

AGENDA

Page No

6. LOCAL PLAN PUBLICATION CONSULTATION

1 - 340

This report seeks approval of the Hambleton Local Plan: Publication Draft and Policies Map, attached at Annex 1 and 2 of the report, for formal publication, representations and submission to the Secretary of State for public examination. It also seeks approval for publication of the Local Development Scheme.

In accepting the recommendations, Cabinet will approve and recommend to Council that the Hambleton Local Development Scheme is published; the Hambleton Local Plan: Publication Draft as attached at Annex 1 and the Policies Map at Annex 2 of the report are approved for the purpose of publication for representations to be made commencing on or around the 23rd July 2019; the Sustainability Appraisal and Infrastructure Delivery Plan are published for consultation; the Director of Planning and Economy be authorised to make minor amendments and graphical improvements that (taken together) do not materially affect the policies set out in the Local Plan prior to publication; in the event of modifications being required to the Hambleton Local Plan: Publication Draft or supporting documentation prior to its submission, the Director of Economy and Planning in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economy and Planning be authorised to make these changes and undertake any necessary pre-submission consultation; and following the period of representation the Hambleton Local Plan: Publication Draft and Policies Map, proposed minor modifications and all relevant documentation is submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination by an independent planning inspector.

This page is intentionally left blank

Consultation Statement

Hambleton Local Plan

Publication Draft

July 2019

1	Introduction	3
	Purpose of Consultation Statement	3
	Statement of Community Involvement	4
	Key Stages of Local Plan Production	4
2	Pre-Issues and Options	6
	Local Plan partial review	6
	Scoping of key issues for new Local Plan	6
	Duty to cooperate meetings	7
3	Call for Sites	18
	Introduction	18
	Site assessment methodology	18
	Key stages of the site assessment process	18
	Approach to consultation	19
	The Response	19
4	Duty to Cooperate	20
	Forums for duty to cooperate	20
	Member to member duty to cooperate workshops	21
	Duty to Cooperate Statement and Statement of Common Ground	22
5	Issues & Options	23
	Sustainability Scoping Report	23
	Approach to consultation	23
	Consultation events	24
	The Response	25
	Issues raised at public consultation events	25
	Issues raised at parish council meetings	31
	Summary of key issues from public events and parish council meetings	37
	Response to the consultation documents	39
	Summary of key issues from the consultation documents	52
	Addressing issues raised	54

6	Preferred Options	55
	Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment	55
	Approach to consultation	60
	Consultation events	67
	The Response	68
	Issues raised at parish council meetings	68
	Summary of key issues from parish council meetings	71
	Response to the consultation documents	72
	Part 1 - Policies, Vision & Objectives	72
	Summary of key issues from the consultation documents	85
	Part 2 - Potential Development Sites	91
	Addressing issues raised	296
7	Alternative Sites and Local Green Space Designation	297
	Approach to consultation	297
	The Response	297
	Bedale area	298
	Easingwold area	309
	Northallerton area	319
	Stokesley area	322
	Thirsk area	330
	Addressing issues raised	335
8	Publication of the Local Plan	336
	Introduction	336
	Soundness	336
	Legal compliance	336
	Submission	337

1 Introduction

Purpose of Consultation Statement

- 1.1** The Hambleton Local Plan will replace the suite of documents which currently comprise the Hambleton Local Development Framework (LDF), Core Strategy (2008), Development Policies (2008) and Allocations (2010). Once adopted it will become the Development Plan for Hambleton and will be used in the determination of all planning applications. The Local Plan will include planning policies and land allocations that will guide the development and use of land in Hambleton up to 2035.
- 1.2** This Consultation Statement complies with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) 'Influencing the Local Plan and Planning Policy' adopted by the Council in July 2013.
- 1.3** Regulation 18 of the 2012 Regulations requires the local planning authority to:
 - i. notify relevant organisations or individuals about the intention to prepare a plan,
 - ii. invite comments on what the plan should contain.
- 1.4** This Consultation Statement sets out how the Council has undertaken public and stakeholder engagement in preparing the Local Plan. The Council recognises the importance of engaging with the local community from the outset of the Local Plan process and this document provides an overview of the following:
 - Who was invited to make representations;
 - How they were invited to do so;
 - A summary of the main issues raised; and
 - How these issues have been addressed in the Local Plan.
- 1.5** Regulation 22(c) of the 2012 Regulations require a statement to be produced which sets out:
 - i. which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18;
 - ii. how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18;
 - iii. a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18;
 - iv. how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account;
 - v. if representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations; and
 - vi. if no representations were made in regulation 20, that no such representations were made.
- 1.6** The purpose of this document is to fulfil the above requirements. The statement will be submitted to the Secretary of State alongside the Plan (and other documentation) for Examination.

- 1.7 This Consultation Statement explains the development of the Local Plan and how the Council has engaged with members of the public and stakeholders throughout the process in line with the SCI (2013). The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning authorities to produce a SCI which sets out how they will consult as part of the production of plans and in considering planning applications. The Local Plan has been prepared in accordance with the SCI which was adopted in July 2013 and can be seen on the [Council's website](#).

Statement of Community Involvement

- 1.8 The [Hambleton Statement of Community Involvement](#) (SCI) sets out how we intend to involve participants in the planning process. Part 3 of the SCI refers specifically to the production of the Local Plan and other policy documents. The following guiding principles apply to the Local Plan consultations and we will:

- communicate clearly about what is being consulted on;
- make it easy for you to get involved;
- coordinate with other departments;
- avoid consultation overload;
- consider ideas and comments fairly;
- make sure your involvement is meaningful and effective;
- learn from our mistakes;
- share information and provide feedback; and
- make information available.

- 1.9 Throughout the Local Plan process, the Council has engaged with the full range of consultees identified in the SCI and applied the various consultation methods as required. These include:

- sending letters and emails to consultees;
- issuing press releases and placing statutory notices;
- making documents, news and information available on the Council's website;
- supporting consultations with questionnaires to enable responses;
- holding one to one meetings and discussion groups;
- facilitating workshops;
- holding public exhibitions; and
- using social media.

Key Stages of Local Plan Production

- 1.10 The key stages of plan production are set out in the SCI and this Consultation Statement demonstrates that the preparation of the Local Plan has complied with the provisions set out in the adopted SCI.
- 1.11 At the Publication Draft stage, in line with the Regulations representations will be invited in respect of soundness and legal compliance of the Local Plan.
- 1.12 The Consultation Statement provides detail on each of the key stages of Local Plan production as set out in the table below:

Table 1.1 Key stages of Local Plan production

Stage	Dates
Pre-Issues and Options Consultation	Summer 2013 to December 2015
Local Plan partial review – scoping workshops	Summer 2013
Council agreed to proceed with a full Plan review	16 th September 2014
Call for Sites opens	8 th June 2015
Scoping of key issues for new Local Plan	Summer 2015
Site Assessment Methodology presented to Housing Market Partnership and consultation with statutory partners	December 2015
Issues and Options Consultation	11th January 2016 to 19th February 2016
Consultation on the Sustainability Scoping Report	11 th January 2016 to 19 th February 2016
Call for Sites closes	19 th February 2016
Preferred Options Consultation	31st October 2016 to 12th December 2016
Consultation on Sustainability Appraisal of Preferred Options Report	31 st October 2016 to 20 th January 2017
Consultation on Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report	31 st October 2016 to 20 th January 2017
Consultation on Settlement Character Studies & Draft Northallerton, Brompton & Romanby Landscape & Open Space Study 2016 (supporting documents)	31 st October 2016 to 31 st January 2017
Alternative Sites and Local Green Space Designation Consultation	21st April 2017 to 2nd June 2017
Publication Draft including final SA	July 2019
Submission of Local Plan	November 2019

1.13 As identified in the above table, in addition to the key stages of Local Plan production set out in the SCI, the Council has also undertaken consultation on Preferred Options and consultation on Alternative Sites and Local Green Space Designation. Detail on all stages of Local Plan production are provided in the following sections of this document.

2 Pre-Issues and Options

Local Plan partial review

- 2.1 Work on the partial review of the Local Plan began in Summer 2013 with a series of scoping workshops with Council members, parish councils, developers and local interest groups. A Cabinet report in October 2013 agreed the scope of the review and following this, evidence base work was commissioned and published on Affordable Housing Viability, Objectively Assessed Housing Need, Economic Development, Employment Land Review and Retail and Town Centre Uses. Further member workshops were held between June and September 2014.
- 2.2 As part of the work undertaken as part of the Local Plan review, it became apparent that the LDF spatial approach which focuses growth in the market towns, significantly constrained development in smaller villages. In December 2014, the Council consulted on the Draft Interim Policy Guidance Note (IPGN) and in April 2015, to ensure consistent interpretation of the NPPF alongside Policies CP4 and DP9, the IPGN was adopted by the Council. This guidance was intended to bridge the gap between CP4/DP9 and the NPPF and relates to residential development within villages and rural areas. In practice, the IPGN would support small scale housing development in villages and contribute towards sustainable development and enhancing the vitality of local communities.

Scoping of key issues for new Local Plan

- 2.3 A full plan review was agreed by Council on 16th September 2014. A further report was presented to Council on 17th March 2015 to agree the scope and resources for the new Local Plan. This report was agreed and referred to the Council meeting on 7th April 2015. A Local Plan Member Working Group was established to take forward the Hambleton Local Plan comprising of six councillors, one from each of the sub-areas and the portfolio holder for Planning and the Environment.
- 2.4 Following agreement of the full plan review in 2014, the Council scheduled a series of stakeholder workshops to take place in summer 2015 which focused on scoping of key issues for the new Local Plan.
- 2.5 The stakeholder workshops covered topic areas which included transport, housing, education, leisure and community, employment and economy, and the historic and natural environment. A range of stakeholders were invited to the workshops including parish councils, interest groups and agents and developers. The workshops were well attended. A number of internal scoping meetings were also held with key departments within the Council, including Business and Economy, Development Management and Housing and Leisure.
- 2.6 The workshops and internal scoping meetings informed the preparation of the Issues and Options document which was to be consulted on in Spring 2016.

Duty to cooperate meetings

- 2.7** A key part of the scoping of key issues exercise was a series of duty to cooperate meetings which the Council initiated. The schedule of duty to cooperate meetings which took place at this time, the key issues discussed and summary of strategic issues are shown in table 2.1. An overview of how duty to cooperate has informed the preparation of the Local Plan is provided in section 4 of this report.
- 2.8** Further details of the Issues and Options stage of Local Plan preparation which followed the scoping of key issues work is provided in section 5 of this report.

Table 2.1 Duty to cooperate meetings (held in advance of Issues and Options consultation - April, September and October 2015)

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council. Date of meeting: 21.09.15		
<p>No specific comments on existing strategy as adjoining boundary is small.</p> <p>Focus on stemming the population decline.</p> <p>Looking to meet their own need, and not export need, however they may take on others need if required.</p> <p>Pressure to de-allocate employment land in Redcar and Cleveland as not being brought forward. North of borough more attractive for employment.</p> <p>It would be unlikely that there would be any cross boundary matters with regards to retail.</p> <p>Considered that there would be no cross boundary issues with regards to health or conservation, landscape or climate change</p>	<p>It is considered there are no strategic cross boundary issues at this point in time.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Stockton on Tees Borough Council. Date of meeting: 17.09.15		
<p>No comment on existing strategy.</p> <p>Stockton is looking to meet their own need, and not export need.</p> <p>The flows to Hambleton are fairly limited at present, but should the strategy for the northern part of the District change there is a potential to draw away some of the population. Stockton</p>	<p>Some concern from Stockton Council over any potential change to the spatial strategy for the northern part of Hambleton district.</p> <p>The concern from the point of view of Stockton Council is that loss of the</p>	<p>This will inform the spatial strategy for new development in the new Local Plan.</p>



Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
<p>would need some additional evidence on commuting patterns to enable them to consider the impact of any change in strategy.</p> <p>At this stage it would be unlikely that there would be any cross boundary matters with regards to retail.</p> <p>The allocation of additional employment land within the north of the District could have cross boundary implications.</p> <p>The ability for Stockton to bring forward development is constrained by highways (A66 connectivity and A19 crossing).</p> <p>Any improvements to the A19 could impact on commuting patterns.</p> <p>Impact of freight movements from Port Clarence to Northallerton - leads to potential cross boundary issues where major schemes require rail freight.</p> <p>No cross boundary issues with regards to health, landscape, conservation and climate change based on information available at the time.</p>	<p>area of restraint in the northern part of Hambleton and allocation of housing sites in this area in the new Local Plan has potential to draw population away from Stockton borough.</p> <p>Likewise, officers of Stockton Council had concern that allocation of employment land in the north of Hambleton could affect commuting patterns and result in some population loss.</p>	
<p>Darlington Borough Council. Date of meeting: 23.09.15</p>		
<p>Darlington Borough Council are looking to meet their own housing need, and not export need.</p> <p>The Borough Council is currently reviewing results of the OAN and implications for Local Plan.</p> <p>The understanding is that Darlington Borough Council and Hambleton District Council are looking at preparing a joint case with regards to the Scotch Corner appeal.</p> <p>Improvements to the A1 were discussed but no cross boundary issues envisaged.</p>	<p>It was acknowledged by both Darlington Council and Hambleton District Council that the scaling back of services at the Friarage in Northallerton may result in some increased demand for services at Darlington Memorial.</p>	<p>The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and healthcare providers are consultees in the Local Plan making process. Discussions will inform decisions on site allocations alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
<p>It was noted that the scaling back of services at the Friarage in Northallerton may result in some increased demand for services at Darlington Memorial.</p>		
<p>Middlesbrough Borough Council. Date of meeting: 24.09.15</p>		
<p>Middlesbrough Borough Council would like to see area of restraint in north of District maintained. The Borough Council noted it would not be feasible for Hambleton District Council to allocate in the north of the District in the area of restraint as this would be likely to stall sites in southern part of Middlesbrough.</p> <p>Middlesbrough Borough Council are looking to meet their own housing need, and not export need.</p> <p>Housing Local Plan shows some housing allocations in the south of the borough of mid to upper end homes with view to retaining population.</p> <p>The Borough Council are running out of employment land so they are looking to south of borough to grow employment. The Borough Council are focusing on attracting high-tech, IT related jobs.</p> <p>No apparent cross boundary issues with regards retail.</p> <p>With regards to health, it was noted that the scaling back of services at the Friarage in Northallerton may result in some increased demand for services at James Cook Hospital.</p>	<p>Some concern from Middlesbrough Council over any potential change to the spatial strategy for the northern part of Hambleton district.</p> <p>The concern from the point of view of Middlesbrough Council is that loss of the area of restraint in the northern part of the District and allocation of housing sites in this area in the new Local Plan has potential to draw population away from Middlesbrough.</p> <p>Likewise, officers of Middlesbrough Council had concern that allocation of employment land in the north of the District could have cross boundary implications for Middlesbrough Council's strategy of focusing employment growth in the south of the borough.</p> <p>It was acknowledged by both Councils that the scaling back of services at the Friarage in Northallerton may result in</p>	<p>This will inform the spatial strategy for new development in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and healthcare providers are consultees in the Local Plan making process. Discussions will inform decisions on site allocations alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>



Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
	some increased demand for services at Darlington Memorial.	
Richmondshire District Council. Date of meeting: 21.09.15		
<p>Current strategy worked well in achieving objectives however perhaps a sub area approach is not working. Areas relate by means of transport corridors and Catterick and Bedale relate closely, particularly once Bedale and Leeming Bar Relief Road is in place, opening up the east west movement. The river Swale is a natural barrier which follows the A1 in the northern west area of the District.</p> <p>Richmondshire District Council is looking to meet own housing need. Some cross over with military sites i.e. Catterick, Topcliffe, Linton etc.</p> <p>Brompton on Swale and Scorton may be able to accommodate additional growth which relate well to the north-west part of Hambleton.</p> <p>Scotch Corner retail park currently with Secretary of State for determination, however this is a long term allocation so could see development of some type.</p> <p>A1 upgrade and Bedale and Leeming Bar Relief Road will enable better links north south and east west</p> <p>Richmond Healthy Towns bid – Ministry of Defence (MOD) and health authority to provide primary healthcare in a rural setting.</p>	It is considered there are no strategic cross boundary issues at this point in time.	Noted.
York City Council. Date of meeting: 24.09.15		
York City Council noted that there was not an appetite amongst local planning authorities for sub-regional approach to meeting housing need and for this reason would need to look at meeting own housing need in the first 15 years	York City Council would look to meet own housing need in the first 15 years of the Local Plan. Beyond 15 years, the City Council would explore whether a	This will be achieved through further duty to cooperate meetings with local authority partners.

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
<p>of the Local Plan. Beyond 15 years, York City Council would explore whether a sub-regional approach is an option.</p> <p>With regards to health, it was noted that the scaling back of services at the Friarage in Northallerton may result in some increased demand for services at York.</p> <p>Highways England is doing some modelling work on A19/A1 improvements.</p>	<p>sub-regional approach for meeting housing need is an option.</p> <p>Regular dialogue between Hambleton District Council and York City Council will be necessary.</p>	
Harrogate Borough Council. Date of meeting: 7.10.15		
<p>Harrogate Borough Council plan to meet their own housing need.</p> <p>SHMA February 2015 with updated September 2015 following publication of the 2012 sub national projections. OAN has been reduced downwards from 621 to 518.</p> <p>Do not foresee any issues subject to location of any new settlement if proposed and subject to Hambleton District Council planning to meet their own need in the plan period to 2025.</p> <p>Scale of development indicated through GVA studies unlikely to cause any significant cross boundary issues with regards retail, leisure and commercial development.</p> <p>The Borough Council do not foresee any significant cross boundary issues regarding transport – likely to be asked to protect rail route. The Borough Council have been asked to protect route between Harrogate and Ripon.</p> <p>Do not foresee any significant cross boundary issues at this stage regarding health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities.</p> <p>The Borough Council need to do further work to establish if they need to review the greenbelt.</p>	<p>It is considered there are no strategic cross boundary issues at this point in time.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
North Yorkshire County Council Extra Care. Date of meeting: 10.09.15		



Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
<p>SP3 Settlement hierarchy - needs to be considered against a North Yorkshire County Council desire to deliver self-containment in rural areas.</p> <p>Aim to enable people to live in their own homes for as long as they can. Providing services to help them - in rural communities to look at the development of local facilities, post offices, shops, hairdressers.</p> <p>Bus routes are a particular issue, accessible public transport is still a high priority for both staff and residents.</p> <p>Access to health facilities is important issue as are wider telecommunications. Need good connections for TeleHealth and TeleMedicin. Need good wi-fi or 4g in rural areas.</p> <p>Energy efficient building also important.</p>	<p>Bus routes and accessible public transport generally along with retaining local facilities and services in rural communities identified as key to the work of Extra Care team.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>North Yorkshire County Council Minerals and Waste and Flooding. Date of meeting: 22.09.15</p>		
<p>What do we do about the issue of rail, movement of station south, issue of car parking, connection of A168 and issues about operation? How do we address connectivity issues and serve a wider community?</p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council keen to work closely with Hambleton District Council on infrastructure planning – looking at scales and patterns of development and how it could be delivered.</p> <p>Opportunities for joint working.</p> <p>Officer to work with local planning authorities on large sites and infrastructure plan.</p> <p>Wider employment policy where are key opportunities for growth. What might the status of Ministry of Defence (MOD) sites be?</p> <p>Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) strategy. Local economic assessments – prison opportunity.</p>	<p>North Yorkshire County Council noted need to work closely with Hambleton District Council on infrastructure planning.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work closely with North Yorkshire County Council and other key partners with regards to infrastructure planning and this will inform the preparation of the Infrastructure delivery Plan which will underpin the new Local Plan.</p>

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
<p>Market towns remain healthy.</p> <p>How can the District support the wider growth agenda? Are there strengths in the District to capitalise on?</p> <p>Pick up through the spatial plan.</p> <p>Move the spatial plan forward – it is a non-statutory document – Issue of timing.</p> <p>Rural sustainability.</p> <p>Open to balanced approach to enable communities to be sustained.</p> <p>Explore opportunities for a new settlement – What are implications for rail stations/parkway? Role of Dalton.</p> <p>Issues around logistics.</p>		
Historic England. Date of meeting: 14.04.15		
<p>Produce an action plan for heritage, which may include:</p> <p>Cross-boundary impacts of development on heritage within adjoining authorities.</p> <p>Evaluation of impact of possible growth options upon the historic environment</p> <p>Production of strategic conservation area assessments to inform the allocation of land for development.</p> <p>How to identify non-designated parks and gardens.</p> <p>Consideration of the archaeological potential of sites.</p> <p>Updating the buildings at risk database to identify where heritage could be improved and whether development could bring this forward.</p>	<p>The need to consider cross boundary impacts of proposed development on heritage within adjoining local authority areas was raised as an important factor.</p>	<p>This will be achieved through further duty to cooperate meetings with local authority partners.</p>
North York Moors National Park Authority. Date of meeting: 22.09.15		



Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
<p>Current strategy worked well in achieving objectives and is aligned with the National Park approach and in those villages where planning function is shared.</p> <p>There is a distinct lack of tourism promotion between Hambleton and the National Park. Tourism has benefit for the economy and should be better promoted.</p> <p>York potash mine raises issues regarding where the skilled workers will live. May result in housing pressure in Stokesley/Middlesbrough.</p> <p>Management Plan priority for high speed broadband.</p> <p>Any closure of services at Friarage would affect west of National Park.</p> <p>Changing demographics – increase in elderly.</p>	<p>The need to coordinate tourism promotion between Hambleton District Council and the National Park was raised as an important factor.</p>	<p>This will be achieved through further duty to cooperate meetings.</p>
<p>Ministry of Defence (MOD) - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). Date of meeting: 5.10.15</p>		
<p>The MOD is currently going through an asset review decision making process. The aim is to reduce the size of the national estate by 25-30% in order to reduce costs. The focus is likely to be on the built estate as opposed to the rural areas. There is a focus on market housing delivery from the sale of any sites.</p> <p>Spring 2016 – to have a strategic view regarding priorities and type of asset affected.</p> <p>Summer 2016 – footprint review will specify which sites are to close/reduce.</p> <p>Hambleton District Council ideas for taking the Issues and Options forward could influence the MOD's decision regarding what sites are sold off.</p>	<p>The Council will need to keep informed of MOD decisions regarding its asset review process during the new Local Plan preparation stages.</p>	<p>This will be achieved through further duty to cooperate meetings. Discussions will inform decisions on site allocations alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>Heartbeat Alliance (GP Alliance). Date of meeting: 14.10.15</p>		

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
<p>The alliance covers the District down to Topcliffe and across to Stokesley and Great Ayton.</p> <p>Thirsk two practices are full or nearly full.</p> <p>No funding for GP practice development</p> <p>No revenue for rental/funding issue.</p> <p>Northallerton two practices not much change over the last 10 years in registrations – not full. Not sure how much population has changed in Northallerton over the last 10 years.</p> <p>Bedale Surgery is full</p> <p>Lambert medical centre has closed temporarily but building not fit for purpose?</p> <p>There is an opportunity to replace the Lambert hospital with something else – look at CCG Strategic Estates Review discussion document.</p> <p>Community venture have looked at existing population forecasts.</p> <p>Provides a 5 year full review.</p> <p>Looking to put things together – Hubs.</p> <p>District nurses can operate within a 10 mile radius /20 minute drive time of the practice.</p> <p>NHS England patient transport – looking to transport to Hubs where possible and not hospitals.</p> <p>Key issue now and for the future is recruitment of GP's</p> <p>District valuers have possibly completed some work on requirements per person for a new development.</p>	<p>The Council will need to keep informed of capacity issues of GP practices and health care facilities.</p>	<p>The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and healthcare providers are consultees in the Local Plan making process. Discussions will inform decisions on site allocations alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>Easingwold GP practice and York Teaching Hospital. Date of meeting: 14.10.15</p>		
<p>The surgery has no capacity – issues with Tollerton and Stillington.</p> <p>New housing development resulting in increase in patient numbers.</p>	<p>The Council will need to keep informed of capacity issues of GP practices and health care facilities.</p>	<p>The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and healthcare providers are consultees in the</p>



Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
<p>General health priorities moving out into the community.</p> <p>Part of CARVER.</p> <p>Vale of York – 19.09.15 there was a meeting at Galtres Centre – CCG – York Trust to establish the vision for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Prime Ministers Infrastructure Fund.</p>		<p>Local Plan making process. Discussions will inform decisions on site allocations alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>Hambleton and Richmondshire Clinical Care Commissioning Group (CCG). Date of meeting: 13.10.15</p>		
<p>Key Issues are that to date they have found it difficult to access money from developments for health.</p> <p>In Hambleton there is an issue with transport getting to GP services to existing locations for both elderly people and from affordable housing.</p> <p>Hambleton District Council asked has any work being carried out which identifies the ratio of number of new properties to new registrations with GP's.</p> <p>Health organisations do not understand how to influence the CIL 123 list.</p> <p>Need to understand how many new houses and how many new people.</p>	<p>The Council will need to maintain regular dialogue with the CCG to address issues discussed around transport, funding and planning of infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and healthcare providers are consultees in the Local Plan making process. Discussions will inform decisions on site allocations alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Discussions will also inform the preparation of the Infrastructure delivery Plan which will underpin the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>Natural England. Date of meeting: 21.10.15</p>		
<p>Ensure early involvement of local nature group (SINC panel – North Yorkshire County Council) in the proposed allocation sites to provide advice on whether there are likely to be any natural environment problems.</p>	<p>No strategic cross boundary implications identified.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>North Yorkshire Police. Date of meeting: 08.10.15</p>		

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of strategic issues	HDC response
A range of issues were discussed.	Dialogue with the Police will continue.	There is agreement to continue dialogue.
York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Date of meeting: 15.04.15		
<p>It was acknowledged that Hambleton District Council needs to work closely with colleagues in Business and Economy within the District Council and also the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP when developing scenarios in the new Local Plan, to ensure this reflects the economic strategy. Hambleton District Council need to understand assumptions behind the economic strategy.</p> <p>It was agreed that Hambleton District Council need to establish best point of contact at Tees Valley Unlimited (Tees Valley LEP) in order to establish what is modelled in terms of economic forecasts and to what extent the Hambleton economy is factored in.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Hambleton District Council needs to ensure that the new Local Plan is aligned with the economic strategy of the Council and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP.</p> <p>It is necessary to establish contact with the Tees Valley LEP to ensure the Tees Valley LEP has considered the Hambleton economy within its strategy and to also ensure the Council factors in and considers the Tees Valley LEP economic strategy when preparing the new Local Plan.</p>	<p>The Council will work closely with colleagues in Business and Economy and the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP during the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council will liaise with the Tees Valley LEP and discussions will inform the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>

2.9 North Yorkshire Local Access Forum was also involved in duty to cooperate meetings.

3 Call for Sites

Introduction

- 3.1** One of the first steps in preparing the new Local Plan was to establish what land is available for development within Hambleton over the Local Plan timeframe. In order to help establish this, landowners, agents and developers were invited to put forward land for potential development in the future through the Call for Sites.
- 3.2** The Call for Sites was launched on 8th June 2015. The scheduled end date for the Call for Sites was 4th September 2015, but the period was extended until 19th February 2016 in response to feedback from consultees.

Site assessment methodology

- 3.3** The Council prepared a site assessment methodology in order to ensure a rigorous and consistent approach to the assessment of all submitted sites. It provided a tool for officers to objectively assess sites submitted to the Council and to enable informed choices to be made on selection of sites for allocation. The site assessment methodology was aligned with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives and its aim was to ensure selected sites would best meet the objectives of the new Local Plan.
- 3.4** The draft site assessment methodology was presented to the Housing Market Partnership in December 2015 for their comment. The Partnership includes a range of developers and agents who operate in Hambleton. The Council also consulted other key stakeholders on the draft site assessment methodology including Natural England, Historic England, Environment Agency and North Yorkshire County Council. Comments from these partners helped to refine the methodology.

Key stages of the site assessment process

- 3.5** The final version of the site assessment methodology included three stages:
- Stage 1: The site was assessed against key eligibility criteria, including consideration of the scale of development and assessment against key constraints
 - Stage 2: The site was assessed against Local Plan Sustainability Objectives
 - Stage 3: The deliverability and viability of the site was considered.
- 3.6** The site assessment methodology comprises a series of questions under different themes against which the site can be assessed in terms of suitability.
- 3.7** In stage two, a colour coding (red/amber green) was used to indicate the relevant impact of the site against each Sustainability Objective. Stage 2 of the assessment was informed by information gathered from a variety of sources as listed below:
- site visits;
 - data held within the Council's Geographical Information System (GIS);
 - the emerging evidence base available including the Employment Land Review and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment;

- screening of sites in terms of impact on biodiversity; and
- engagement with and comments from a range of stakeholders including Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England, North Yorkshire County Council Highways and Minerals and Waste.

Approach to consultation

3.8 The following list provides an overview of the main ways in which the Council engaged with consultees as part of the Call for Sites consultation:

- An online Call for Sites form and PDF version of the form was available on the Council's website during the Call for Sites period.
- A letter informing residents, agents, developers and neighbouring authorities about the Call for Sites process was sent out on the 8th June 2015.
- This letter was sent to all contacts within the planning policy consultation database (Approximately 2500). The letter was circulated via email and by post.
- A letter was also circulated by the Council's Business and Economy team to commercial agents. This was via email on 12th June 2015.
- A press release was also issued at the start of the Call for Sites.

The Response

3.9 The Call for Sites exercise resulted in over 500 sites being submitted for consideration. These sites will be assessed and the results presented in the Preferred Options Consultation.

4 Duty to Cooperate

- 4.1** Under the Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), local authorities have to address strategic planning matters in their local plans. The duty to cooperate is the mechanism for ensuring that this happens and this is one of the main ways in which the Council has consulted and liaised with neighbouring local authorities and stakeholders on planning issues during the preparation of the new Local Plan.
- 4.2** Planning issues are not constrained to local planning authority boundaries. The NPPF states that public bodies have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those that relate to strategic priorities. Local planning authorities are required to work collaboratively to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual local plans.

Forums for duty to cooperate

- 4.3** The Council has continued to fulfil its duty to cooperate in the following ways:
- a. It has consulted with adjoining planning authorities on the preparation of its plans and policies from the initial stages and on studies which will form the evidence base that will underpin those plans.
 - b. It has responded to consultations from other adjoining planning authorities and North Yorkshire County Council on the preparation of their policy documentation and evidence base;
 - c. It has continued to work in a collaborative way with other local planning authorities and statutory bodies; and
 - d. It has continued to engage with other local planning authorities and statutory bodies through participation of the following strategic planning forums:
 - i. Tees Valley Development Plan Officer's Forum
 - ii. North Yorkshire and York Spatial Planning and Transport Board
 - iii. The York, North Yorkshire, East Riding and Hull Development Plans Forum (previously known as the North Yorkshire Development Plans Forum)
 - iv. North Yorkshire and East Riding Directors of Development
 - v. North Yorkshire Heads of Development
 - vi. York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership
 - vii. The Tees Valley Combined Authority
- 4.4** There has been ongoing dialogue with duty to cooperate partners through the above forums and through regular contact with partnering organisations. Discussions have informed the preparation of the Local Plan. However, it is possible to identify two stages within the Local Plan preparation process where officer resources have been focused on duty to cooperate meetings. These are as follows:
- Duty to cooperate meetings held in advance of the Issues and Options consultation (April, September and October 2015);
 - Duty to cooperate meetings held in advance of the Preferred Options Consultation (April – May 2016).

4.5 The key issues discussed and summary of strategic issues at these meetings are shown at table 2.1 and table 6.2.

Member to member duty to cooperate workshops

4.6 A further way in which strategic cross boundary issues have been identified and addressed is through member to member workshops. The Council has hosted workshops with members from neighbouring local authorities in North Yorkshire and Tees Valley during the preparation of the new Local Plan. Members from the Council have also attended member duty to cooperate meetings that have been hosted by other neighbouring local authorities.

Meetings hosted by Hambleton District Council

4.7 On 20th November 2017, Hambleton District Council hosted a member duty to cooperate meeting with North Yorkshire local authorities and a further meeting with Tees Valley local authorities. At each of these meetings, the Council provided an update on the progress made in preparing the new Local Plan and provided an overview of the main sections covered. This was followed by a discussion on duty to cooperate and potential cross boundary issues. The cross boundary issues that were raised had already been identified at earlier officer duty to cooperate meetings but a brief summary of what members discussed is provided below.

4.8 At the meeting with Tees Valley local authorities, the main areas discussed were:

- It was noted that the potential loss of the area of restraint in the northern part of Hambleton District had been raised as a concern at some officer duty to co-operate meetings. The concern of some of the Tees Valley local authorities was that the possible loss of the area of restraint and allocation of housing sites in this area in the new Local Plan has potential to draw population away from neighbouring local authority areas in the north. In response to this, the Council confirmed that the proposal was for smaller two to three bedroom homes as opposed to larger homes, to reflect identified need.
- There was some concern that the loss of services at the Friarage Hospital in Northallerton could have cross boundary implications as more people will have to travel to James Cook Hospital in Middlesbrough. The importance of ensuring that the health authorities (NHS and CCGs) are engaged in the Local Plan process was raised.
- In terms of employment growth aspirations of the Council, it was noted that the employment uses that Hambleton is seeking to attract should complement those of its neighbouring authorities.
- It was noted that there should be a consistent approach across neighbouring authorities towards renewable energy.

4.9 The main cross boundary issues that were identified at the meeting with the North Yorkshire local authorities was in relation to Ministry of Defence (MOD) decommissioning of sites. It was agreed that it will be important to maintain dialogue between the councils with regards to the MOD decommissioning of sites which may become available for housing. A strategic cross boundary approach will be required in respect of this.

Other Member Meetings

4.10 Members from Hambleton District Council attended a member duty to cooperate meeting hosted by Darlington Council on 15th August 2017 and a meeting hosted by Middlesbrough Council on 21st June 2018. At both meetings, the hosting local authority provided an update on the progress made in preparing the a new Local Plan for their area and provided an overview of the main elements of the spatial strategy that was being proposed. These meetings provided an opportunity to discuss any strategic cross boundary issues. There were no additional issues identified over and above those identified at earlier officer duty to cooperate meetings.

Duty to Cooperate Statement and Statement of Common Ground

4.11 In line with the requirements in the NPPF, the Council will produce a Duty to Cooperate Statement which will set out how the Council has managed strategic planning matters in the Local Plan and will be working with neighbouring authorities and other duty to cooperate stakeholders to produce a Statement of Common Ground (SCG). As the requirement to produce a SCG is relatively new the first version will be produced for the publication (regulation 19) version of the local plan.

5 Issues & Options

- 5.1** The Issues and Options document was informed by the feedback provided through a number of stakeholder scoping workshops which took place during summer 2015 as discussed in chapter 2 of this document. The aim of the Issues and Options document was to identify the issues that the Local Plan needs to address and to consider the options by which to deal with them.
- 5.2** The Issues and Options document sought views on the following topics:-
- Vision and objectives for Hambleton;
 - Critical issues facing the area;
 - What is special about Hambleton;
 - The scale of future development; and
 - How development should be distributed
- 5.3** A questionnaire was designed to help provide a structured approach to the on line consultation and to aid responses. Consultation on the Issues and Options document took place for a 6 week period between 11th January 2016 and 19th February 2016.

Sustainability Scoping Report

- 5.4** As part of the consultation on the Issues and Options document, the Council also published and consulted on the Sustainability Scoping Report. Sustainability Appraisal is required under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Scoping Report represented the initial phase in establishing the framework for undertaking Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Hambleton Local Plan.
- 5.5** The purpose of the Scoping Report was to help ensure that the Sustainability Appraisal of the Hambleton Local Plan would consider all relevant significant issues of environmental, social and economic sustainability. It also outlined the method by which the options, policies and potential sites in the Plan would be evaluated during their development and prior to their implementation.
- 5.6** This document therefore;
- Provided a review of other relevant policies, plans, programmes and objectives which would inform the Local Plan;
 - Provided baseline information in relation to Hambleton District and the surrounding area;
 - Identified the sustainability issues; and
 - Proposed the Sustainability Objectives and appraisal methodology.

Approach to consultation

- 5.7** A wide range of publicity was undertaken to promote the Issues and Options consultation and during the consultation a number of consultation events were held.
- 5.8** In terms of the Sustainability Scoping Report, in accordance with the statutory requirements, the three Strategic Environmental Assessment bodies were consulted (Historic England, Environment Agency and Natural England) alongside other consultees as part of the consultation on the Issues and Options Consultation document.

Table 5.1 Summary of publicity

Dates	Publicity
19 th November 2015	Parish councils engaged in Local Plan making process through the Parish Council Liaison meeting.
3 rd December 2015	Formal letters or emails sent to parish councils to inform them of the consultation and programme of events. This included correspondence to parish councils to notify them of presentations to parish councils and to provide early notification of public drop in sessions to be held in January 2016.
10 th December 2015	An email was circulated, followed by a flyer, to all primary school head teachers in Hambleton to promote a school competition. The aim of the competition was to engage with the younger 'hard to reach' population by asking them to design what their town or village might look like in 2035.
December 2015	An article was published in the Council's Business Round Up newsletter and Older Persons Newsletter in December 2015.
14 th December 2015	A press release was issued to promote the Issues and Options consultation, indicating how and where people could get involved. Promotional material was also sent to Parish Councils, libraries, the Council's area offices and Council leisure centres.
4 th January 2016	Formal notification of consultation was sent to all consultees by letter or email to inform them of the consultation and programme of events.

Consultation events

5.9 Public drop in sessions were held in each market town to enable members of the public to find out more about the Issues and Options consultation. Planning officers were available to provide information and to answer any questions. The Council also held a number of meetings specifically for parish councils to discuss some of the issues that the Local Plan needed to address. The public drop in sessions and parish council meetings that were held are listed below.

Table 5.2 Consultation events

Date	Location	Consultation event
12 th January 2016	Easingwold	Public drop in session and parish council meeting
14 th January 2016	Thirsk	Public drop in session
19 th January 2016	Northallerton	Public drop in session and parish council meeting

Date	Location	Consultation event
21 st January 2016	Stokesley	Public drop in session and parish council meeting
26 th January 2016	Thirsk	Parish Council meeting
28 th January 2016	Bedale	Public drop in session and parish council meeting

The Response

Issues raised at public consultation events

5.10 A summary of issues raised at each of the public consultation events is provided in the tables below.

Table 5.3 Bedale, 28 January 2016, 2-7pm, 56 people attended

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Option 2 is preferred option – focusing development along central transport corridors as it enables good connectivity between housing and jobs. Good transport connections are key.	This feedback will help to shape the spatial strategy for new development in the new Local Plan.
Option 4 is not practical in transport terms – if housing development is dispersed more widely into the villages, people will be reliant on travelling by car to access jobs as public transport links are not adequate in many villages. Bus services have been declining so where will the investment come from to improve transport links?	This feedback will help to shape the spatial strategy for new development in the new Local Plan.
The level crossing at Low Gates in Northallerton needs a solution.	The Council will be commissioning transport modelling work to support the preparation of the Local Plan. This is likely to involve a review of capacity of the local and strategic road network affected by new development proposals. Recommendations for mitigation will be made. The transport modelling work will help to determine whether the proposed development sites are viable and deliverable and inform decisions on the selection of sites for allocation.

Table 5.4 Easingwold, 12 January 2016, 2-7pm, 216 people attended

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
<p>Are biodiversity and green infrastructure taken into account when planning future development</p>	<p>An assessment of the impact of proposed development on biodiversity and green infrastructure will be part of the site selection methodology and assessment criteria within the sustainability appraisal of sites which informs decisions on site allocations.</p>
<p>There is inadequate provision for drainage and sewers in Easingwold due to the pressure of new housing – how is this shortfall going to be addressed?</p>	<p>Yorkshire Water is a statutory consultee in the Local Plan making process. As part of the site assessment process, Yorkshire Water will advise the Council on the likely impact of proposed development on water utilities infrastructure and any improvements required to enable development to go ahead. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>GP practices and pharmacies are at capacity</p>	<p>The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and NHS Property Services are consultees in the Local Plan making process. As part of the site assessment process, these organisations will identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing provision and demand for additional facilities. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>People parking in town centre all day and travelling by bus to work in York. These take up valuable shopper spaces and discourage visitors. New car park required to cater for these commuters.</p>	<p>The car parking issues are likely to be considered as part of the work of the Easingwold Neighbourhood Plan. The Council will also seek to work with the County Council to consider options.</p>
<p>Smaller homes required in the villages to give more options for people downsizing and for younger people so they can afford to live in the villages.</p>	<p>Housing policy will seek to ensure that all new housing development assists in the creation of sustainable and inclusive communities through provision of an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will be a key piece of evidence for informing housing policy in the Local Plan.</p>

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Development should be linked to facilities available in the villages or will increase need to travel.	An option being considered is to allow more limited development in smaller settlements where this will support social and economic sustainability.
Focus development around the transport network	This feedback will help to shape the spatial strategy for new development in the new Local Plan. An option being considered is that the majority of new development will be along the transport corridors and the market towns and villages in proximity to this with more limited development in the outlying villages where this helps to retain the sustainability of settlements.

