where appropriate; to provide support for green infrastructure; and to show how details of this approach are to be addressed in the future.
- 4.12.5 It is the intention of the Local Authority to produce a separate Heritage Strategy, which will set the priorities for management of the plan area's historic environment. This will include the production of a 'Buildings at Risk' Register and a Local List of non-designated

heritage assets as well as work with English Heritage to revise and update the National Heritage List for England.

- 4.12.6 Green infrastructure is an important element of sustainable communities and although in some ways more relevant to urban areas, it also relates to the rural environment. Establishing the strategic and locally important elements of the plan area's rich green infrastructure will be an important responsibility of the plan. Green infrastructure works at different levels so that in the wider countryside it is often viewed at a larger scale, encompassing large country estates or parks, extensive habitats, major landscape features such as river corridors and flood meadows, landscapes, along with the identification of wide green corridors and ecological networks.
- 4.12.7 The strategic green infrastructure corridors identified by Natural England within the plan area are along the River Ure; the Swale Valley; the Tees Valley; the Skeeby – Newsham corridor; the Ravensworth – Forcett – Cliffe corridor; the Scorton – Croft corridor and the Catterick Village – Leyburn corridor.
- 4.12.8 The urban area of Catterick Garrison is particularly notable for its green infrastructure which is made up of corridors of open spaces, recreation areas and trees which flow through the urban area, whilst in the urban area of Richmond, The Batts and Round Howe to the west of the town are particularly important.
- 4.12.9 Within the small areas of the Nidderdale and the North Pennines AONBs, development which would be inconsistent with the purpose of this policy will not be acceptable unless clear evidence is brought forward to show that it needs to be located in the AONB because of a lack of suitable sites elsewhere. Any new development will be expected to attain the highest standards of design in accordance with Core Policy CP13.
- 4.12.10 When considering matters affecting landscape assets, particular regard will be given to the following key landscapes:
- gritstone high plateaus
  - vale fringes
  - vale farmland with dispersed settlements
  - settled vale farmland
  - limestone dales
  - river floodplains
- 4.12.11 The approach will take account of Natural England's Joint Character Areas; the North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation Project; and more detailed local landscape character and enhancement. The Core Strategy is designed to provide a strategic policy framework with further detail and site specific matters to be addressed in the forthcoming Delivering Development Plan. That

document will contain detailed policies and proposals maps for the various components of the local ecological network, including opportunities for habitat restoration and creation.

4.12.12 Prior to preparation of the Delivering Development Plan, when considering matters affecting biodiversity and geodiversity assets, particular regard will be given to the following key sites, habitats and species commensurate with their status and giving appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks :

Internationally Designated Sites

- European Natura 2000 sites of the North Pennines Dales Meadows Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the North Pennine Moors Special Protection Area (SPA) & SAC

Nationally Designated Sites

- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Locally Designated Sites

- local Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- the Foxglove Covert Local Nature Reserve

Locally Important Sites, Habitats and Species

- the Tees, Swale and Ure river corridors
- the upland areas of Kexwith Moor, Holgate Moor, Holgate Pasture, Hurst Moor, Marrick Moor, Redmire Moor, Preston Moor, Stainton Moor and Bellerby Moor
- the network of nature conservation resources including ancient and broadleaved woodland, semi-improved grassland, flushes and marshy grassland, ponds and open water, hedgerows, cliffs and rock faces
- priority habitats – woodland, lowland wood pasture, parkland and veteran trees, upland hay meadow, flood plain grassland, upland calcareous grassland, species rich grassland, upland heathland and blanket bog, moorland edge, fen, reedbed, flowing water and standing water
- priority species – otter, water vole, bats, black grouse and curlew.

4.12.13 The integrity of Natura 2000 sites shall be maintained and protected in accordance with their statutory protection. Development or other initiatives that have the potential to adversely affect the integrity of these sites, either in isolation or in combination with other development, plans or strategies, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect such sites can be fully met. This applies to proposed development and initiatives within and outside of the boundaries of the designated Natura 2000 sites. The impact of development and initiatives on the

integrity of Natura 2000 sites up to 20km outside of the plan area should be equally considered.