Table 5.5 Northallerton, 19 January 2016, 2-7pm, 66 people attended

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Shortage of bungalows causes issues for older people wanting to downsize.	Housing policy will seek to ensure that all new housing development assists in the creation of sustainable and inclusive communities through provision of an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will be a key piece of evidence for informing housing policy in the Local Plan.
Important to maintaining the unique identity of Northallerton market town and to make the most of tourist opportunities.	Policy in the new Local Plan will maintain and enhance the environment, vibrancy and vitality of market towns, particularly their market places and high streets and delivery of key projects will help to achieve this.
A new higher education facility would have benefits for retaining younger people, and media and technology industry	The Council will be commissioning consultants to undertake an Employment Land Review to assess the need for and supply of employment land in Hambleton up to 2035. This information will inform the new Local Plan with regards these aspects.
Need to consider capacity and age of infrastructure (particularly sewerage) prior to planning new development.	As part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water companies, North Yorkshire County Council highways and the CCG. The input of these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
	on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.
Consider an outer ring road around Northallerton - the north Northallerton Link Road will not solve the traffic problems in the town.	The Council will be commissioning transport modelling work to support the preparation of the Local Plan. This is likely to involve a review of capacity of the local and strategic road network affected by new development proposals. Recommendations for mitigation will be made. The transport modelling work will help to determine whether the proposed development sites are viable and deliverable and inform decisions on the selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.

Table 5.6 Stokesley, 21 January 2016, 2-7pm, 84 people attended

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Shortage of bungalows causes issues for older people wanting to downsize. There is a need for the right size and type of new homes, not just big homes.	Housing policy will seek to ensure that all new housing development assists in the creation of sustainable and inclusive communities through provision of an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will be a key piece of evidence for informing housing policy in the Local Plan.
More affordable housing needed for local people.	The Council will seek to maximise the delivery of affordable housing in order to meet locally identified needs. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment will be a key piece of evidence.
There is a need for some kind of community care transport scheme for older people.	This area of provision sits outside the aspects covered by the Local Plan, however, the Council would seek to work alongside the County Council to look at options.
Roads need sorting before any further development is allowed. Suggestions for by passes at various locations made.	The Council will be commissioning transport modelling work to support the preparation of the Local Plan. This is likely to involve a review of capacity of the local and strategic road network affected by new development proposals. Recommendations for mitigation will be made. The transport modelling work will help to determine whether the proposed

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
	development sites are viable and deliverable and inform decisions on the selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.
<p>Older people identify a lack of local facilities in some of the villages as an issue for them and in particular poor access to a pharmacy.</p> <p>There is also concern that the Health Centre is oversubscribed or nearly oversubscribed and that an ageing population will be dependent on these services.</p>	<p>The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and NHS Property Services are consultees in the Local Plan making process. As part of the site assessment process, these organisations will identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing health care provision and demand for additional facilities. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>There is concern about flooding as a result of new development and concern that further building will increase flood risk. Drains are also identified as a major issue.</p>	<p>As part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water utility companies, drainage boards and the Council drainage engineer. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will also be commissioned. The input of these organisations and SFRA will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>Parking in the town is an issue and there is concern it will get worse with new residential development. The question was asked in relation to what is being done to increase parking facilities in the town in line with the new housing provision.</p>	<p>The car parking issues are likely to be considered as part of the work of the Stokesley Neighbourhood Plan. The Council will also seek to work with the County Council to consider options.</p>
<p>Focus growth on the transport corridor so young people can get to work.</p>	<p>This feedback will help to shape the spatial strategy for new development in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>Consider the role of tourism and in particular the link to cycling around Stokesley and Great Ayton. Stokesley wants to become a hub for cycling.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>



Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
<p>Where are the facilities for younger people?</p> <p>There is need for a supermarket in the right location in Stokesley.</p>	<p>A key planning issue is how to meet the need for additional community facilities arising from planned housing growth and population change. In terms of provision of open space, recreation and sports facilities, the Council will be commissioning consultants to undertake a review of the quality and quantity of existing provision and this will identify where additional provision or improvements are needed to support planned housing growth in Hambleton. This will inform the Local Plan in terms of policies and any site allocations.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned consultants to undertake an updated Retail and Leisure Study to provide a review of the future retail and commercial leisure needs of the District Council's administrative area up to 2035. This will inform retail policy in the new Local Plan by providing an understanding of how the existing facilities serve the District's residents and what potential there is to plan for any additional facilities over the plan period.</p>
<p>The need for better design of new housing to take into account the character of the area was raised as an issue.</p>	<p>There will be policies on design of new development in the new Local Plan. The Council will aim to achieve high quality design, reinforce local distinctiveness and a strong sense of place.</p>

Table 5.7 Thirsk, 14 January 2016, 2-6.30pm, 37 people attended

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
<p>Concern in relation to the capacity of infrastructure and in particular in relation to flooding, surface water drainage and the sewerage network in light of new development.</p>	<p>As part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water utility companies, drainage boards and the Council drainage engineer. The input of these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>There is concern of insufficient parking at Thirsk train station.</p>	<p>The Council will work with other organisations such as the County Council and Network Rail to identify options.</p>

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
<p>Importance of cycle routes and green corridors was raised.</p>	<p>The Local Plan will include policies that seek to protect existing green infrastructure and green corridors and to secure net gains to green infrastructure by setting out requirements for new development proposals which will include the need to incorporate and where possible enhance and / or create new links between green infrastructure features.</p>
<p>It was noted that there is a need to improve housing choice for older people; there is a need for smaller homes; there is a need to ensure affordable housing is for local people and that new housing has good space and design standards.</p> <p>It was noted that there is a need to balance new development alongside protecting the character of Hambleton in particular the rural settlements that have special characters that should be protected or enhanced.</p>	<p>Housing policy will seek to ensure that all new housing development assists in the creation of sustainable and inclusive communities through provision of an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure.</p> <p>The Council will seek to maximise the delivery of affordable housing in order to meet locally identified needs.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will be a key piece of evidence for informing housing policy in the Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of design, there will be policies on design of new development in the new Local Plan. The Council will aim to achieve high quality design, reinforce local distinctiveness and a strong sense of place.</p>
<p>There is a need for 'quality' jobs that will sustain our workforce and attract younger people to stay or move into the area.</p> <p>There is a need to provide affordable places for the workforce to live locally</p>	<p>The Council will be commissioning consultants to undertake an Employment Land Review to assess the need for and supply of employment land in the District up to 2035. This information will inform the New Local Plan with regards these aspects.</p> <p>The Council will seek to maximise the delivery of affordable housing in order to meet locally identified needs. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will be a key piece of evidence for informing housing policy in the Local Plan.</p>

Issues raised at parish council meetings

5.11 A summary of issues raised at the parish council meetings is provided in the tables below.

Table 5.8 Bedale, 28 January 2016, 7.30pm

Attendance: Bedale Town Council; Snape Parish Council; Exelby, Leeming and Newton Parish Council; Carthorpe and Kirklington and Howgrave Parish Council.



Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Parking charges are having a negative impact on the vitality of high streets.	Noted.
A business study is required to help establish a better mix of retailers in the high streets.	The Council has commissioned consultants to undertake an updated Retail and Leisure Study to provide a review of the future retail and commercial leisure needs of the District Council's administrative area up to 2035. This will inform retail policy in the new Local Plan by providing an understanding of how the existing facilities serve the District's residents and what potential there is to plan for any additional facilities over the plan period.
Public transport in rural areas is an issue alongside the state of the roads that need major investments to bring them up to an acceptable standard and these issues do not help with supporting local services.	Noted.
Creating sustainable communities is key to maintaining what facilities these villages have but a view given is that cars are proving to be an essential mode of transport.	The Local Plan policies and site allocations will seek to ensure that development makes a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities.

Table 5.9 Easingwold, 12 January 2016, 7.30pm

Attendance: Easingwold Town Council; Stillington Parish Council; Husthwaite Parish Council; Crayke Parish Council.	
Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
The allocated sites for Easingwold have already been delivered or are in the process of being delivered –will this be factored into account when setting new allocations/targets for Easingwold?	The Local Plan has to identify land supply across the District as a whole. However, when looking at distribution in the future, consideration will be given to the fact that a significant amount of development has recently taken place in Easingwold and at a faster rate than was planned for in the LDF, when compared to other parts of the District.

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Easingwold has already taken a huge slice of the housing delivered, are we going to have more appeals? Are we expected to accept more speculative applications?	The new Local Plan will have limited weight in any future appeals until the submission stage. The current situation (at Issues and Options stage) is that we will need to deal with applications as and when they come in. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will provide a robust evidence base on housing need in the District and has been supported by inspectors at appeal.
There are infrastructure problems in Easingwold but no new infrastructure provision has come forward from any developments. Why is this not joined up?	As part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water companies, North Yorkshire County Council highways and the CCG. Input from these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.
Smaller homes are required for first time buyers and low cost homes needed for local people, not 5-6 bedroom homes but 1-3 bedroom modest homes.	Housing policy will seek to ensure that all new housing development assists in the creation of sustainable and inclusive communities through provision of an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will be a key piece of evidence for informing housing policy in the Local Plan.
Does Hambleton District Council have a preferred option or are they all of equal consideration?	At Issues and Options stage, all options are being considered and appraised. Consultation responses and the emerging evidence base will inform the Preferred Options stage of the Local Plan.
There are no employment opportunities in Easingwold – more needs to be created. More shops are closed than new ones opening.	The Local Plan will look to support the role of market towns through allocations as appropriate.

Table 5.10 Northallerton, 19 January 2016, 7.30pm

Attendance: Northallerton Town Council; Appleton Wiske Parish Council; Kirby Wiske and Newsham with Breckenbrough Parish Council; Danby Wiske with Lazenby.



Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Achieving a balance between what local communities feel is a right appropriate level of growth and what is needed District wide was thought to be a key issue for the Plan.	The Local Plan will be informed by key messages emerging through the consultation process alongside key conclusions emerging from the evidence base.
Ensuring that health issues are taken account was also felt to be important.	As part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including the CCG and local doctor's surgeries. Input from these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.
Employment was highlighted as a key issue - The fact that a lot of housing would inevitably be built in Hambleton over the period of the new Local Plan and that Northallerton could become a dormitory town if there was no employment for the people buying the new houses.	Through the Local Plan, the Council will seek to achieve sustainable development and this means that as well as securing the provision of suitable housing of the right size, type and tenure, the Local Plan will seek to promote Hambleton as a recognised location for business by providing a range of employment opportunities that meet local aspirations.
Achieving a balance between what local communities feel is a right appropriate level of growth and what is needed District wide was thought to be a key issue for the Plan.	The Council has commissioned key studies to provide an assessment of need for employment and housing growth. The evidence base will inform policy direction within the new Local Plan.

Table 5.11 Stokesley Parish Council meeting, 21 January 2016, 7.30pm

Attendance: Stokesley Town Council	
Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
It is important whatever option is taken that the infrastructure that is required to meet the needs of the population is put in place.	As part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water companies, North Yorkshire County Council highways, the local education authority and the CCG. Input from these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
	infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.
There is a need for some development in the villages in order to keep them sustainable.	This feedback will help to shape the spatial strategy for new development in the new Local Plan.
It was felt that Hambleton would not attract big industry.	The Council will be commissioning consultants to undertake an Employment Land Review (ELR) to assess the need for and supply of employment land in Hambleton up to 2035. This will help to ensure there is enough choice of sites in the District to help meet the needs of new and expanding businesses. The ELR findings will inform the new Local Plan with regards these aspects.
There is a need for more affordable homes, in particular smaller housing that would provide opportunities for downsizing.	Housing policy will seek to ensure that all new housing development assists in the creation of sustainable and inclusive communities through provision of an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure.
<p>There is a need for bungalows for older people.</p> <p>There is a need for housing to rent for younger people for example those who are on low income such as farm workers. Younger people are struggling to stay in the areas.</p>	The Council will seek to maximise the delivery of affordable housing in order to meet locally identified needs. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will be a key piece of evidence for informing housing policy in the Local Plan.
There was concern that the provision of public services need to be considered, particularly schools and health care.	A key planning issue is how to meet the need for additional community facilities arising from planned housing growth and population change. As part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water companies, North Yorkshire County Council highways, NYCC education and the CCG. The input of these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and selection of sites for allocation alongside relevant policies in the new Local Plan.

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Broadband Infrastructure is vital to rural development as well as the availability of 3G and 4G and even just a phone signal in some locations. There is an issue with mobile coverage at Stokesley Business Park and this impacts on business.	Noted.

Table 5.12 Thirsk, 26 January 2016, 7.30pm

Attendance: Thirsk Town Council; Knayton-with-Brawith Parish Council; Carlton Miniott Parish Council; Sutton-under-Whitstonecliffe Parish Council; Sowerby Parish Council; Dalton Parish Council; Borrowby Parish Council.	
Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Ensuring quality of life was highlighted as an issue for consideration. There is a need to ensure that the type and mix of housing reflects the needs of the population and that any housing that is provided includes adequate public open space that is properly planned and designed to encourage social interaction.	Housing policy will seek to ensure that all new housing development assists in the creation of sustainable and inclusive communities through provision of an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (to go to Cabinet shortly) will be a key piece of evidence for informing housing policy in the Local Plan.
Public open space provision for villages was thought important and there were concerns to ensure that good levels of provision were retained.	In terms of open space provision, the Council will be commissioning consultants to undertake a review of the quality and quantity of existing provision and this will identify where additional provision or improvements are needed to support planned housing growth in Hambleton. This will inform the Local Plan in terms of policies and any site allocations.
There was a point made that the objectives of the Plan do not really take account of young people and children.	This feedback will inform the drafting of objectives in the new Local Plan.
Development in some villages will help to keep them sustainable. Small village sites are more attractive to small builders.	This feedback will inform the spatial strategy in the new Local Plan.

Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
Combining some growth in villages with that of the market towns is a good idea.	
Neighbouring authorities' views and the views of the two CCGs need to be taken account of.	As part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water companies, North Yorkshire County Council highways, CCG and neighbouring local authorities. The Council will be undertaking duty to cooperate meetings with these organisations as part of the Local Plan preparation process.
Public transport is an important factor and is limited in some areas.	The Council will work with the County Council to look at options with regards this.
Continuing to plan around the existing spatial approach might mean you get entrenched - is there not some point at which you need to break the pattern?	The Council has not yet identified the spatial strategy for the new Local Plan. This feedback will inform the spatial strategy in the new Local Plan.
Where would the funding come from for the more radical changes to public transport e.g. potential relocation of Thirsk station.	A possible funding source might be the Local Enterprise Partnership. The Council will continue to work closely with North Yorkshire County Council on this matter.
Scattering development across rural areas may be a bad thing if people have then got to rely on cars to get to work.	This feedback will inform the spatial strategy. Limited development in villages would only be considered where this supports social and economic sustainability.
Is the 2014 settlement hierarchy constantly under review?	The Council aims to complete a periodical review of the level of services and facilities in the settlements to inform the settlement hierarchy.

Summary of key issues from public events and parish council meetings

5.12 A number of key issues were raised and discussed at the public drop in sessions and parish council meetings that were held in the five market towns during the Issues and Options consultation. The tables above provide a summary of issues raised at these meetings and an officer response is provided for each of these.

- 5.13** While there was a wide range of issues and topics raised during each of the different meetings and while some of these were specific to a particular market town or its surrounding area, it is possible to identify from these meetings a number of key issues that were common throughout the various discussions and meetings and these are summarised below.

Alternative spatial growth options

- 5.14** While there were some differences in opinion as to which was the most appropriate of the five alternative spatial growth options put forward, a message that came through from the various meetings was that there was recognition that option 4, for development across the five towns and villages, was an approach which would help support the sustainability of villages and this was identified as important. However, there was also a view coming through that any development of new housing in the villages would need to be limited. This was on the basis that the reduction in bus services has increased reliance on the private car in the villages which is thought to give a less sustainable basis for new development. Distribution of new development in proximity to the key transport corridors, which was spatial growth option 2, was also identified in the meetings as being a good option for enabling better connectivity between housing and jobs.

Infrastructure provision

- 5.15** The factor that was mentioned and discussed the most frequently in the meetings was the importance of infrastructure provision and ensuring this is in place before new development comes forward. This covered the full range of infrastructure from roads, drainage and capacity of the sewerage network to services and facilities such as health care provision and schools. There is much concern expressed that new development would come forward before the infrastructure has been provided at the levels required.

Housing type and tenure

- 5.16** A need to increase the supply of smaller homes and the need to increase the supply of affordable homes was often identified in the meetings, specifically, the need to increase the supply of two and three bedroom homes and the supply of bungalows. An increase in supply of this type of housing was identified as being particularly important in the villages to enable older people to downsize and to provide opportunities for younger people to afford to live in the villages, both key to the sustainability of the villages.

Local jobs

- 5.17** The need for quality jobs that will sustain the local workforce and attract younger people to stay or move into the area was a clear message that came through from the meetings.

Protecting Hambleton's landscape

- 5.18** Another key message that came through was that there is a need to balance new development alongside protecting the character of Hambleton, in particular the rural settlements that have special characteristics that should be protected or enhanced. The importance of maintaining the unique identity of the market towns and making the most of tourist opportunities was highlighted.

5.19 The importance of green corridors, biodiversity and public open space within new developments was also something that came through from the meetings.

Response to the consultation documents

5.20 A questionnaire was designed to help provide a structured approach to the on line consultation and to aid responses. A total of 270 responses were received in response to the on line consultation. The key issues identified are summarised in the table below. An officer response is also provided. A summary of the key messages emerging from the on line consultation is provided in the section below the table.