4.12.14 The Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) for Richmondshire was prepared in 2005. It provides a great deal of detailed information which is important in terms of developing the plan's approach to our environmental assets. In particular, it places an emphasis on 'priority habitats' such as lowland wood pasture and on 'priority species' such as the Curlew). Within the BAP there are individual action plans for twelve types of habitat and for five priority species. Reference should also be made to the regional Biodiversity Opportunity Areas Map when considering cross boundary issues of biodiversity importance.

4.12.15 There will be opportunity as part of new developments to enhance sustainable access to the towns and countryside in the form walking, cycling and riding routes. Focussing on this can contribute to the health and wellbeing of residents, drive tourism through improved access to surrounding countryside and link people by sustainable means to important goods and services in principal towns.

4.12.16 When considering matters affecting historic assets, particular regard will be given to the following list and also to any SPD covering such issues:

- those elements which contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of Richmondshire's Conservation Areas and their settings as identified in the respective Conservation Area Appraisal;
- the later prehistoric heritage of the plan area such as Stanwick Fortifications and Scots Dyke;
- the Roman forts and civilian settlements at Cataractonium and along the line of Dere Street;
- other recorded sites of archaeological importance across the plan area but especially the archaeologically sensitive areas in and around the historic cores of Richmond and Middleham;
- the medieval heritage including the network of impressive fortifications such as Middleham and Richmond Castles, monastic houses such as Jervaulx Abbey and abandoned settlements and field-systems including Walburn Hall;
- buildings and structures included on the National Heritage List for England;
- opportunities to secure a sustainable future for assets on English Heritage's Heritage at Risk Register or which may be included on a Local At Risk Register;
- undesignated heritage assets which contribute to the overall character of the area;
- the character of Market Towns, including their grain, plot layouts and passageways

- historic shop fronts in Richmond, Middleham and Leyburn as well as some villages;
- locally important boundary walls, hedges or railings, historic passageways and yards, important trees and tree groups, pinfolds, troughs, pumps, mounting blocks, pillar boxes, K6 telephone kiosks, orchards and historic plot layouts;
- historic public viewpoints from Richmond Castle Keep; Castle Walk, Richmond; Frenchgate Head, Richmond; Maison Dieu, Richmond; the Grandstand on Richmond's former Racecourse; Sleegill, south of Richmond; Middleham Castle Keep; and The Shawl, Leyburn;
- sites designated by English Heritage as Registered Parks and Gardens at Aske Hall, Constable Burton Hall, Forcett Hall, St. Nicholas, the Temple Lodge Grounds and Middleton Lodge;
- the landscape, buildings and other structures associated with local country estates including Croft Hall and Halnaby, Barningham Estate, Cliffe Hall, Bolton Estate, East Witton Estate and Hornby Castle.

## **Core Policy CP12: Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets**

**Development or other initiatives will be supported where they conserve and enhance the significance of the plan area's natural and man-made, designated or undesignated assets. Development will not be supported which:**

- a. has a detrimental impact upon the significance of a natural or man-made asset;**
- b. is inconsistent with the principles of an asset's proper management.**

### **Environmental Assets**

- 1. Where avoidance of adverse impacts is not possible, necessary mitigation must be provided to address potential harmful implications of development. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures will be required. This approach will apply to specific assets as follows:**
  - a. within the Nidderdale and the North Pennines Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which cover parts of East Witton and Muker Parishes respectively, priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape;**
  - b. the landscape character of the plan area will be maintained, enhanced and, where appropriate, restored to secure a sustainable future for the natural and historic environment;**
  - c. the biodiversity and geodiversity of the plan area will be maintained, enhanced and, where appropriate, restored to achieve a net gain for nature and ensure a sustainable future for the natural environment in support of the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Biodiversity Strategy, the North Yorkshire Biodiversity Action Plan and the Richmondshire Biodiversity Action Plan. Particular support will be given to initiatives to improve the natural environment where it is poor and lacking in diversity;**
  - d. the green infrastructure network of the plan area and its value for biodiversity will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced to provide a high quality, accessible, diverse and well-connected network of green space to meet the needs of the community, businesses and visitors. The key green infrastructure network includes:**



- i playing fields, outdoor sports facilities, play parks and amenity green space;**
- ii the Coast to Coast walk and views from it;**
- iii corridors of green space, recreation areas and trees which flow through urban areas (particularly Catterick Garrison and Leyburn);**
- iv the gap between the settlements of Leyburn and Harmby, and Colburn and Hipswell;**
- v village greens and common land;**
- vi allotments, cemeteries, churchyards and civic spaces;**
- vii woodlands, scrubland, grassland, wetland, running water, wasteland, open land and parks and gardens, river banks, cycle ways and the Public Rights of Way network;**
- viii sites important for biodiversity and geodiversity referred to at Paragraph 4.12.12.**

#### **Historic Assets**

- 1. Those elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage assets across the Plan area will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced. Particular attention will be paid to those assets referred to in Paragraph 4.12.16 which make a particularly important contribution to the character and sense of place of Richmondshire.**
- 2. Where a proposal is likely to result in harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset and there are compelling reasons for allowing that development, opportunities will be sought to offset this harm by ensuring that other elements which contribute to the significance of that particular asset are enhanced or their significance better revealed.**
- 3. Consideration of development proposals will also need to take into account the objective of securing the long term existence of the heritage asset. This is particularly the case for those assets which have been identified as being at risk. Enabling development may be considered acceptable in the particular location (site or buildings), where all other alternatives have been explored, and the development or use proposed is the only practical means of securing the future conservation of a heritage asset.**

Chapter 5: Implementation & Delivery

| Mod Ref No | Chapter 5             | Modification  | Comment   |
|------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| M047       | Chapter 5<br>Para 5.5 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>The plan or specific elements of it will be formally reviewed periodically and to see if it is leading to outcomes significantly different from those intended. Contingency arrangements are considered to be unnecessary in most of this rural area, where significant change is not expected. The exception to this is Catterick Garrison where major change is expected, but is complicated by the uncertainty surrounding the scale and timing of future military-related development. Alternative strategies are suggested to respond to different timings and scales of change, while maintaining the intended direction.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/><b>The plan or specific elements of it will be formally reviewed every 5 years from its start date of April 2012 to ensure that it stays on course and remains responsive to local and wider conditions. In these reviews adjustments to the scale and direction of development will be considered in the light of development progress, land availability assessment and market conditions. Contingency arrangements are considered to be unnecessary in most of this rural area, where significant change is not expected. The exception to this is Catterick Garrison where the scale and timing of any future military-related development will be affected by successive national Defence and Security Reviews, but the timing of the 5 year review cycle means that the strategy will remain alert to military policy. <del>Alternative strategies are suggested to respond to different timings and scales of change, while maintaining the intended direction.</del></b></p> | Inclusion of 5 year plan review cycle to clarify practical expectations for Local Plan Review |

|      |                          |   |                   |
|------|--------------------------|---|-------------------|
| M048 | Chapter 5 –<br>Para 5.12 | <p><u>Before</u></p> <p>The Highways Agency (HA) raised no specific existing capacity issues affecting the strategic road network (SRN) (A1 and A66) in the plan area, in response to Local Plan Core Strategy consultation. The HA did raise general concerns about the potential impact of the scale of development on the SRN including development around Scotch Corner. The impact of growth on the strategic road network has been modelled and assessed in co-operation with the HA to ensure that it does not raise any capacity or safety issues related to the A1 route through the District, which could limit the amount of development in this area. The cancellation of the A1 upgrade through the area removes the potential for major junction improvements near Catterick Village and its impact has been accounted for in the infrastructure requirements identified along the A6136. However, it is considered that development will help to mitigate any impact. Further discussions with the HA regarding the impact of specific sites and broader locations on the SRN, and how these could be mitigated, will continue and any issues will be addressed through development and developer contributions to local highway improvements.</p> <p><u>After</u></p> <p><b>The A1 upgrade to motorway standard from Leeming Bar to Barton is expected to be complete by 2017. The design of the upgrade has been modelled to reflect the development growth contained within this Core Strategy. The creation of a new Catterick Central junction will significantly improve access not only to the main growth areas at Catterick Garrison but also to the wider district. This significantly improves local prospects for local economic growth, which is recognised by the Local Enterprise Partnership’s recognition that Catterick Garrison has great potential for growth.</b></p> | A1 Upgrade update |
|------|--------------------------|---|-------------------|