Table 5.13 Q1: Are there any other issues regarding economic growth which you think should be included?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Growth should be centred around existing towns and include provision for walking /cycling whilst ensuring more public transport.</p> <p>An increase in health care provision is required to serve the growing scale of development</p> <p>Further clarification with regard to the forecast of for jobs per annum.</p> <p>local businesses in rural villages are in need of support which includes the provision of fast broadband.</p>	<p>Development will need to demonstrate that it is sustainable within reach of services.</p> <p>The aim of the Local Plan is to allocate sites for a variety of uses and that service providers can plan accordingly to accommodate that growth.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review (GVA, 2014), used the latest economic forecasts available at the time of preparation.</p> <p>Support of rural businesses is noted. The Council's Interim Policy Guidance Note (IPGN) allows for small scale development in villages. Broadband is being improved through the work of NYNET.</p>

Table 5.14 Q2: Are There Any Other Issues Regarding Housing Growth Which you Think Should be Included?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>There is an imbalance of housing types and future development should focus on the provision of small and affordable homes. Any development should be limited to the current boundary limits of the villages and existing in fill development opportunities rather than allowing village creep along the single roads.</p> <p>Consideration is required to protect the landscapes, the historical environment and local identity. Housing growth should not be allowed if it changes features in villages which would detract from their character.</p>	<p>It is noted more explicit explanation for affordable housing this will be set out in the emerging Local Plan. Policies shall be incorporated into the emerging Local Plan to protect the open countryside from inappropriate development. The Affordable Housing SPD sets out guidance for smaller dwellings this will be incorporated into policies within the emerging Local Plan.</p>



Summary of key issues	HDC Response
	<p>The principle of sustainability requires development to be located where it can support services. In the case of affordable housing, this must be located where there is an identified need. The Local Plan will consider this matter further.</p>

Table 5.15 Q3: Are There Any Other Issues Regarding Our Environment Which you Think Should be Included?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>There should be an increase in green spaces to improve the quality of life. Light pollution specifically should be addressed. Along with further consideration is required in terms of protecting development from flooding.</p> <p>The character and integrity of rural villages needs to be maintained and this has been omitted from the local plan. Brownfield sites should be used where possible. Consideration should be given to maintaining the countryside which allows for an increase in development in small villages. There is further concern that additional development would harm the character of the market towns and encourage traffic.</p> <p>In order to maintain our rural landscapes, clear policy decisions need to be made regarding the positioning of renewable energy farms and the exploration and extraction of oil and gas. Providing the extra infrastructure to support the extra population will have a negative impact on the environment.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Recreation development is planned as part of the allocated site at North Northallerton. The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study will identify any further gaps in Northallerton and provide the policies for any requirements as part of the new development. Consider the inclusion of light pollution within development policies. Incorporate sustainable surface water drainage matters into emerging policy.</p> <p>The character and appearance of the built and natural environment will be a key consideration of the emerging Local Plan. Brownfield sites are identified and where appropriate supported for reuse. However, in Hambleton there are insufficient brownfield sites for the delivery of the housing requirement, therefore the development of greenfield land is inevitable.</p> <p>The importance of Hambleton's landscape is recognised and the Landscape Character Assessment will help inform the plan. The process of fracking is beyond the scope of the Local Plan. Planning applications for this type of development will be a North Yorkshire County Council matter.</p>

Table 5.16 Q4a: Are there any other issues regarding improving transport which you think should be included?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Careful consideration in relation to the environmental impact of new industries. More active promotion of biodiversity through appropriate management of road side verges. More cycle lanes needed <input type="checkbox"/> particularly to industrial estates in the edges of town.</p> <p>The timing of the construction of traffic congestion relieving schemes must be in the forefront of any future plan for housing development.</p> <p>Houses should be built with a view to not encouraging commuting. If the housing is built in the villages there will be an increase need for parking spaces in the towns.</p> <p>Good transport links are a fundamental part of rural communities life and wellbeing, good transport provision and links onto the wider highway network are essential for both the business and private sectors of society.</p>	<p>Links between new developments could be provided through good site layout and design at planning application stage.</p> <p>The funding of new infrastructure comes largely from developer contributions. In most cases, developers are unable to fund such works up front as this would make the development unviable.</p> <p>The location of new housing will be considered as part of the emerging Local Plan. Sustainability factors are a key consideration in the plan making process.</p> <p>Connectivity within and between new developments will feature within the policies of the emerging local plan.</p>

Table 5.17 Q5a: Are there any other issues regarding creating better places which you think should be included?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>The 'Creating Better Places' section needs to address the ageing population and the importance of local identity and a quality environment</p> <p>Larger schemes master planning and recreational facilities are to be preferred. Northallerton really needs is a decent sized park to reflect the expanding population.</p> <p>Options for new development should enhance the natural and historic environment. Policies should ensure protection and enhancement of the natural environment.</p>	<p>Noted. Meeting the principles of Secured by Design will be integrated into emerging policies. The needs of an aging population will be considered within the emerging Local Plan including meeting needs through smaller housing including bungalows.</p> <p>Support for growth in towns to accommodate facilities noted as well as good design and enhancement of existing landscape features.</p> <p>The Council is preparing an Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study which will consider the type and location of additional greenspace. Landscape is a key focus of the Local Plan and the emerging document will be informed by the Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Study.</p> <p>These matters will be addressed within the emerging Local Plan.</p>

Table 5.18 Q6: Do you agree with the main topics covered by questions 1 to 5?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Option 1 sought views on development within the Principal Towns Northallerton and Thirsk.</p> <p>Comments received welcomed the Council to consider a range of different spatial options to direct new development as part of the new Local Plan. Further comments noted the good facilities which are available to communities in relation to schools, medical practise and shops.</p> <p>Option 2 sought views on development within the transport corridors the comments received noted that development in this area would reduce the demand on car journeys. Given the travel corridors lie within existing villages and towns this would deliver a sustainable pattern of growth that is dispersed across the District.</p> <p>Option 3 sought views on development in the ‘five towns’ The comments received considered that development within the five towns would capitalises on the current infrastructure and causes minimum disruption to the local villages. In addition would allow new housing for ageing population and to deliver far more affordable housing.</p> <p>Option 4 sought views for development in the ‘five towns and villages’. The comments received relate to the distribution of housing requirements across the full District with lower infrastructure issues and would provide more opportunities</p> <p>Overall it was considered that any option whichever strategy is followed, it should allow the housing requirements to be delivered in a sustainable manner. Furthermore allow for the requirements for all housing types to be delivered in full in the plan period.</p>	<p>The outcome from this consultation resulted in support for all 5 options. Option 4 gains the majority of support closely followed by Option’s 3, 1, 2 then Option 5.</p> <p>All the comments have been noted and shall be considered as part of the on going work within the Local Plan.</p>

Table 5.19 Q7a: Are there any other topics you think should be included within the Local Plan?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>The Local Plan must address climate change, flooding, the design process, the economy, housing, environment, transport and 'places'. It must address protection of green areas, the special character and landscape of Hambleton. The Local Plan also needs to identify how it will deliver efficient and sustainable infrastructure to cope with the expected growing demand.</p>	<p>These matters will be addressed through the Local Plan.</p> <p>The process of fracking is beyond the scope of the Local Plan. Planning applications for this type of development will be a North Yorkshire County Council matter.</p>

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Fight the development of Fracking with all your power. It will have a major impact on Hambleton.</p> <p>Any neighbourhood plan which has been published or is substantially developed must be taken into consideration as the desire of that community, providing it can be shown that full consultation has taken place with the residents.</p>	<p>Whilst public engagement is recognised as having value, a neighbourhood plan does not have status until it has been adopted.</p>

Table 5.20 Q8a: Are there any other issues regarding cross boundary matters which you think should be included?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Existing boundaries to towns and villages should be protected to avoid urban sprawl into green belt and to avoid two urban areas becoming one larger area with no unique identity.</p> <p>There are clear pressures to the north and south of the Council boundaries. Cross boundary pressures suggest that the majority of new housing growth should be centred around the three central market towns of Bedale, Thirsk and Northallerton. Whilst some development could take place in service centres and villages in the north or south, the focus should remain in the central parts of Hambleton.</p> <p>The Local Plan must consider the 'duty to cooperate'.</p> <p>Transport is a cross boundary issue that will also require consideration, particularly in rural settlements where some settlements can perform a service centre role for groups of smaller settlements which may cross the local authority boundary.</p> <p>There are a number of the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Living Landscapes which cross boundaries between Hambleton and neighbouring districts. In addition the planning system support catchment areas of flood control.</p>	<p>The Council works closely with neighbouring authorities to establish cross boundary issues and common themes.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment will inform the number, type and mix of properties needed within Hambleton. The Council will work closely with neighbouring authorities under the duty to cooperate to discuss housing needs on a regular basis.</p> <p>The capacity of the highway network will be informed by traffic modelling work with North Yorkshire County Council. This will inform proposals within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Consider reference to living landscapes and cross boundary flooding matters within the emerging Local Plan.</p>

Table 5.21 Q9a: Do you think the Local Plan vision for Hambleton is correct?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
Concern for the preservation of the quality of life given the adequate infrastructure at the same time as building new homes.	The aim of the emerging Local Plan is to plan for sustainable new development, which means enabling the necessary infrastructure to cater for planned housing growth. The development of sites outside of a Local Plan process does not give sufficient time for infrastructure providers to put measures in place to deal with this. Other towns have had a similar experience to Easingwold in this respect.
The vision should be more ambitious in terms of jobs growth across Hambleton. There should be greater emphasis on the potential for development tourism/visitor economy. The vision should be more positive, ambitious and in accordance with both the NPPF and the Council Plan.	Noted. Consider amendments to the vision.

Table 5.22 Q10a: Is there anything else that you think should be included in the vision?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>There should be greater emphasis on the potential for tourism, furthermore the vision should ensure the character of Hambleton as a rural District is retained.</p> <p>The vision should recognise that villages differ very widely in function, size and sustainability and that some play a significant service role for large parts of Hambleton. The Spatial Vision lacks an aspirational long term vision for rural communities.</p>	<p>Support for local distinctiveness noted. Consider amendments to the vision to incorporate this. The potential for tourism and benefits to the economy are recognised and will be considered within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>It is recognised that villages need to grow appropriately in order to sustain their communities. This will be addressed through the emerging Local Plan.</p>

Table 5.23 Q11a: Do you agree with the objective to support sustainable patterns of development across and beyond Hambleton?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
The rural communities need protecting from haphazard planning developments. Development should concentrate on Thirsk and Northallerton.	The principle of sustainable development is set out in the National Planning Policy

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>The new approach needs to refocus on providing sustainable development in areas which can be achieved through small scale or phased schemes to provide the housing required.</p> <p>It is not possible to endorse these broad objectives without a more detailed spatial strategy being exposed. The existing Core Strategy spatial strategy is a sound one which leads towards more sustainable outcomes than previously was the case. Concentration of development in key locations will achieve the most sustainable outcome.</p>	<p>Framework. The comments related to development are noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Table 5.24 Q12a: Do you agree with the objective to promote sustainable and resilient economic growth and infrastructure improvements?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Economic growth and infrastructure improvements should also consider flexibility in economic growth and diversification in rural locations which embraces a wide range of alternative employment generating developments.</p> <p>There is a definite shortage of affordable housing for over 65's who wish to downsize without incurring expensive.</p> <p>There is support for the objective to promote sustainable and resilient economic growth and improvements to infrastructure that reflects the needs and requirements within the District. We generally consider that a range of sustainably accessible business premises within the District would help to retain jobs and reduce the need to travel further afield. Therefore this would contribute towards a reduction in travel and the level of congestion and helping to ensure that existing capacity issues on transport infrastructure are not exacerbated by new development.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment will inform the housing need for Hambleton. There is a recognised need for smaller homes for first time buyers and older people.</p> <p>These matters will be addressed within the emerging Local Plan.</p>

Table 5.25 Q13a: Do you agree with the objective to provide a scale and mix of housing to meet the diverse needs of the entire community and support the local economy?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>In the District's villages there should be some small scale new housing development which will provide small extensions to existing developments and provide rural housing without compromising the character and local environment of the villages. The development sites should not be restricted under this objective to provide an element of affordable housing which would make the site undeliverable within</p>	<p>Development within the lower order settlements and the provision of affordable housing will be considered as part of the emerging Local Plan.</p>



Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>the plan period; this could tip the scale of the economic viability of many sites. Sites proposing up to 5 dwellings should have no affordable housing requirement at all.</p> <p>There is support for the Council’s identified objective in respect of new housing development on account that it specifically identifies the role of the delivery of new homes as a driver to stimulate economic growth, and the creation of jobs. However, believe that reference should be made to the ability of residential developments to enhance the District’s natural and built environment.</p> <p>These representations wholly support this key housing objective. This objective seeks to address the housing needs for the entire District and underpin the local economy. This includes meeting the needs of the communities across the District for both market and affordable housing. There must be range of sites to accommodate large strategic housing sites and smaller developable sites appropriate to smaller settlements. These objectives can only be met through the identification of sites which are deliverable, viable and sustainable.</p>	<p>High quality design and sustainability will be a key feature of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Table 5.26 Q14: Do You Agree With the Objective to Improve Access Between Homes, Jobs and Facilities and Support Choice as to How People Travel?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>In a District as rural as Hambleton having bus services to gain access to employment and services is no longer available or viable, therefore expecting everyone to travel by public transport is impossible in todays climate of reduction of bus services.</p> <p>Access should improvements are integral with any development and that the improvements are installed in a timely manner relative to the housing developments. Allowing housing developments to take place without commitment to improve access must not be entertained.</p> <p>Cycling and public transport should be prioritised to avoid increased car usage that will affect ability to deliver Objective 5.</p>	<p>It is recognised that the bus services are declining and less emphasis has to be placed upon them in terms of defining sustainable development.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Table 5.27 Q15: Do you agree with the objective to protect and enhance the qualities and heritage of our settlements, countryside and wildlife habitats?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Avoid large scale housing industrial sites in village areas. Maintain a kind of green belt farming countryside where practical and develop green parklands in the larger developing towns as part of the long term plan.</p> <p>Green field sites are threatened and Brompton particularly is in danger of losing its identity as an ancient village. The village is in danger of becoming a suburb of Northallerton? The Brompton Gap was at one time protected with reassurances that building would not occur there and now we are faced with a link road and associated development.</p> <p>Heritage is being swamped with new type houses and nothing unique to distinguish one town from another is being created. Developers provide the bare minimum of green space they can get away with. Budgets for new public parks is non existent. It should also seek to retain and reinforce those aspects which make the District distinctive. Therefore it is suggested that this Objective is amended to read: "To safeguard and reinforce those elements which contribute to the distinct character of Hambleton including its heritage assets, landscapes and wildlife"</p>	<p>Policies within the emerging Local Plan will protect the character of the open countryside. An Open Space Study will inform the location and accessibility of recreation space</p> <p>It is important that spaces between settlements are maintained. Whilst development is planned to the north of Northallerton, a gap will be retained between the two settlements. The character of Brompton is important and listed buildings and Conservation Area are to be protected and enhanced. Work on the character of Service Villages is being undertaken to inform the Local Plan.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Consider rewording of the objective to read "To safeguard and reinforce those elements which contribute to the distinct character of Hambleton including its heritage assets, landscapes and wildlife".</p> <p>Consider wording and format within emerging Local Plan.</p>

Table 5.28 Q16a: Do you agree with the objective to sustain towns and villages as healthy, inclusive and vibrant hubs for local communities and a changing population?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>It is essential that significant new housing is only built where the local infrastructure and services can cope. This means excluding large scale development in the villages, which would ruin their distinctive character.</p> <p>Villages and towns need to see development spread more evenly to maintain services in as many locations as possible making village shops, pubs, interest groups etc viable.</p>	<p>Support for dispersed development noted.</p> <p>It is likely that the emerging Local Plan will use a criteria based policy as opposed to rigid development limits which will enable the flexibility of settlements and appropriate development.</p>



Table 5.29 Q17a: Are there any other objectives you think we should include?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>These representations support this sustainable approach in principle, provided that the development limits/ boundaries of these towns and villages are not drawn too tightly or policies worded too inflexibly; stifling the growth of these sustainable locations.</p> <p>One objective should be economic viability. housing development should be in locations where with adequate public transport connections.</p> <p>A broader and longer term view of development trends needs to accompany the Local Plan in the form of long term vision that addresses not only housing and employment growth, but considers future trends in retail, flood and surface water management and sport and recreation facilities.</p> <p>There is no reference to focusing on specific towns or areas within the District. The generic nature of the vision and objectives will make it difficult to measure the success and accountability of the Vision and Objectives within the New Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These matters will be addressed within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The wording of the vision will be reviewed as part of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment will inform the housing need for Hambleton.</p>

Table 5.30 Q18: Do you think the Local Plan annual housing figure should be higher or lower and why?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>What is the evidence that this level of housing is needed. If this level of housing is justified for the area it should be spread across the whole area and not adding to the current town sprawls.</p> <p>Need to ensure that housing type is appropriate with focus on smaller houses for families and appropriate housing for the elderly close to services and with transport links.</p> <p>This should be demand lead if the infrastructure is in place before the figure is set. It has got to be flexible depending on capacity and jobs created. 50% affordable housing is good as hopefully will keep local jobs and develop more local industrial sites.</p> <p>Any housing figure in the plan must be expressed as a minimum and must significantly boost the supply of housing In the light of the above we consider that the Local Plan annual housing figure needs to be significantly higher than the 350-450 range suggested</p>	<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment will inform the number, type and mix of properties needed within Hambleton.</p>

Table 5.31 Q19: Development Options - Option 1 - Principal Towns

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Major new developments to the north of Thirsk and south of Northallerton would work better than trying to manufacture schemes or new towns requiring substantial new infrastructure and local services in place of certainty and planning gain. Development should be forced to the centre of the District to discourage excess outward commuting where there is a base of existing infrastructure; health services; retail opportunities; education facilities and efficient sustainable transport links. Developments should instead be focused with a radius of travel time from the major transport junction/stations and existing services and no area of opportunity need be defined.</p> <p>The two largest towns have all the necessary infrastructure, transport links and employment. The towns are already well developed and it would not change the character of the towns if well planned. Starter homes and single/small family homes would be easily integrated within the development and the people who live in them would not be isolated for work, schools, hospitals and shopping. It would further enhance the towns as shopping centres for the town and surrounding towns and villages. This would not exclude appropriate development in other towns and villages when the need arises. No option should be chosen on the basis that developers can make a profit by building houses when there is no demand or need on any plot of land that they can buy. This option allows for future variations.</p> <p>The best Option is concentration on the Principal Towns of Northallerton and Thirsk. The perceived weakness derived from the existing plan in respect of delivery is misplaced. The existing plan sought to attach housing provision to infrastructure financing and delivery. That approach has undermined the imposition of those development obligations.</p>	<p>Support for Option 1 noted.</p>

Table 5.32 Q19: Development Options - Option 2 - Central Transport Corridors

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>The appeal of living in Northallerton is partly due to it's rural charm, if it becomes industrialised it would lose it's character and appeal. Hence people have to have good transport links to commute to their workplace.</p> <p>Major new developments on the north of Thirsk and south of Northallerton would work better than trying to manufacture schemes or new towns. Development should be forced to the centre of the District to discourage excess outward commuting where there is a base of existing infrastructure, services and efficient sustainable transport links. The area of restraint should be substantially expanded to abut the north and west of Northallerton and south and east of Thirsk and within the expanded area of restraint policies can control new housing scale, type and tenure and scale and nature</p>	<p>Noted.</p>



Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>of employment space/target markets. Developments should instead be focused with a radius of travel time from the major transport junction/stations and existing services and no area of opportunity need be defined.</p> <p>Option 2 proposes to focus development on settlements that are linked to the main transport corridors and connections in Hambleton. Whilst the focus on existing large settlements, such as Northallerton is supported, the increased focus on smaller settlements is not supported. Although transport connections are an important consideration in planning future sustainable development, this is not the only consideration. The availability and accessibility to services within settlement is a significant consideration. The Issues and Options document acknowledges that option 2 would increase the need to travel to facilities in larger towns and that it would also result in the significant expansion of small villages with limited facilities. This approach would conflict with the core planning principles of NPPF.</p>	

Table 5.33 Q19: Development Options - Option 3 - Five Towns

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>New housing for ageing population and to deliver far more affordable housing. The five towns already have the basic infrastructure to accommodate growth.</p> <p>This option spreads development more evenly across the District and should lead to the improvement of infrastructures, facilities, amenities and access in those areas. Planning approvals must incorporate, as a mandatory condition, that such improvements are incorporated in the development.</p> <p>In needy rural areas already having to travel to larger towns for all our shopping and work and admin needs. It would be preferred if all 5 towns to be further developed and to have similar facilities in them so that local towns are used for everything, thereby cutting down on time, fuel and other expenditure.</p> <p>This approach therefore proposes that all of the five towns have an equal role in meeting the growth needs for the District, rather than the current approach which focusses the majority of development in Northallerton and Thirsk. This appears to offer a pragmatic approach that recognises the development pressure on Northallerton and Thirsk and therefore seeks to equitably redistribute the growth needs to settlements that are all of such a scale that they have an existing level of infrastructure in place and are better able to accommodate further development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Support for Option 3 noted along with comments regarding the equal development of the market towns and the potential large scale expansion of Bedale.</p>

Table 5.34 Q19: Development Options - Option 4 - Five Towns Villages

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Development should be shared and not concentrated on any one place. But needs to be proportionate and take into consideration how much growth there has been already.</p> <p>Option 4 is the most suitable, flexible and robust spatial strategy of the five suggested. The previous LDF sought to concentrate development in the main towns supplemented with limited new housing development in certain of the larger villages, leaving many smaller settlements without the prospect of a proportionate level of new housing development to help support local shops and services in smaller villages with the inevitable adverse effect on the vitality and viability of these settlements even when there was a delay in delivering housing in the main towns</p> <p>Option 4 would focus development on the five market towns and a range of villages. This approach is not supported as it would not focus the majority of development on the most sustainable locations within the District, increasing the level of development taking place in more remote rural areas. The strategic approach proposed in option 4 would increase the need to travel to the larger towns to access services and facilities and is therefore contrary to the core planning principles of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Support for five towns and villages noted.</p> <p>Support for Option 4 noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Table 5.35 Q19: Development Options - Option 5 - New Settlements

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>New settlements only work where there is a very high housing requirement to support the size needed to be sustainable, and at the same allow development elsewhere across a District. Also, they have long lead in times and struggle to provide choice of location when set against a District housing need.</p> <p>This is the only option that avoids excessive pressure on the facilities and services available in existing towns given that the capacity of existing facilities and services is finite. Allowance for increasing future demand by a growing population can be built into the planning of new settlements at the outset, avoiding the sort of unoptimised additional capacity which can blight existing towns. New settlements can be designed to be self-sufficient in terms of the necessary facilities and services, minimising miles travelled by the local population.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Support for Option 5 noted.</p>

Table 5.36 Q20: Are there other approaches to allocating development you think we should consider?