|      |                          |   |   |
|------|--------------------------|---|---|
| M049 | Chapter 5 –<br>Para 5.15 | <p><u>Before</u><br/>Yorkshire Water has also indicated that there is sufficient existing waste water treatment capacity to accommodate existing sites with planning permission. However, development on the scale proposed in the Local Plan Core Strategy would be restricted due to limited existing capacity at the larger Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) at Richmond and Colburn in particular. Further strategic development proposals will require new investment in the water infrastructure, possibly resulting in a completely new WWTW facility to serve Richmond and Catterick Garrison. The development of specific sites will need to be coordinated with Yorkshire Water’s future Asset Management Plan 6 (AMP6) covering the period 2015-2020, to ensure funding for improvements is available. Leyburn WWTW should be able to accommodate the level of growth proposed in the Local Plan Core Strategy, subject to some local improvements to mitigate any adverse impacts on existing development. However, any substantial growth in the smaller settlements could raise waste water treatment capacity issues in these settlements.</p> <p><u>After</u><br/><b>Yorkshire Water has also indicated that there is sufficient existing waste water treatment capacity to accommodate the scale of development expected over the first 5 years of the plan. Longer term development would be restricted due to limited existing capacity at the larger Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) at Richmond and Colburn in particular. New investment is required in the water infrastructure, possibly resulting in a completely new WWTW facility to serve Richmond and Catterick Garrison. The development of specific sites will need to managed in line with the resolution of these capacity issues. Yorkshire Water’s future Asset Management Plan 6 (AMP6) covering the period 2015-2020, to ensure funding for improvements is available is expected to address these issues. Leyburn WWTW has the capacity to</b></p> | Change reflecting ongoing discussions with YW |
|------|--------------------------|---|---|

|      |                          |   |  |
|------|--------------------------|---|--|
|      |                          | <b>accommodate the proposed level of growth, subject to some local improvements to mitigate any adverse impacts on existing development. Substantial growth in the smaller settlements could raise waste water treatment capacity issues in these settlements.</b>  |  |
| M050 | Chapter 5 –<br>Para 5.21 | The rural nature and pattern of development in the plan area restricts local capacity for renewable energy provision. Core Policy <b>CP2</b> seeks to maximise the plan area’s renewable energy potential within its highly sensitive environmental constraints guided by the Richmondshire Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Capacity Study. Development within the Catterick Garrison and Leyburn strategic growth areas and on medium to large scale sites elsewhere is expected to provide infrastructure for combined heat and power or district heating networks where viable and feasible. Core Policy <b>CP2</b> requires all new housing developments and also commercial developments exceeding <b>1,000m<sup>2</sup></b> to minimise carbon emissions and incorporate on site renewable energy technologies. | Correction and update to reflect renumbering of CP1 to CP2 |
| M051 | IDP Table –<br>Point 4   | <u>A6136 Improvements</u><br><br>£1.4M<br>Delivery Partners : RDC and NYCC<br>Funding Sources : Developer contributions and Local Growth Fund<br>Timescale : 2015 – 2021<br><br><u>A1 Upgrade</u><br>Timescale 2014 - 2017  | A1 upgrade and funding changes                             |

|      |   |  |  |
|------|---|--|--|
| M052 | Annex 1:<br>Richmondshire Local<br>Plan –<br>Superseded<br>Policies,<br>Pg105 | <p>Addition of further superseded Local Plan 99/06 Saved Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 – Design in the Countryside</li> <li>8 – Landscape Zones</li> <li>9 – Brompton on Swale Riverside Protection Area</li> <li>12 – Traditional Barns and Barns Groups</li> <li>51- Historic Shop Fronts</li> <li>58 – Richmond: Residential Streets adjoining the Town Centre</li> <li>69 – Scorton Lakes</li> <li>83 – Richmond: Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages</li> <li>88 – Signs and Advertisements in Town Centres and on Commercial Premises Elsewhere</li> </ul> | To reflect replacement and incorporation of policies within Core Strategy contained in preceding modifications or simply superseded. |
|------|---|--|--|