Summary of key issues	HDC Response
<p>Any 'new settlement' development should be limited to the use of redundant MoD land and should not encroach on open countryside</p> <p>The allocation of development needs to respond to local need. The provision of homes for the actual and future inhabitants of the District who add to the economic vibrancy and success of the District through employment and investment in local services, wealth creation and jobs is paramount.</p> <p>The current approach to housing distribution is founded on an assessment of sustainability, and this is reflected by one of the emerging Local Plan's objectives to continue to "support sustainable patterns of development across and beyond Hambleton". As such, the focus for new housing development should continue to be towards principal centres where there is access to jobs and services (within these towns and beyond). The overall spatial distribution will however be dictated by housing requirements and capacity of accommodating these requirements within existing settlements. Defining the spatial distribution prior to establishing the housing requirements is therefore premature.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Summary of key issues from the consultation documents

5.21 Respondents had the opportunity to respond to 20 different questions via the online consultation form. A summary of the key messages emerging is provided below. The officer response to the points raised is not provided in the section below.

5.22 The first five questions covered the themes of:

- Economic growth;
- Housing growth;
- Environment;
- Transport; and
- Creating better places.

5.23 Respondents were asked whether there were other issues that have not been addressed in the Issues and Options Consultation document in relation to each of these themes. Additional issues were identified for each theme and these are set out below.

Economic growth

5.24 In terms of economic growth, other key issues included the view that growth should be centred around existing towns; an increase in healthcare provision is required; local businesses in rural villages are in need of support and further clarification was sought on economic growth data, such as a forecast of jobs per annum.

Housing growth

- 5.25** For housing growth, other key issues included the view that there is need for more small and affordable homes and that new housing developments should not detract from the character of the location and landscape.

Environment

- 5.26** In terms of environment, other key issues include the view that the character and integrity of rural villages and rural landscapes needs to be maintained; the importance of green spaces on quality of life is identified and flood prevention.

Transport

- 5.27** Other key issues for transport included the need to plan to address traffic congestion and implement required mitigation; to ensure the location of new development minimises the need for commuting and the need to plan for good transport links including sustainable modes of transport.

Creating better places

- 5.28** In terms of creating better places, other key issues identified included the need to masterplan larger schemes so that they would incorporate open space and recreational facilities; the importance of local identity and protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment and also the need to plan for an ageing population.

Other topics

- 5.29** The questionnaire asked respondents if they agree with the main topics covered in the document and asked if there were any other topics that should be addressed in the Local Plan. Additional topics highlighted as being particularly important included climate change, flooding and design.

Cross boundary matters

- 5.30** There was also a question about other issues regarding cross boundary matters that should be addressed by the Local Plan. There was nothing of significance raised that was not already identified in the consultation document.

Local Plan Vision

- 5.31** When asked about the vision for the Local Plan the main message was that the vision should be more ambitious in terms of jobs growth; that there should be greater emphasis on the potential for tourism and also greater emphasis on ensuring the character of Hambleton is retained.

Sustainable development

- 5.32** Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the objectives around sustainable development. The main message was that there is a need for more detail on the spatial strategy before respondents can comment effectively.

Housing mix

5.33 There is general support for the objective around scale and mix of housing.

Connectivity

5.34 Respondents were asked if they agreed with the objective relating to improving access between homes, jobs and facilities. The emphasis is placed on the need to promote and enable sustainable modes of transport while noting that the Local Plan needs to acknowledge the loss of bus services in rural areas and that there is reliance on the private car which is difficult to avoid.

Heritage and landscape

5.35 A question asked respondents if they agreed with the objective relating to protecting and enhancing the heritage of settlements and the landscape. The need to protect and enhance the identity of settlements and landscape was raised as well as the need to avoid large scale development in villages.

Towns and villages

5.36 In relation to sustaining towns and villages as healthy, inclusive and vibrant hubs respondents identified the need to avoid large scale development in villages as a key point. Enabling some development in villages is identified as key to their sustainability.

Local Plan objectives

5.37 A question asked respondents if there were any other objectives the Local Plan should include. General support for the objectives within representations was made. It is noted that the vision and objectives need to be more detailed to enable success to be measured.

Housing need

5.38 Respondents were asked about whether the Local Plan annual housing figure should be higher or lower. It was suggested that the annual housing figure should be higher than the range given in the consultation document and that there should be a requirement for 50% affordable.

Spatial growth option

5.39 Respondents were also asked to indicate which spatial option they prefer. The online consultation resulted in some support for all five spatial growth options. However, option 4 gained the majority of support with 70% of respondents supporting it, closely followed by option 3, option 1 and 2, in that order. Option 5 gained the least support.

Addressing issues raised

5.40 The initial response to issues raised is included above in the form of an officer response. The issues raised will be considered and addressed in the Preferred Options consultation.

6 Preferred Options

- 6.1** The Preferred Options document is a key stage of the Local Plan preparation. Although not a statutory stage for consultation, it set out the Council's preferred spatial approach and preferred policy approach for the emerging Local Plan and the Council felt it important to consult on this. The Preferred Options document identified a range of preferred sites for housing and employment which provided options for land allocations to meet the growth needs of Hambleton up to 2035.
- 6.2** This was a key stage in the Local Plan process, however, following the Preferred Options consultation, more work including work around viability and further evidence gathering was undertaken to confirm the eligibility of the proposed sites and to inform the Publication version of the Local Plan.
- 6.3** The Preferred Options consultation document was published for a 6 week period of public consultation between 31st October and 5pm on 12th December 2016. It consisted of a two part document, Part 1 containing the preferred policies, the vision and objectives; Part 2 setting out options for where development could take place and how much. The consultation aimed to gain feedback on the preferred policies and whether consultees agreed with the preferred policy approach as well as the options for preferred sites.
- 6.4** A questionnaire was devised to help aid responses to the consultation. The questions asked whether the correct strategy had been chosen as the preferred option and whether they agreed with the preferred development site options. If they did not agree, they were asked to give reasons why not. There was also an opportunity for the submission of further sites if they felt these would result in a better option for future development.

Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment

- 6.5** As part of the Preferred Options consultation, the Council also consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of Preferred Options and the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening Report.
- 6.6** The SA report set out the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Preferred Options for the new Local Plan. The purpose of the report was to ensure that Sustainability Appraisal is integrated into decisions on the preferred options for the Local Plan. The report provided:
- an assessment of spatial options against the Sustainability Objectives;
 - an assessment of preferred policy options against the Sustainability Objectives; and
 - an assessment of preferred site allocations against the Sustainability Objectives.
- 6.7** In terms of the Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report, this comprised Stage 1 of the HRA process and provided screening for the likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites. The report was consulted on at Preferred Options stage.
- 6.8** There were three consultation responses received in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal of Preferred Options as part of the Preferred Options consultation. These are shown in the tables below alongside an officer response:

Table 6.1 Comments from the Environment Agency

Comment	HDC response
<p>Additional documents recommended for inclusion in the contextual review are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northumbria River Basin Management Plan • The Ouse Catchment Flood Management Plan • The Tees Catchment Flood Management Plan • North Yorkshire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy • Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy. <p>The RBMPs should be reviewed for locally specific information, such as individual waterbody status and relevant mitigation measures that the local authority and developers should consider implementing.</p>	<p>The scope of the SA will be updated to include the suggested plans, programmes and policies.</p>
<p>The scores summarised in Appendix 4 do not match those outlined in the full assessment in Appendix 7. It appears that the sustainability appraisal objectives have been incorrectly numbered along the top of the site summary table.</p> <p>For clarity and ease of reference it would be useful if the summary tables included a key word (biodiversity, climate change etc.) to describe each SA objective rather than just referring to a number.</p>	<p>When the SA Report is being prepared, the relevant appendices will be amended to reflect the issues identified. The tables will also be updated so that it is easier to identify the nature of the SA Objectives.</p>

Table 6.2 Comments from Natural England

Comment	HDC response
<p>Natural England welcomes the range of international, national, regional and local environmental material reviewed. However, a range of further documents are suggested for inclusion in the contextual review of plans, programmes and policies.</p>	<p>Suggested documents will be included within the contextual review as appropriate.</p>
<p>Designations</p> <p>Consider all designated sites within and outside of the District and identify their conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Designated sites will be identified and mapped.</p>
<p>Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) identify the local action needed to deliver UK targets for habitats and species. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of local importance and can provide a useful blueprint for</p>	<p>Local Biodiversity Action Plans will be included within the scope of the plan.</p>

Comment	HDC response
<p>biodiversity enhancement in any particular area. Local Geodiversity Action Plans (LGAPS) identify agreed local action for geodiversity.</p>	
<p>Baseline data</p> <p>Baseline conditions for ecological networks and green infrastructure should reference local Green Infrastructure strategies.</p>	<p>No local strategies have been identified. A green infrastructure / Green Corridor map will be inserted into the SA Report in the relevant section.</p>
<p>A provisional Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) map is on Magic, however, we advise that this data is not sufficiently accurate for use in assessment of individual sites. You should ensure that sufficient site specific ALC survey data is available to inform decision making. For example, where no reliable information is available, it would be reasonable to expect that developers to commission a new ALC survey, for any sites they wished to put forward for consideration in the Local Plan. Some areas already have detailed ALC maps.</p>	<p>A map of provisional Agricultural Land Classification will be provided. There are no detailed local studies. Should it be considered appropriate such studies could be commissioned by the Council (for example, if there is a considerable loss of Grade 1, 2 or 3a land / to determine whether grade 2 land is 3a or 3b)</p>
<p>Climate change is welcomed as a sustainability topic; we advise you make reference to the following works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England’s National biodiversity climate change vulnerability model which provides a spatially explicit assessment of the relative vulnerability of priority habitats • The Climate Change Adaptation Manual which provides evidence to support nature conservation in a changing climate • The LWEC Climate Change Impacts Report Cards which present the latest evidence on how climate change is affecting different aspects of our environment, economy and society. 	<p>The documents will be included within the contextual review.</p>
<p>National Character Areas and local landscape character assessments should be considered key baseline information. As part of the evidence base we also suggest you make reference to the relevant protected landscape management plans. The nationally important Cleveland Way national trail should also be considered.</p>	<p>Map of national character areas will be prepared.</p> <p>Cleveland Way will be identified as an important area of landscape character and tranquillity.</p>

Comment	HDC response
In terms of its landscape and visual amenity. With regards to areas of tranquillity you may find it helpful to refer to the work undertaken by the CPRE which includes mapping.	Noted.
<p>The SA Framework</p> <p>The SA Framework should be updated (if necessary) to reflect any updates to the scope of the SA arising as a result of a wider contextual review and (re)establishing the baseline position. In addition, the following suggestions are made.</p>	We will amend to include additional prompt for SA Objective 9: <i>'Will the option / policy ensure good access to open space and the natural environment?'</i> .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Population and human health</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of 'loss/gain of open space and other facilities' as an indicator for human health; this should be reflected in the prompts section of Appendix 3 by a question relating to access to nature.</p> 	Prompt will be amended as follows under SA Objective 1: <i>Will the option / policy help to protect and strengthen ecological networks?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Material assets</p> <p>The decision aiding questions should include indicators to improve the provision of natural greenspace. We also advise that assessment questions ensure current ecological networks are not compromised, and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced.</p> 	<i>Access to open space, green infrastructure covered by SA 1 and SA5.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Cultural heritage and landscape</p> <p>The decision making questions should address the setting of protected landscapes as well as the protected areas themselves.</p> 	Will amend prompts for SA8: <i>'Will designated landscapes and their settings be protected and enhanced?'</i> .

Table 6.3 Comments from Historic England

Comment	HDC response
<p>Scoping Report</p> <p>Generally, in terms of the historic environment, we consider that the Report has identified the majority of plans and programmes and the key sustainability issues which are likely to be of relevance to the development of the Local Plan. We believe that it has established an appropriate baseline together with a reasonable set of objectives against which to monitor the likely significant effects of the Plan. Therefore, we consider that it sets out the basis for an appropriate framework against which to assess the potential impact which the Policies and proposals of the Plan might have upon the historic environment. The following suggestions are made:</p>	Data will be refreshed to latest available.

Comment	HDC response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be preferable to use the most up-to-date information on Heritage at Risk in the District. Reference to “<i>Parks and Gardens of historic or landscape interest</i>” ought to be amended to read:- “<i>locally-designated parks and gardens of historic or landscape importance</i>”. In relation to the cultural heritage and landscape indicator (appendix 2) it would be preferable to amend this to read:- “<i>Reduction in the number of designated heritage assets identified as being at risk on the ‘Heritage at Risk Register’</i>” 	
<p>Appendix 3, SEA Topic Cultural Heritage:</p> <p>It is suggested that the first Objective is amended to read:- <i>“To preserve and, where appropriate, enhance...”</i></p> <p>The prompts ought to read as follows: “Will the option/Policy preserve or enhance designated heritage assets?” “Will the option/Policy preserve or enhance non-designated heritage assets?”</p>	<p>Wording of objectives and prompts will be reviewed.</p>
<p>Appendix 3, SEA Topic Cultural Heritage, Indicators:</p> <p>The following indicators are suggested: <i>“Numbers of each type of designated heritage asset”</i> <i>“Reduction in the number of designated heritage assets identified as being at risk on the ‘Heritage at Risk Register’ ”</i></p>	<p>Wording will be reviewed.</p>
<p>Preferred Options SA Report</p> <p>At this stage in the preparation of the plan, we would broadly concur with the assessment of the likely significant effects which the Policies and proposals put forward in the Preferred Options Consultation would be likely to have upon the historic environment and, where harm has been identified, would endorse the mitigation measures proposed.</p> <p>In our response to the Plan we have identified where we consider that further evaluation is necessary in order to demonstrate that the Allocation of these sites is consistent with national policy guidance for the conservation of the historic environment. We would expect that the SA will be reviewed and updated to reflect the conclusions of this more detailed evaluation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Appendix 6, Spatial Strategy for Other Settlements: SA Objective 8</p>	<p>Noted.</p>



Comment	HDC response
<p>The use of Development Limits in previous versions of the Local Plan has assisted users of the document to clearly identify where development will, or will not, be permitted. It has helped to ensure that development was directed to those areas which are best related to the form and character of the settlement. As such it has also helped to safeguard the landscape setting of these settlements and the surrounding countryside of Hambleton by identifying where the Policies for the protection of the countryside apply. A criteria-based Policy is likely to make this less clear to the decision-maker and, as a result, potentially harm Hambleton's landscapes.</p> <p>Consequently, the use of development limits is more likely to have a positive impact against SA Objective 8 than the Preferred Option in that it is more likely to safeguard the landscapes of the District.</p>	

- 6.9 There were no responses in respect of the Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report as part of the Preferred Options consultation.
- 6.10 The draft final Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment will be published alongside the Publication version of the Local Plan.
- 6.11 At Preferred Options stage, the Council also consulted on two further documents that formed part of the evidence base. These were the Settlement Character Studies and the Draft Northallerton, Brompton and Romanby Landscape and Open Space Study.

Approach to consultation

- 6.12 A wide range of publicity was undertaken to promote the Preferred Options consultation and during the consultation a number of consultation events were held.
- 6.13 In terms of the Sustainability Appraisal of Preferred Options, in accordance with the statutory requirements the three Strategic Environmental Assessment bodies were engaged with and consulted (Historic England, Environment Agency and Natural England) alongside other consultees as part of the Preferred Options consultation exercise.
- 6.14 A summary of the publicity used at Preferred Options stage is provided below.

Table 6.4 Summary of publicity

Dates	Publicity
5 th and 6 th October 2016	Email to all consultees notifying them of dates of consultation and schedule of consultation events, also providing a link to the new Objective consultation portal.
Start of October 2016	Article on Council's home page of the website and new Local Plan microsite launched to advertise consultation.

Dates	Publicity
31 st October 2016	Email sent to all consultees to confirm start of consultation and schedule of consultation events.
20 th / 21 st October 2016	Publicity information sent to parish councils for display on notice boards
20 th / 21 st October 2016	Consultee letter sent to consultees without email address notifying them of consultation dates and consultation events schedule.
w/c 24 th October 2016	Publicity information sent to Council area offices, District libraries, leisure centres and business centres (Evolution and Springboard) for display on notice boards. Displayed also in Civic Centre customer service area.
w/c 24 th October 2016	Email alerts sent to businesses on Council business network consultation databases. Article in Business newsletter and twitter account for business forums advertising consultation.
w/c 24 th October 2016	Article in Council Talk newsletter for members advertising the consultation.
w/c 24 th October 2016	Press release in newspapers (sent to D&S, Northern Echo, Advertiser, North Yorkshire News, Yorkshire Post, Evening Press, Evening Gazette and Easingwold Advertiser).

6.15 The Preferred Options document was prepared following consultation on the Issues and Options document and the Call for Sites. However, further duty to cooperate meetings held in April / May 2016 and an additional meeting held in October 2016 also informed the preparation of the Preferred Options document.

6.16 The schedule of duty to cooperate meetings which took place in April/ May 2016, a summary of issues discussed at the meetings and emerging strategic issues are shown in the tables below.

Table 6.5 Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council: 27.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
Scale and location of any additional housing growth in Hambleton would be important in determining whether there would be a cross boundary issue with Redcar and Cleveland.	Some concern from Redcar and Cleveland Council that a strategy that includes housing allocations of any scale in the northern part	This will inform the spatial strategy for new development in the new Local Plan.



<p>Additional housing growth in northern part of Hambleton District could cause issues in terms of attracting working age population from Redcar and Cleveland into Hambleton.</p> <p>No cross boundary issues known at this time with regards to retail.</p> <p>Redcar and Cleveland council currently commissioning Employment Land Review. The need to deallocate employment land is anticipated.</p> <p>Any significant uplift in employment growth in Hambleton District could cause issues in terms of attracting working age population from Redcar and Cleveland into Hambleton.</p> <p>The possibility of a new settlement is something that both councils have considered as a potential option in future Local Plans. The Councils will maintain dialogue with regards to this.</p> <p>No other cross boundary issues known at this time.</p>	<p>of Hambleton District would have potential to draw working age population away from Redcar and Cleveland borough.</p> <p>Likewise, there was some concern that any significant uplift in employment growth in Hambleton District could cause issues in terms of attracting working age population from Redcar and Cleveland into Hambleton.</p> <p>The possibility of a new settlement is something that both councils have considered as a potential option in future Local Plans. The Councils will maintain dialogue with regards to this.</p> <p>No other cross boundary issues known at this time.</p>	<p>This will be achieved through further duty to cooperate meetings with local authority partners.</p>
--	--	--

Table 6.6 Stockton on Tees Borough Council: 18.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
<p>The meeting was an opportunity for each Council to provide an update on progress made towards preparing their respective Local Plans.</p> <p>Cross boundary issues did not seem to form part of the meeting.</p>	<p>Strategic cross boundary issues were discussed at previous duty to cooperate meeting held prior to the Issues and Options consultation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Table 6.7 Middlesbrough Borough Council: 25.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
<p>A range of issues were discussed.</p>	<p>Agreed to continue dialogue</p>	<p>Agreed to continue dialogue.</p>

Table 6.8 Richmondshire District Council: 19.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
<p>In terms of housing, the following cross boundary linkages were identified:</p> <p>It was recognised that there is some need for additional housing development in some of the smaller villages. Reference was made to North Cowton in Richmondshire which it was suggested does well for housing numbers and comparison was made to East Cowton which has struggled.</p> <p>It was suggested that dialogue between the councils is important with regards to the Ministry of Defence (MOD) decommissioning of sites which may become available for housing. Some sites such as Topcliffe are in proximity to the Richmondshire boundary.</p> <p>There is cross boundary movements of population where military sites are concerned such as Catterick, Topcliffe and Linton. However, each council intend to meet housing need within their own plan areas.</p> <p>In terms of health, the following cross boundary linkages were identified:</p> <p>There was suggestion that Catterick Primary Care Plus could potentially provide a range of medical services for people in surrounding areas, such as Bedale and that this could reduce traffic to the Friarage in Northallerton.</p> <p>Commuting patterns between the two local authority areas were identified:</p> <p>Movement of population between the districts is inevitable and recent infrastructure improvements such as the Bedale and Leeming Bar Relief road and A1 upgrade will improve journey times and potentially increase commuting between the authority areas.</p> <p>In terms of retail, leisure and tourism, the following cross boundary linkages were identified:</p> <p>Scotch Corner retail park has been a long term allocation in Richmondshire and presents potential for cross boundary implications.</p> <p>Cinema development at Catterick Garrison will cater for needs of Bedale and hinterland as well as some of Hambleton to north west.</p> <p>Catterick Garrison leisure centre draws visitors from Bedale area.</p>	<p>A number of cross boundary linkages were identified in the meeting.</p> <p>However, it is considered that there are no strategic cross boundary issues of significance at this point in time.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
<p>It was suggested that Bedale tends to relate to Wensleydale more than it does to Hambleton. The Bedale and Leeming Bar relief road introduces better links to the Dales.</p> <p>In terms of tourism, it was acknowledged that Richmondshire and Hambleton councils share the Wensleydale Railway. It was agreed that better links with Northallerton station could add to the success of the railway and surrounding areas through improving the east west tourism link.</p>		

Table 6.9 Harrogate Borough Council: 20.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
It was established that both Councils are able to meet their housing need within their own boundaries.	No strategic cross boundary issues were identified at this point in time.	Noted.

Table 6.10 North Yorkshire County Council: 28.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
A range of issues were discussed.	Agreed to continue dialogue.	Agreed to continue dialogue.

Table 6.11 Historic England: 05.05.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
The meeting provided an opportunity to consider how the significance of the historic environment and wider landscape is addressed within the new Local Plan.	No strategic cross boundary issues were identified at this point in time.	Noted.

Table 6.12 Ministry of Defence (MOD) - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO): 29.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
MOD noted that there is a commitment for the MOD to make an announcement in spring / summer 2016 about which MOD sites are likely to be released for development. However, it was noted that the MOD is unlikely to know	It was acknowledged that if any MOD sites become available in Hambleton, they could contribute to housing delivery within Hambleton in the long term.	This will inform planning policy in the new Local Plan.

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
<p>the outcome of the review prior to the preparation of the emerging Local Plan document.</p> <p>It was noted that the government has given the MOD high housing targets for sites that become available for development. Therefore it was acknowledged that if any MOD sites become available in Hambleton, they could contribute to housing delivery within Hambleton in the long term.</p> <p>In order to deal with the uncertainty at this stage regarding MOD sites within Hambleton, it was suggested that a flexible policy option around MOD sites was required in the new Local Plan.</p>	<p>However, in order to deal with the uncertainty at this stage regarding MOD sites within Hambleton, it was suggested that a flexible policy option around MOD sites was required in the new Local Plan.</p>	

Table 6.13 Easingwold GP practice and York Teaching Hospital: 21.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
A range of issues were discussed.	Agreed to continue dialogue.	Agreed to continue dialogue.

Table 6.14 Natural England: 28.04.16

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
<p>This meeting involved Yorkshire Wildlife Trust, Natural England, Environment Agency and Hambleton District Council.</p>	<p>No strategic cross boundary issues were identified at this point in time.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Council will continue to consult with each of the organisations participating in the meeting, as part of the ongoing consultation during the preparation of the draft policies, Sustainability Appraisal and site assessments.</p>	<p>This will be achieved as part of future consultation stages and ongoing dialogue with statutory partners.</p>

6.17 Other organisations involved in duty to cooperate meetings:

- Darlington Borough Council
- York City Council

6.18 For the additional duty to cooperate meeting held in Northallerton on 21.10.16 there were representatives from North York Moors National Park Authority; North Yorkshire County Council; Natural England; York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and Ryedale District Council. A summary of the issues discussed at the meeting and emerging strategic issues are provided in the table below.

Table 6.15 Summary of issues and emerging strategic issues

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
The representative from the LEP noted that the LEP supports the growth aspirations as reflected in the housing and employment growth figures. They noted that allocations along the A1 and A19 corridor would support LEP work.	The LEP supports housing and employment growth aspirations in the emerging Local Plan. The LEP noted allocations along the A1 and A19 corridor would support LEP work.	The Council will continue to seek to ensure that the growth strategy in the Local Plan aligns with LEP strategy.
North Yorkshire County Council confirmed support for the growth aspirations.	North Yorkshire County Council confirmed support for the growth aspirations.	The Council will continue to work with the County Council during the preparation of the Local Plan.
It was noted that the MOD are yet to announce plans for MOD sites in the District and that there may be opportunities for future sites.	Hambleton District council will work with York and Harrogate councils to look at any strategic allocations if MOD brownfield sites become available.	This joint working will be achieved through further duty to cooperate meetings.
Hambleton District Council noted that the proposal in the new Local Plan is to remove the area of restraint in the north and southern areas of Hambleton. Responses from the Issues and Options consultation indicated that existing LDF approach of concentrating new housing development in the larger market towns is too restrictive.	Hambleton District Council noted that the proposal in the new Local Plan is to remove the area of restraint in the north and southern areas of Hambleton. The need for a change in spatial strategy was a key message from the Issues and Options consultation.	The Council will continue to seek views on the proposed spatial strategy from neighbouring planning authorities through further duty to cooperate meetings.
The District Council noted that North Yorkshire County Council has undertaken transport modelling for the North Northallerton scheme and concluded the development can be	Transport modelling concludes that the North Northallerton scheme can be achieved with existing infrastructure together with the new strategic Link road.	This will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Summary of issues discussed	Summary of Strategic issues	HDC response
achieved with existing infrastructure together with the new strategic Link road.		
Additional transport modelling work will also look at whether there is a need for a link road around the eastern side of Northallerton.	The additional transport modelling work will consider if an eastern link road is required to facilitate delivery of new homes in Northallerton coming through the new Local Plan.	This will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
There was a question regarding what the affordable housing requirement will be in the new Local Plan.	Council noted that although targets in the LDF are 40% and 50%, around 27% is being achieved.	The new Local Plan proposes 30% requirement for affordable housing across the District. This is still subject to viability testing.

Consultation events

6.19 Consultation events consisted of:

- market stall displays within the five Market Towns (10am- 1pm) where the public could talk to officers about the preferred options;
- public drop in events where anyone could attend an informal session at the Town Hall (5-7.30pm) to discuss consultation documents; and
- parish council meetings on a sub-area basis (7.45pm).

6.20 These events were held in:

Table 6.16 Consultation events

Date	Location
7 th November	Bedale
9 th November	Stokesley
10 th November	Northallerton
15 th November	Thirsk
22 nd November	Easingwold

The Response

Issues raised at parish council meetings

6.21 The issues raised at the meetings with Parish Councils are summarised below.

Table 6.17 Bedale, 7 November 2016, 7.45pm

Attendance: Hackforth Parish Council; Crakehall Parish Council; Bedale Town Council.	
Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
<p>The meeting took the format of a question and answer session.</p> <p>A question was raised in relation to what criteria would be used if the settlement limits are removed.</p>	<p>The criteria are to be written and will respond to points raised during the consultation.</p>

Table 6.18 Stokesley, 10 November 2016, 7.45pm

Attendance: Great and Little Broughton; Stokesley Town Council and Neighbourhood Plan Group; Seamer Parish Council; Great Busby Parish Meeting; Worsall Parish Council; Whorlton Parish Council; Rudby Parish Council; Kirkby in Cleveland Parish Council; Potto Parish Council.	
Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
<p>The meeting took the format of a question and answer session.</p> <p>An area where opinion was given by attendees was in relation to the view that the Preferred Options document does not consider or address a reliance on cars for transport which it was stated is a weakness of the emerging Local Plan.</p>	<p>The Council will need to ensure that the spatial strategy in the emerging new Local Plan is sustainable.</p>
<p>There was also a view that sites close to Stokesley town centre have been identified as not preferred due to flood risk and that sites further out of town have been selected as alternatives. It was suggested that sites closer to the town centre would be more sustainable.</p>	<p>Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test will determine if sites closer to the town centre in zones 2 and 3 can be considered.</p>
<p>Attendees had some concern in relation to what infrastructure will be delivered to support additional housing.</p>	<p>The Council will prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will consult with key organisations including the local education authority, local highway authority, health and utility companies to identify if and what additional infrastructure is required to support planned housing growth.</p>

Table 6.19 Northallerton, 10 November 2016, 7.45pm

<p>Attendance: Appleton Wiske Parish Council; Romanby Parish Council; Danby Wiske Parish Council; Ingleby Arncliffe and Ingleby Cross Parish Council; Kirby Wiske Parish Council; East Harlsey Parish Council.</p>	
Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
<p>The meeting took the format of a question and answer session.</p> <p>An area focused on in the meeting in terms of how the Local Plan will respond, was in relation to the MOD plans to close some of its sites.</p>	<p>There is a policy hook in the Preferred Options document that recognises that a new town may be considered as an option at some point in the future which would be looked at in conjunction with neighbouring authorities.</p>
<p>Another area questioned was in relation to the criteria based approach set out for the current Interim Policy Guidance. It was suggested that the cumulative impact is not well defined and it was asked how this would be addressed in the new Local Plan.</p>	<p>The preferred approach is to take forward the criteria based approach set out in current policy. Through the consultation, there is an opportunity to make suggestions on what else should be covered.</p>
<p>There was concern expressed that there is a reduction in bungalows as a result of extensions and redevelopment and question as to what the new Local Plan would do to address this.</p>	<p>The Plan will need to ensure there is a robust policy addressing this. However, to increase the supply of bungalows, the preferred option is to require 10-15% of housing sites to comprise of modest size 2 bedroom bungalows.</p>
<p>There was a question relating to affordable homes asking whether affordable homes will remain affordable on new sites.</p>	<p>Through planning conditions, affordable homes will be required to remain affordable in perpetuity.</p>
<p>A question was asked as to whether a non-preferred site could become a preferred site during the Local Plan preparation stages.</p>	<p>Landowners / agents would need to address the reasons for the site being non-preferred as set out in the site assessment. If aspects can be addressed and site is available and deliverable, the Council would need to reconsider the preferred options.</p>
<p>Will the criteria based approach apply to those villages where allocations are made.</p>	<p>The criteria based approach will still apply, but this would include consideration of impact on form and character and services.</p>

There was concern over traffic congestion in Northallerton and the impact of additional housing. There was question as to what the Local Plan will do to address this in light of additional housing.	The Council has commissioned transport modelling work which will consider the implications of additional housing and capacity of the highway network.
---	---

Table 6.20 Thirsk, 15 November 2016, 7.45pm

Attendance: Carlton Miniott Parish Council; Thirlby Parish Council; Bagby and Balk Parish Council; Thornton-le-Moor and Thornton-le-Street Parish Council; Thirsk Town Council; Sowerby Parish Council.	
Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
The meeting took the format of a question and answer session. There was a question around how realistic the identified dwelling numbers are for each preferred site.	The dwelling number is indicative at this stage, based on a density of around 25 dwellings per hectare. During the Local Plan preparation stages, the Council will consider what is appropriate and this will include consideration of form, layout and characteristics of surrounding area.
There was a question in relation to how planning applications on sites relate to identified preferred sites or potential allocations.	Planning applications will come forward outside the Local Plan process. Applications in villages / hamlets may be approved under the interim policy guidance in advance of decisions on allocations. The allocations process will take account of existing permissions as it will be necessary to assess housing need in the settlement and factors such as impact on form and character.
There was a question in relation to what happens to non-preferred sites.	Landowners / agents would need to address the reasons for the site being non-preferred as set out in the site assessment. If aspects can be addressed and site is available and deliverable, the Council would need to reconsider the preferred options.
There was concern over infrastructure and how this will be delivered to support housing growth.	The Council will continue to have dialogue with key organisations such as the local education authority, local highway authority and utility companies through duty to cooperate. Advice and guidance from these organisations will assist in identifying if and what level of additional infrastructure is needed. The Council will prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
There was a question regarding the proposed reduction in affordable housing requirement on sites.	The proposed affordable housing provision is based on feasibility and viability of sites. The level of affordable housing contributions in the LDF was based on considerations pre-recession.

Affordable housing and the Council's role in this was questioned.	The Council no longer holds any stock and there are no plans to be a provider.
In terms of support for tourism what does this entail?	There was support for a policy addressing tourism arising through the issues and options consultation which made the most of the opportunities presented by the District's location.

Table 6.21 Easingwold, 22 November 2016, 7.45pm

Attendance: Easingwold Town Council, Aine Parish Council, Brafferton Parish Council, Crayke Parish Council, Sutton-on-the-Forest Parish Council, Thornton-on-the-Hill Parish Council,	
Summary of issues raised	HDC Response
<p>The meeting took the format of a question and answer session.</p> <p>There was concern around the impact of additional housing in Shipton.</p>	<p>A long term plan is a ring road which is a priority for the sub-region. The Council will liaise with York City Council on this.</p> <p>The Council will continue to have dialogue with key organisations such as the local education authority, local highway authority and utility companies through duty to cooperate. Advice and guidance from these organisations will assist in identifying if and what level of additional infrastructure is needed. The Council will prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
Question was asked in relation to distribution of housing.	At this stage, the spatial strategy is still being developed as the Council looks at options.

Summary of key issues from parish council meetings

- 6.22** A number of key issues were raised and discussed at the parish council meetings that were held in the five market towns during the Preferred Options consultation. The tables above identify the issues raised during these meetings and an officer response is provided for each of these.
- 6.23** While there was a wide range of issues and topics raised during each of the different meetings and while some of these were specific to a particular market town or its surrounding area, it is possible to identify from these meetings a number of key issues that were common throughout the various discussions and meetings and these are summarised below.

Infrastructure provision

- 6.24** A factor that was mentioned and discussed the most frequently in the meetings was the importance of infrastructure provision and ensuring this is in place before new development comes forward. This covered the full range of infrastructure from roads, drainage and capacity

of the sewerage network to services and facilities such as health care provision and schools. There is much concern amongst parish councils that new development will come forward before the infrastructure has been provided at the levels required.

Travel by car

- 6.25** Another factor that was raised and discussed at the meetings was in relation to travel. There was concern that the Preferred Options document does not consider or address a reliance on cars for transport which it was stated is a weakness of the emerging Local Plan.
- 6.26** During the parish council meetings, there were several questions asked where clarity or further information was sought. These are summarised below.

Affordable homes and settlement limits

- 6.27** There was a question as to whether new affordable homes on sites remained affordable and also the rationale for the proposed reduction in affordable housing requirement was questioned. There was also a question in relation to what criteria would be used if the settlement limits are removed.

Interim Policy Guidance

- 6.28** It was suggested during the meetings that the cumulative impact is not well defined in the criteria based approach set out for the current Interim Policy Guidance and it was asked how this would be addressed in the new Local Plan. It was also asked would the criteria based approach be applied in villages where allocations are made.

Spatial distribution of housing

- 6.29** There was a question about how the Local Plan will respond to the MOD's announcement to close some of its sites. There was a question about how new housing will be distributed in the new Local Plan. There was also a question as to what the Local Plan will do to address traffic congestion in light of additional housing.

Next steps

- 6.30** One of the common questions asked at the meetings was in relation to what happens to preferred or non-preferred sites after the consultation and how planning applications are affected by this.

Response to the consultation documents

Part 1 - Policies, Vision & Objectives

- 6.31** A questionnaire was designed to help provide a structured approach to the on line consultation and to aid responses. Respondents had the opportunity to provide a response to 39 questions. Over 1,000 responses were received in response to the on line consultation. A summary of the comments received and officer response is summarised in the table below. A summary of the key messages is provided below the table.

Table 6.22

Key Issues	HDC Response
<p>Question 1: Do you think the Preferred option for meeting the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agreed with the preferred option for meeting the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Where there was disagreement, this was in relation to two points not being adequately addressed, these were climate change and neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>There is also a view that the role of agriculture in Hambleton is not adequately addressed.</p>	<p>The Council will seek to address these aspects in relation to the policy relating to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>
<p>Question 2: Do you think the preferred option for tackling climate change is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agreed with the preferred option for tackling climate change.</p> <p>Where there was disagreement, this was in relation to solar energy potential on new housing developments which it was felt was not adequately addressed and the view that whilst the approach mitigates the impact of climate change, it does nothing to help reduce the cause.</p>	<p>The Council will seek to address these aspects in relation to the plan.</p>
<p>Question 3: Do you think the preferred option for meeting Hambleton’s development need is the right approach?</p>	
<p>A small majority of respondents which indicated Yes or No agreed with the preferred option for meeting Hambleton’s development need.</p> <p>For those respondents taking the view that the preferred option was not the right approach, this was largely due to the view that the target of 320 dwellings per annum is not sufficient to meet housing needs and it is also suggested that the period to assess housing need in the preferred option is incorrect, in that it uses a base date of 2019 instead of 2014 as used in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).</p>	<p>The housing requirement per annum will be reviewed and amended as necessary as further evidence becomes available during the preparation stages of the plan.</p> <p>In the next iteration of the emerging Local Plan, assessment of housing need will be based on an assessment period from 2014 to 2035 in line with the SHMA.</p>



Key Issues	HDC Response
<p>Question 4: Do you think the preferred approach for the spatial distribution of new development is the right approach?</p>	
<p>A small majority of respondents which indicated Yes or No agreed with the preferred approach for the spatial distribution of new development.</p> <p>Where there was disagreement with the preferred approach, this was due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the strategy will put too much pressure on the market towns; • the audit of village services and the hierarchy suggesting it is too simplistic; • the loss of development limits is not desirable; • the strategy should include firm plans for a new town; • there was criticism that there is no specific reference to service villages in the preferred approach and that their role is not clear. It was suggested that service villages should have a prime focus for new development; • there was criticism of the proposed roles of the market towns when compared to each other; • there was a suggestion that development close to settlements in the open countryside should be considered appropriate; • there was a view that due to poor public transport links, a strategy which focused on the five market towns would be more sustainable; • it was suggested that the quantum of development proposed in Northallerton is reduced given the 1,000 dwellings at North Northallerton already approved and that numbers are increased in the other market towns; • there were mixed views in relation to the proposal of 1,000 dwellings across service and secondary villages; 	<p>The preferred approach is to support an appropriate level of development in villages and this should reduce pressure on market towns.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy assists in measuring the sustainability of settlements.</p> <p>In adopting a criteria based approach to development, rather than development limits, the Council will seek to ensure that development is organic and incremental providing a good fit with form and character of the settlement.</p> <p>A new town is a potential option that may be considered, but is currently not considered to be necessary to meet the housing requirement.</p> <p>The preferred approach is for housing allocations to be made across the service and secondary villages.</p> <p>The proposed levels of development in the market towns is reflective of the role and function of the towns in Hambleton. The balance will be kept under review.</p> <p>The preferred approach is that development in the open countryside will only be supported where it supports the rural economy.</p> <p>The proposal is that development in villages will only be supported where it supports sustainable development and helps maintain the vitality of villages.</p> <p>The proposed levels of development in the market towns is reflective of the role and function of the towns in Hambleton. The balance will be kept under review.</p>

Key Issues	HDC Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is noted that the alignment of jobs growth and employment sites with new housing developments is important; it is noted that the allocation of new development should only take place where there is adequate infrastructure to support the growth. 	<p>The proposal is that development in villages will only be supported where it supports sustainable development and helps maintain the vitality of villages.</p> <p>Promoting sustainable development is central to the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you think the preferred option for the design of new development is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agreed with the preferred option for the design of new development.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, comments were varied ranging from the view that the proposed design policy should be supplemented by design code documents to the view that the proposed design policy is overly-prescriptive and inflexible.</p>	<p>The Council will seek to prepare a policy which takes into account these comments.</p>
<p>Question 6: Do you think the preferred option for enforcement is the right approach?</p>	
<p>All the respondents who indicated Yes or No agreed with the preferred option for enforcement.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Question 7: Do you think the preferred option for the Northallerton spatial strategy is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agree with the preferred option for the spatial strategy for Northallerton.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, this is in relation to the view that Northallerton does not have adequate infrastructure to support the planned level of growth. Particular concern is shown in relation to the inadequacy of the road infrastructure and congestion caused by the level crossing.</p>	<p>Part of the strategy for Northallerton is to facilitate improvements to local infrastructure to alleviate traffic congestion resulting from the Low Gates level crossing.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around other infrastructure, as part of the plan making process, the Council will work with a range of other organisations, including water companies, North Yorkshire County Council highways, education and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). Input from these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on</p>



Key Issues	HDC Response
	existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on housing allocations.
<p>Question 8: Do you think the preferred option for the Thirsk Spatial Strategy is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agree with the preferred option for the spatial strategy for Thirsk.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, this is in relation to the view that Thirsk should have a higher level of development.</p>	<p>The proposed levels of development in the market towns is reflective of the role and function of the towns in Hambleton.</p>
<p>Question 9: Do you think the preferred option for the Bedale Spatial Strategy is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agree with the preferred option for the spatial strategy for Bedale.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, this is in relation to the level of development that is deemed appropriate.</p>	<p>The proposed levels of development in the market towns is reflective of the role and function of the towns in Hambleton.</p>
<p>Question 10: Do you think the preferred option for the Easingwold Spatial Strategy is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agree with the preferred option for the spatial strategy for Easingwold.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, this is in relation to the view that the proposed level of development at Easingwold should be reduced. There is concern that Easingwold does not have adequate infrastructure to support the planned level of growth.</p> <p>There is also a view that there is not sufficient emphasis on the inclusion of green infrastructure within new developments and protection of this within the town.</p>	<p>The proposed levels of development in the market towns is reflective of the role and function of the towns in Hambleton.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around infrastructure, as part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water companies, North Yorkshire County Council highways, education and the CCG. Input from these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on housing allocations.</p>

Key Issues	HDC Response
	<p>Within the new Local Plan there will be a policy that sets out a requirement for the provision of green infrastructure within new developments and which also sets out the importance of protecting and enhancing green infrastructure.</p>
<p>Question 11: Do you think the preferred option for the Stokesley Spatial Strategy is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agree with the preferred option for the spatial strategy for Stokesley.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, this is in relation to the view that the proposed level of development at Stokesley should be reduced. There is concern that Stokesley does not have adequate infrastructure to support the planned level of growth. Also, conversely, it is suggested that the transport links to Teesside are not good.</p>	<p>The proposed levels of development in the market towns is reflective of the role and function of the towns in Hambleton.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around infrastructure, as part of the Local Plan making process, the Council has a duty to cooperate and consult with a range of other organisations, including water companies, North Yorkshire County Council highways, education and the CCG. Input from these organisations will help to identify the likely impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure and demand for additional facilities or improvements. This will inform decisions on housing allocations.</p>
<p>Question 12: Do you think the preferred option for retail and leisure development in town centres is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agree with the preferred option for retail and leisure development in town centres.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, this is in relation to the view that Thirsk and Northallerton should both be identified as main town centres and that Stokesley should have a proportionate increase in retail and service facilities to match the proposed housing growth.</p>	<p>The preferred approach is in line with the evidence base, that being national policy and also the recommendations of the Retail and Town Centre Uses Study (2016).</p>
<p>Question 13: Do you think the preferred option for planning for new Local Neighbourhood Centres is the right approach?</p>	



Key Issues	HDC Response
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No agree with the preferred option for Local Neighbourhood Centres.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, this is in relation to the view that neighbourhood centres are not supported and specific reference is made to this being the case for Stokesley and Easingwold. There is concern that new centres would have a negative impact on existing retail centres and a view that the new centres may not be commercially viable.</p>	<p>These comments will inform decisions as to if and how this policy is featured in the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>Question 14: Do you think the preferred option for the spatial strategy for service and secondary villages, the scale of the allocations and the proposal not to define settlement boundaries is the right approach?</p>	
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there was a similar level of respondents in support of the preferred option as there was in disagreement with the preferred option.</p> <p>The vast majority of comments that do not support the approach are in relation to the proposal to remove development limits. There is concern over this proposal in that it may lead to sprawl and there is a view that development limits provide some certainty and clarity to the community.</p>	<p>The preferred approach is that a criteria based approach will guide decisions on development proposals which will include an assessment as to how well the proposed development fits with the form and character of the existing settlement. This will allow a more considered decision based on the specific merits of each case. This approach also means there would not be a presumption that develop in every space within a settlement boundary line would be permitted.</p>
<p>Question 15: Do you think the preferred approach for the spatial strategy for other settlements is the right approach? Have the right settlements been identified?</p>	
<p>There is a small majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>The majority of comments that do not support the approach are in relation to the proposed removal of development limits. There is concern over this proposal in that it may lead to uncontrolled and unplanned development.</p>	<p>The preferred approach is that a criteria based approach will guide decisions on development proposals which will include an assessment as to how well the proposed development fits with the form and character of the existing settlement. This will allow a more considered decision based on the specific merits of each case. This approach also means there would not be a presumption that develop in every space within a settlement boundary line would be permitted.</p>
<p>Question 16: Do you think the preferred option for the spatial strategy for the countryside is the right approach?</p>	

Key Issues	HDC Response
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is general support for the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is some disagreement to the preferred approach, this is based on a view that there is inadequate mention of the role of agriculture in the countryside.</p> <p>There is also a view that the policy should allow for re-use of previously developed land in the open countryside.</p>	<p>The Council will seek to ensure adequate coverage of agriculture in the emerging policy.</p> <p>Development in the countryside will be strictly controlled. The preferred approach is that support will be given to the provision of new employment premises to support rural businesses and tourist opportunities, the re-use of rural buildings and the provision of new dwellings where necessary to meet the needs of rural businesses.</p>
<p>Question 17: Do you think the preferred option for affordable housing on exception sites is the right approach?</p>	
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is general support for the preferred option from responses received.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Question 18: Do you think the preferred option for meeting Hambleton’s employment needs is the right approach?</p>	
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is general support for the preferred option based on responses received.</p> <p>There is some criticism over the quantum of employment land the preferred approach is proposing to allocate and concern that the quantity is in excess of that identified in the employment land review.</p>	<p>Making provision for a higher level of employment land will allow greater choice both in terms of location and the type of site.</p>
<p>Question 19: Do you think the preferred option for the protection and enhancement of employment land and strategic employment sites is the right option?</p>	
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is general support for the preferred option based on responses received.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Question 20: Do you think the preferred options for rural businesses are the right approach?</p>	
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is general support for the preferred option based on responses received.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>



Key Issues	HDC Response
Question 21: Do you think the preferred options for tourism sites are the right approach?	
Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is general support for the preferred option based on responses received.	Noted.
Question 22: Do you think the preferred option for military sites is the right approach?	
Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, all respondents supported the preferred option.	Noted
Question 23: Do you think the preferred option for meeting Hambleton's housing needs is the right approach?	
<p>There is both support and objection to this preferred option. Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is the same number of respondents in support of the preferred option as there is in disagreement with the preferred option.</p> <p>In terms of responses which object to the preferred approach, reasons include the view that the proposed level of development is too low.</p> <p>Another view is that housing allocations should mean there is no need for unplanned windfall developments.</p> <p>There is concern that a 5% buffer is too low and that the new Local Plan should include an option to increase the buffer to 20% if it becomes appropriate at some point in the plan period.</p> <p>There is criticism of the District Council's objectively assessed housing need.</p> <p>There is criticism of the District Council's proposed approach to phasing.</p>	<p>A housing provision target figure has been established using the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) OAN figure (274 homes per annum between 2014 and 2035) and then making an adjustment for the job creation from the Employment Land Review (2016) which increases the housing requirement to 320 per annum over the plan period.</p> <p>The combination of 5% buffer in addition to windfalls allows for sufficient flexibility to ensure deliverability.</p> <p>Hambleton does not have a record of significant under delivery and the combination of 5% buffer in addition to windfalls allows for sufficient flexibility to ensure deliverability.</p> <p>A housing provision target figure has been established using the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) OAN figure (274 homes per annum between 2014 and 2035) and then making an adjustment for the job creation from the Employment Land Review (2016) which increases the housing requirement to 320 per annum over the plan period.</p> <p>Phasing of housing allocations where appropriate will ensure a balanced delivery of housing across the District and help to align delivery with the infrastructure provision.</p>

Key Issues	HDC Response
<p>Question 24: Do you think the preferred option to deliver the appropriate mix of housing sizes, types and tenures is the right approach?</p>	
<p>There is a small majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>The majority of comments that do not support the approach are in relation to the following:</p> <p>There is a view that the affordable housing contribution sought from developers on sites is not enough. There are contrary views that welcome the proposed reduction in affordable housing requirement.</p> <p>There is concern that the social housing target of 75% is not financially viable.</p> <p>The main area of criticism coming through the responses is in relation to the proposed policy approach towards housing mix. A key message from responses is that the proposed housing mix on sites is too prescriptive. The suggestion is that the market in the local area should determine housing mix on individual sites.</p> <p>There is concern that the proposed policy approach with regards affordable housing contribution is subject to viability evidence that has not yet been prepared.</p>	<p>The proposal for 30% affordable housing on site is more in line with what has been achievable since the introduction of new targets in the LDF. Targets of 40% and 50% have been more difficult to achieve. The 30% target is subject to viability testing.</p> <p>The target affordable housing mix of 25% intermediate products and 75% social or affordable rent is based on the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016).</p> <p>The % targets for housing mix set out in the preferred option are informed by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) but are subject to viability assessment.</p> <p>At preferred options stage, the focus is on identifying options and it is recognised that there is still additional work to be done to help inform the policy approach, including viability assessments.</p>
<p>Question 25: Do you think the preferred option which supports new development in open countryside where certain requirements are met is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is disagreement, this is in relation to a view that the policy should allow for redevelopment of previously developed land in the open countryside.</p>	<p>The proposed policy approach would support conversion of rural buildings for residential use where there is no conflict with other policies and the proposed approach would support replacement of existing residential dwellings in the countryside where appropriate.</p>
<p>Question 26: Do you think the preferred option for the provision of specialist housing requirements is the right approach?</p>	



Key Issues	HDC Response
Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, all respondents supported the preferred option.	Noted.
<p>Question 27: Do you agree with the preferred option and policy provision for enhancing and protecting the natural environment?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there was challenge to the preferred option, this was in relation to how the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land should be worded in any policy.</p> <p>There was also a request for more protection to be provided for irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland.</p> <p>There was comment around green infrastructure and connections to biodiversity and a view that this should not be a requirement of all developments.</p>	<p>This will inform policy wording where appropriate.</p> <p>It is not deemed unreasonable to require all developments to make some contribution towards protection and enhancement of green infrastructure and biodiversity networks.</p>
<p>Question 28: Do you think the preferred option for protecting and enhancing Hambleton’s landscape is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is challenge to the preferred option, this is mainly in relation to policy around greenbelt.</p> <p>There is also some objection to the requirement for an independent landscape assessment to be prepared for those proposals which could impact on the landscape.</p>	<p>Development in the York greenbelt would only be considered in exceptional circumstances. Planned growth for housing can be achieved without compromising the greenbelt boundary.</p> <p>An independent landscape assessment will be an important piece of evidence for making the case for development where there is possible impact on the landscape.</p>
<p>Question 29: Do you think the preferred option for development in the AONB or development impacting on the special qualities of the North York Moors National Park is the right approach?</p>	
Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, all respondents supported the preferred option.	Noted.
<p>Question 30: Do you think the preferred option for water quality and supply is the right approach?</p>	

Key Issues	HDC Response
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is generally support for the preferred option.</p> <p>There is suggestion that the need for tree planting and other environmental measures should be referenced in the policy as a means by which surface water run off can be managed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Question 31: Do you think the preferred option for flood risk and water management is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is objection to the preferred option, there is suggestion that the need for tree planting and other environmental measures should be referenced in the policy as a means by which surface water run off can be managed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Question 32: Do you think the preferred option for the protection of Air Quality is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is objection to the preferred option, this is in relation to suggesting that the policy is not in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	<p>The Council will ensure the policy is in accordance with the NPPF.</p>
<p>Question 33: Do you think the preferred option for the protection and enhancement of the historic built environment is the right approach?</p>	
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, all respondents supported the preferred option.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Question 34: Do you think the preferred option for minerals safeguarding areas is the right approach?</p>	
<p>Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No there is generally support for the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is objection to the preferred option, this is in relation to suggesting that the policy is not in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	<p>The Council will ensure the policy is in accordance with the NPPF.</p>



Key Issues	HDC Response
<p>Question 35: Do you think the preferred option for the delivery of infrastructure is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is objection to the preferred option, this is in relation to suggesting that the policy needs amending to ensure it is in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	<p>The Council will ensure the policy is in accordance with the NPPF.</p>
<p>Question 36: Do you think the preferred option for transport and accessibility is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is objection to the preferred option, this is in relation to suggesting that the policy needs to be more robust.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Question 37: Do you think the preferred option for health and well-being provision is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is objection to the preferred option, this is in relation to suggesting that the requirement to undertake a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) to support new development proposals is too onerous and that the requirements could be covered by another document such as the Planning Statement or Design and Access Statement. Another view is that HIAs should only be required for large scale strategic development.</p>	<p>The preferred option is that HIAs will be required to support planning applications where necessary. The points made will be taken into consideration when further refining the policy.</p>
<p>Question 38: Do you think the preferred option for open space, sport and recreation is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is objection to the preferred option, this is in relation to suggesting that Stokesley Leisure Hub / Sports Village should be supported.</p>	<p>The Open Space, Sport and Recreation study (2016) was commissioned by the District Council to provide a review of existing provision of indoor sports, open space and outdoor sports. The study provides the evidence base for strategic projects identified</p>

Key Issues	HDC Response
<p>There is also a view that local green spaces do not need designating in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>in the Local Plan. The need for a sports village at Stokesley is not identified by the study.</p> <p>The designation of local green spaces has been done in accordance with the guidance in the NPPF. Sites that have been put forward for consideration as part of the call for sites have been independently assessed and consulted on. The outcome of the assessment and consultation is available separately in the Local Green Space Reports.</p>
<p>Question 39: Do you think the preferred option for community facilities is the right approach?</p>	
<p>The majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No are in support of the preferred option.</p> <p>Where there is objection to the preferred option, this is in relation to the view that the policy is contradictory to other policies in the Preferred Options document in terms of the sustainability of settlements. There is also criticism that there is no definition of community facilities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Summary of key issues from the consultation documents

- 6.32** Respondents had the opportunity to respond to 39 different questions via the on line consultation form as set out in the above table. A summary of the outcome of the on line consultation and the key messages emerging from this is provided below. The section below does not discuss the officer response to the points raised. The officer response is provided in the above table.
- 6.33** All questions required respondents to state Yes or No to indicate whether or not they supported the preferred approach set out for particular aspects of the Local Plan. Space was provided to provide reasons for their answer as they felt necessary. Not all respondents indicated Yes or No in their response to the questions. However, it is possible to conclude that for 38 of the 39 questions, where a Yes or No is indicated, in each case the majority of respondents supported the preferred approach identified in the Preferred Options document, albeit in some cases, this was only a small majority.

Housing need

6.34 There was one question (question 23) which asks respondents whether or not they think the preferred option for meeting Hambleton's housing needs is the right approach, where there was the same number of respondents in support of the preferred option as there was not in support of the preferred option. Where there was objection, the issues identified can be seen in the above table adjacent to Question 23.

Growth aspirations and spatial strategy

6.35 The 39 questions set out within the Preferred Options consultation document cover a range of themes. Almost one third of questions (12) cover aspects which relate to housing and economic growth aspirations and the spatial strategy for the distribution of development. Respondents were asked whether or not they support the preferred approach for meeting Hambleton's employment and housing needs and whether they supported the preferred option for the spatial distribution of new development as set out in the spatial strategy for each of the market towns, the service and secondary villages, other settlements and the countryside.

Hambleton's development need

6.36 In terms of comments relating to the preferred option for meeting Hambleton's development need, a small majority of respondents which indicated Yes or No agreed with the preferred option (26 indicated Yes and 22 indicated No). For those respondents taking the view that the preferred option was not the right approach, this was typically in relation to housing need and largely due to the view that the target of 320 dwellings per annum is seen as not being sufficient to meet Hambleton's housing needs. There is also concern that the application of the 5% buffer to the housing requirement is too low and suggestion that the new Local Plan should include an option to increase the buffer to 20% if it becomes appropriate at some point in the plan period. Many respondents are critical of the methodology applied to assess housing need as set out in the Preferred Options document. Critics state that the period to assess housing need is incorrect, in that it uses a base date of 2019 and critics state that the base date should be 2014 which is consistent with the methodology in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

Employment need

6.37 In terms of comments relating to the preferred option for meeting Hambleton's employment needs, of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, there is general support for the preferred option based on responses received (14 respondents indicated Yes and 4 indicated No). Where there is objection, this is in relation to the quantum of employment land the preferred approach is proposing to allocate and concern that the quantity is in excess of that identified in the Employment Land Review.

Spatial distribution of development

6.38 For the question which asked if respondents agreed with the preferred approach for the spatial distribution of new development, a small majority of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, agreed with the preferred option (40 respondents indicated Yes and 32 indicated No).

Where there was objection to the approach, there was a wide range of reasons identified and no one overriding reason (the issues identified can be seen in the above table adjacent to Question 4).

Development limits

6.39 In terms of comments relating to the preferred option for the spatial strategy for settlements which also set out the proposal to remove development limits, there was a similar level of support and objection. Of those respondents that indicated Yes or No as to whether or not they supported the preferred approach, 23 did not support the preferred approach and 24 respondents indicated support for the approach. However, for the majority of those respondents that raised an objection to the approach, the overriding concern is in relation to the proposal to remove development limits. There is an overwhelming concern amongst respondents in respect of this proposal. The concern is that loss of development limits may lead to development sprawl. The general view is that settlement boundaries provide some certainty and clarity to the community. There is one response from a statutory consultee and this is from Historic England which states that the organisation has a number of reservations about the potential impact which the lack of development limits might have upon the form and character of these villages and their landscape setting. Historic England state that if the Council does adopt the preferred approach for development limits, then it is essential that the Council produces up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisals in order to identify what aspects are of particular importance to the character of those areas.

Spatial strategy for market towns

6.40 In terms of comments relating to the spatial strategy for the market towns, in each case, of those respondents that indicated Yes or No, the majority of respondents are supportive of the spatial strategies. However, it is worth noting that there are a limited number of responses for each market town and any concerns raised in relation to the spatial strategy for each market town are typically only based on a relatively small number of comments. With this in mind, the main points raised by those respondents not in support of the spatial strategy for each of the market towns are summarised below.

Northallerton

6.41 In terms of the spatial strategy for Northallerton, 15 respondents stated Yes or No to indicate whether they supported the preferred approach. 10 respondents indicated support and the remainder had some objection. In terms of the objections, there is a comment that suggests Northallerton does not have adequate infrastructure to support the planned level of growth. It is suggested that the road infrastructure is deemed to be inadequate and the congestion caused by the level crossing is a concern.

Thirsk

6.42 In terms of the spatial strategy for Thirsk, 10 respondents stated Yes or No to indicate whether they supported the preferred approach. 8 respondents indicated support and the remainder had some objection. There is a view that Thirsk should have a higher level of development.

Bedale

- 6.43** In terms of Bedale, 11 respondents stated Yes or No to indicate whether they supported the preferred approach. 8 respondents supported the spatial strategy and the remainder had some objection. Where there is disagreement with the spatial strategy, this is in relation to the level of development that is deemed appropriate with suggestions for both more and less development in the town.

Easingwold

- 6.44** In terms of Easingwold, 17 respondents stated Yes or No to indicate whether they supported the preferred approach. 11 respondents indicated support for the spatial strategy and the remainder had some objection. Where there is criticism of the spatial strategy, this is in relation to the view that the proposed level of development at Easingwold should be reduced. There is concern that Easingwold does not have adequate infrastructure to support the planned level of growth. There is also a view that there is not sufficient emphasis on the inclusion of green infrastructure within new developments and protection of this within the town.

Stokesley

- 6.45** In terms of Stokesley, 22 respondents indicated Yes or No to indicate whether they supported the preferred approach. 16 of these were in support of the spatial strategy. Where there is criticism of the spatial strategy, this is in relation to the view that the proposed level of development at Stokesley should be reduced. There is concern that Stokesley does not have adequate infrastructure to support the planned level of growth and that contrary to the statement in the Preferred Options document, it is suggested that the transport links to Teesside are not good.

Spatial strategy for the countryside

- 6.46** In terms of comments relating to the preferred option for the spatial strategy for the countryside, there is general support for the preferred option. Of the 22 respondents that indicated Yes or No, 17 supported the spatial strategy. Where there is some disagreement to the preferred approach, this is based on a view that there is inadequate mention of the role of agriculture in the countryside. There is also a view that the policy should allow for re-use of previously developed land in the open countryside.
- 6.47** As mentioned earlier, of the 39 questions set out within the Preferred Options consultation, almost one third of questions (12) cover aspects which relate to housing and economic growth aspirations and the spatial strategy for the distribution of development and the key messages are discussed above.

Environment related topics

- 6.48** Almost a quarter (9) of the questions sought comments from respondents on the preferred approach set out for aspects within the Local Plan which related some way to the environment including tackling climate change, enhancing and protecting the natural environment, protecting and enhancing Hambleton's landscape, development in the AONB or National Park, water

quality and supply, flood risk and water management, protection of air quality, protection and enhancement of the historic built environment and minerals safeguarding areas. Key messages relating to these topics are discussed below.

AONB, National Park, historic built environment

- 6.49** In terms of the above subject areas, there were two areas where all respondents that indicated Yes or No supported the preferred approach and this was in relation to the preferred option for development in the AONB and National Park and preferred option for the protection and enhancement of the historic built environment.
- 6.50** For the other environment related areas, in each case, the majority of respondents that indicated Yes or No, were in support of the preferred approach or option. Where there was some objection to a preferred approach, the section below provides a summary of what the area of criticism was for each area.

Protection of air quality and minerals safeguarding

- 6.51** There were two areas where respondents suggested the policy was not in accordance with the NPPF and rewording of the policy would be necessary. These were protection of air quality and minerals safeguarding areas.

Water quality and supply, flood risk and water management

- 6.52** In terms of comments in relation to water quality and supply and flood risk and water management, where there is objection, the main comment made is that the need for tree planting and other environmental measures should be referenced in the policy as a means by which surface water run off can be managed.

Hambleton's landscape

- 6.53** In terms of the preferred option for protecting and enhancing Hambleton's landscape, there is some objection to the requirement for an independent landscape assessment to be prepared for those proposals which could impact on the landscape on the basis that almost all development has some impact on the landscape.

Natural environment

- 6.54** For the preferred option for enhancing and protecting the natural environment, the key message from comments was that there should be more protection for irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and that provision of green infrastructure and connections to biodiversity should not be a requirement of all developments.

Climate change

- 6.55** For the preferred option for tackling climate change, the key message emerging is that while the preferred approach mitigates the impact of climate change, it does nothing to help reduce the cause.
- 6.56** The remaining questions in the Preferred Options document cover a range of topics and these are discussed below.

Sustainable development

- 6.57** There is one key question that seeks comment in relation to the preferred approach for meeting the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The view was that climate change, the role of agriculture and neighbourhood plans are not adequately covered in the preferred option.

Retail

- 6.58** Two questions relate to retail. While the majority of respondents who indicated Yes or No support the preferred option for retail and leisure and planning of new local neighbourhood centres, where there is objection, this is in relation to role and function of market towns and objection to planning of new local neighbourhood centres on the basis that these would have a negative impact on existing centres.

Housing mix

- 6.59** Three questions within the preferred options document relate to the preferred approach for the delivery of homes. For the question relating to affordable housing on exception sites, there is overall support for the preferred option. In terms of the preferred option for the delivery of the appropriate mix of housing size, type and tenure, there is marginally more support for the preferred option than there is objection. The main areas of objection include the view that the affordable housing contribution sought from developers is not enough, there is concern that the social housing target of 75 % is not viable and criticism that the proposed policy approach for housing mix is too prescriptive. In terms of the preferred option for the provision of specialist housing requirements, of those respondents indicating Yes or No, all supported the preferred approach.

Infrastructure provision and transport and accessibility

- 6.60** In terms of the delivery of infrastructure, while there is general support for the preferred approach, there is suggestion that the emerging policy will need amending to ensure it is in accordance with the NPPF and for transport and accessibility, where there is objection, this is in relation to suggesting the policy needs to be more robust.

Health and well-being and community facilities

- 6.61** While there is overall support for the preferred option for health and well-being provision and open space, sport and recreation and community facilities, where there is objection this is in relation to the suggestion that a Health Impact Assessment is too onerous and that requirements could be covered by other planning documents. There is also a suggestion that local green spaces do not need designating in the local Plan. In terms of community facilities, there is a suggestion that the policy is contradictory to other policies in terms of the sustainability of settlements. The absence of a definition of community facilities is also criticised.

Development in the countryside

- 6.62** In terms of the preferred option which supports new development in the countryside where certain requirements are met, while there is overall support for the approach, there is a suggestion that the policy should allow for redevelopment of previously developed land in the open countryside.

Other topics

6.63 Further questions in the Preferred Options document that are not covered in the above sections are in relation to the preferred option for enforcement and military sites where in both cases all respondents indicated support for the preferred approach, and preferred options for rural businesses and tourism sites where almost all responses indicated support.

Part 2 - Potential Development Sites

6.64 The comments received and officer response on Part 2 of the Preferred Options document is summarised in the sections below.

Bedale area

Table 6.23 Bedale (Aiskew)

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/004/004	No consultation responses received for this site.	N/A
B/004/006	The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
B/004/007	Highways England comment on this site stating that this preferred site is a large housing development of over 100 dwellings. It is likely to generate a significant number of trips, and is in close proximity to the A1(M) at Junction 51. As such, it is of concern to Highways England. One other response has been received from Aiskew Women's Institute suggesting that one of the proposed development sites in Aiskew includes space for a new community hall.	Outline permission for the development of 105 dwellings on this site was approved on 13th April 2017. Evidence for the need of a community hall would be needed in support of any application for such a use.
B/004/011	No comments objecting to the allocation of this site have been received.	N/A
B/004/013	The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/004/016	<p>One comment was received from a local resident who raised the following issues:</p> <p>They state that allocation of the site would result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land, however, they suggest that this loss should be balanced against other considerations including the need for housing.</p> <p>They state that the site is within Flood Zone 1 which is defined as being at the lowest risk of flooding, however, as the site is over 1ha, a Flood Risk Assessment would be required.</p> <p>They state that Bedale Road is very busy and that another access on to the site would exacerbate this issue.</p> <p>They state that the site could be a good location for a village hall, specifically a 'sustainably built village hall', including a grassed area and a community vegetable growing area.</p>	<p>The comment regarding loss of agricultural land and housing need is noted.</p> <p>The comment regarding flood zones is covered in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of the comment relating to capacity of Bedale Road, it is noted that the Local Highway Authority has stated a Transport Assessment would be required at application stage to ensure highway safety is fully considered.</p> <p>In terms of the comment suggesting use of the site for a village hall, it is noted that the site has been submitted for consideration for housing land and has been assessed accordingly. Evidence of need would be required to support any proposals for a new village hall.</p>
B/004/017	No comments received for this site.	N/A
B/004/019	No comments received for this site.	N/A

Table 6.24 Bedale

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/011/001	<p>Comments were received from local residents objecting to the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Objections focused on drainage, including the north-eastern corner of the site; highways access, due to the narrow Burrill Road with no footpath accessibility; natural habitats in north-east corner; safety concerns associated with the proximity to</p>	<p>In terms of concerns relating to drainage, as stated in the initial site assessment, part of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding and as the site is over 1ha, a Flood Risk Assessment would be required to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency at planning application stage.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>the golf course and risk of wayward golf balls; the impact on landscape and prominence of the site; the loss of grade 2 agricultural land; the capacity of facilities i.e. doctors surgeries; and the need for housing.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns relating to access, as stated in the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority confirmed an access on to the site can be formed from Burrill Road but they state that a Transport Assessment would be required.</p> <p>The initial assessment also considers the landscape impact, hence the conclusion recommends development of a reduced site area.</p> <p>As stated in the initial site assessment, the site is classed as grade 3b agricultural land.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to capacity of facilities, as part of the Local Plan preparation process, the Council is engaging with infrastructure providers including the NHS and Clinical Commissioning Group. This will help to identify if and what infrastructure improvements are required and this will inform decisions on site allocations.</p>
B/011/002	<p>No comments have been received in relation to this site.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
B/011/021	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
B/011/022	<p>No comments have been received in relation to this site.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
B/011/023	<p>The only comments received in relation to this site is from the site promoter of adjacent sites B/011/020 and B/011/21. This states the site could form part of a more comprehensive scheme that, it is argued, would provide a southern boundary to development and may also</p>	<p>The need for an east-west link road has not been identified by the Local Highway Authority.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	help to provide an east-west link road that would relieve highway capacity elsewhere in Bedale.	
B/011/024	No comments have been received in relation to this site.	N/A

Table 6.25 Crakehall

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/032/001	In relation to the potential impact on Crakehall Conservation Area and the Listed Crakehall Mill House, Historic England have commented on the site and advised that an assessment is required to determine the impact of any development on the heritage assets. The assessment should inform decisions on the suitability of the site.	Noted.
B/032/002	This is the same site as B/032/001. See comments above.	N/A
B/032/003	Comments were received from ten individuals in agreement with the conclusion of the initial site assessment. Concerns are based on the following: Impact of development on the character and form of the surrounding landscape; Extra pressure on local services; Impact on Public Right of Way that runs through the site; Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats; Poor vehicular access on to Hackforth Road; Poor footpath connectivity; Impact on amenity of neighbouring residents in relation to noise, overlooking, overbearing and loss of privacy; The site is susceptible to surface water flooding.	The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment. The concerns raised are covered in the site assessment with exception to impact on amenity of neighbouring residents. Impact on amenity of neighbouring residents would be assessed as part of any planning application and a decision made as to whether any potential impacts could be mitigated through landscape buffers or other measures.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/032/004	One comment received in agreement with the Council's assessment of the site. This was based on the impact of development on Crakehall Conservation Area and the view that the location of the site in relation to the wider settlement would render the site inappropriate for allocation.	The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment.
B/032/005	The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.

Table 6.26 Kirkby Fleetham

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/083/003	The Parish Council note that the site has been identified as providing for affordable housing within the village.	Noted.
B/083/004	Two comments received, including from the Parish Council, agreeing with the recommendation of allocating this site for recreation and greenspace. The Environment Agency questions the recommendation of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which states the site should have water compatible uses. The Environment Agency states the site is partly or wholly in Flood Zone 1. The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome. In terms of the Environment Agency comment, the Council will review the findings of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for this site. The comments from the Environment Agency means this site should be considered as with any site located within Flood Zone 1.
B/083/005	Comments received from Parish Council in agreement with the Council recommendation, partly due to concerns relating to flooding. No other consultation responses received for this site.	Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/083/006	<p>Comments from the Parish Council in agreement with the Council's recommendation in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>One additional comment has been received from a local resident citing concerns that the development of this site would mean the loss of the car park associated with the public house. They suggest that this could mean the eventual closure of the public house which they state is an important local amenity.</p>	Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.

Table 6.27 Snape

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/135/001	<p>Some comments were received from local residents which mainly focused on the potential increase in the yield of the site from 20 dwellings to 40 as suggested by the site promoter. Consultees were concerned that an increase in dwellings would lead to the over development of Snape. They were also concerned about the impact of this on highway capacity, sewerage capacity and flood risk.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	In terms of concerns over an increase in dwelling numbers, the initial site assessment identifies only part of the site as preferred (for up to 20 dwellings). This is already an existing allocation in the Local Development Framework Allocations DPD. The site assessment notes that development of the full site would have a negative impact on the character and form of the settlement.
B/135/002 B/135/003 B/135/004 B/135/005 B/135/006	No consultation responses received for these sites.	N/A

Table 6.28 West Tanfield

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/170/004	No consultation responses received for this site.	N/A
B/170/007	No consultation responses received for this site.	Site has since been withdrawn by the site promoter from the site assessment process.
B/170/008	The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
B/170/009	<p>Historic England note that the site is in close proximity to a conservation area and Tanfield Bridge which is a scheduled monument. Historic England conclude that the development of this site "could impact upon designated heritage assets in [its] vicinity but, at this stage, its allocation seems unlikely to result in harm to the significance of those assets if the development accords with the anticipated Local Plan Policies for the historic environment."</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Noted.
B/170/010	<p>Historic England has commented on this site and confirmed that this site lies in an area of known archaeological importance. The development of this site could result in harm to important archaeological remains. An archaeological assessment is required and this should inform decisions on the suitability of the site for development.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Noted.

Table 6.29 Burneston

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/021/001	No consultation responses received for this site.	N/A

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/021/002	<p>Historic England has confirmed that the development of the site seems unlikely to result in harm to any designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Noted.
B/021/003	No consultation responses received for this site.	N/A

Table 6.30 Leeming

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/048/001	<p>One comment has been received from a local resident objecting to the development of the site. They are concerned it would lead to over development within Leeming. They are also concerned about flooding, sewerage capacity and the proximity to the A1.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as unsuitable in the initial site assessment. Issues of surface water flooding are identified in the assessment.</p> <p>Proximity to the A1 is not identified as an issue by the Local Highway Authority at this stage.</p> <p>Yorkshire Water advise the Council on any capacity issues in the sewerage network as part of the planning application process.</p>
B/048/002	No consultation responses received for this site.	N/A

Table 6.31 Leeming Bar

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/004/001	Highways England note there are no issues.	Noted.
B/004/002	No consultation responses received for this site.	N/A

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/004/003	<p>One comment has been received from a local resident objecting to the overall level of development around Bedale and Leeming Bar and the impact on local services.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of the concern over the level of development in the settlements, it is noted that Bedale is identified as a service centre in the Council's settlement hierarchy and is therefore considered to have capacity to take some additional development in the Local Plan period. Leeming Bar is identified as a secondary village and is also considered to have some capacity to take additional development.</p> <p>Further work is to be undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for each settlement.</p>
B/004/005	<p>Three comments were received from local residents objecting to the potential development of this site. There was concern about the loss of agricultural land and impact on the setting of this part of the settlement. There was also concern over the impact on the nearby Caravan Park and neighbouring bungalows. The risk of over development in Leeming Bar was also noted.</p>	<p>The loss of agricultural land and impact on form and character of the settlement is noted in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Impact on amenity of neighbouring residents would be assessed as part of any planning application and a decision made as to whether any potential impacts could be mitigated through landscape buffers or other measures.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to the over development of Leeming Bar, the settlement is identified as a secondary village in the Council's settlement hierarchy and is therefore considered to have capacity to take some additional development in the Local Plan period.</p> <p>Further work is to be undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for the settlement.</p>
B/004/008	<p>Two objections have been received from local residents citing the loss of agricultural land, sewerage capacity and the level of development in and around Leeming Bar and Bedale as particular concerns.</p>	<p>In terms of the objections to development on the site, the initial site assessment concludes that only part of the site is preferred for development.</p> <p>In terms of the concern over the level of development in the settlements, it is noted that Bedale is identified as a service centre in the Council's settlement hierarchy and is therefore considered to have capacity to take some</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>additional development in the Local Plan period. Leeming Bar is identified as a secondary village and is also considered to have some capacity to take additional development.</p> <p>Further work is to be undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for each settlement.</p> <p>Yorkshire Water advise the Council on any capacity issues in the sewerage network as part of the planning application process.</p>
B/004/009	<p>Two comments received from local residents. Concerns related to the impact of additional traffic along Low Street. There was also concern about the overall level of development in the surrounding area.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns relating to the capacity of Low street to take additional traffic, in the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority view was that access on to Low Street is possible. However, they state that a comprehensive development brief for the area needs to be produced which will assist in identifying any infrastructure improvements required.</p> <p>In terms of the concern over the level of development in the settlements, it is noted that Bedale is identified as a service centre in the Council's settlement hierarchy and is therefore considered to have capacity to take some additional development in the Local Plan period. Leeming Bar is identified as a secondary village and is also considered to have some capacity to take additional development.</p> <p>Further work is to be undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for each settlement.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/004/010	<p>Numerous comments received from local residents objecting to the development of this site. Comments were based on a range of issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the loss of agricultural land; impact on the setting of this part of the settlement including 'overwhelming' Leeming Bar with more industrial units; the impact on the nearby caravan park; the loss of public views and the Public Right of Way; the loss of trees and vegetation; drainage and sewerage concerns; and noise/light pollution. <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over loss of agricultural land, where possible the Council will try to avoid loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, however, this is only one factor to consider in the assessment of the suitability of a site and it does not necessarily rule out a site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact of additional industrial units in Leeming Bar, the Council notes that a key consideration at application stage will be the design of any scheme. This will include ensuring development does not impact adversely on amenity of neighbouring residents. The design should also minimise the impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact on the caravan park, the Council notes that a key consideration at application stage will be design of any scheme. This will include ensuring development does not impact adversely on amenity of neighbouring residents. There is a well-vegetated boundary between the site and the adjacent Caravan Park, the retention of which may assist in resolving amenity concerns.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the loss of public views and the Public Right of Way which runs to the east of the site, the Council notes that the Right of Way would be retained in accordance with the requirements of North Yorkshire County Council who are the responsible body. In relation to public views, the site is in close proximity to existing employment land and bounded to the north by the newly constructed Bedale Bypass, so impact should be minimal.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of trees and vegetation, there will be opportunity to retain some vegetation as part of the design of the scheme, particularly where this is considered important.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over drainage and sewerage, as previously mentioned in the initial site assessment, the site is over 1ha so would require</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		a Flood Risk Assessment even though the site is within Flood Zone 1. Yorkshire Water will advise on capacity of the sewerage network and any necessary works as part of the planning application stage.
B/004/012	One comment received relating to a perceived over development in the area and the impact on services.	<p>In terms of the concern over the level of development in the settlement, it is noted that Leeming Bar is identified as a secondary village and is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>Further work is to be undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for each settlement.</p>
B/004/020	Highways England comment on this site stating that this preferred site is a medium-sized employment development in close proximity to the A1(M) at Junction 51. Due to its proximity and the number of trips it is likely to generate, in combinations with site B/004/021, this site is a concern for Highways England.	The Council will continue to have dialogue with Highways England regarding further assessment work for this site.
B/004/021	Highways England comment on this site stating that this preferred site has the potential for a large employment development, generating over 200 two-way trips. It is located in close proximity to Junction 51 of the A1(M), and has potential to generate enough trips to disrupt junction operation. As such, it is of concern to Highways England.	The Council will continue to have dialogue with Highways England regarding further assessment work for this site.

Table 6.32 Scruton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/127/001	No comments have been received either in support of or objecting to the potential allocation of this site.	N/A
B/127/002	One comment received from a local resident objecting to the allocation of the site. The objector considers the site inappropriate due to sewerage, neighbouring amenity, access and highway capacity, flooding issues, the impact on historic features, and the lack of need for additional housing in Scruton.	<p>The initial site assessment identifies the site as unsuitable for development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns regarding the capacity of the sewerage network, Yorkshire Water would advise the Council of any capacity issues and required works as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to access and highway capacity, since the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority has stated that the site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. They state that the developer would need to demonstrate that a suitable and safe access can be achieved. They confirm that the private road leading to the site will need to be brought up to an adoptable standard.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over flooding, as identified in the initial site assessment, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment states site is entirely in Flood Zone 1, with minimal or no risk from surface water flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommends that the development may be permitted on flood risk grounds. It concludes by stating that further investigation may be required by the developer and the council should be consulted as to whether a Flood Risk Assessment may be required. This should address concerns raised.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on historic assets, Historic England has confirmed that the development of the site seems unlikely to result in harm to any designated heritage asset.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbouring residents, if a planning application was submitted for this site, impact on amenity would be considered as part of the assessment of the planning application.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>In terms of the suggestion that there is no need for additional housing in Scruton, it is noted that Scruton is identified in the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village. It is therefore considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. Further work is to be undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for each settlement.</p>
B/127/005	<p>One comment has been received from a local resident objecting to the potential allocation of this site. This is for the following reasons;</p> <p>Ham Hall Lane is too narrow, has plenty of blind corners and has no passing places;</p> <p>Flooding;</p> <p>Sewerage system is not fit for purpose;</p> <p>Poor footpath connectivity;</p> <p>No local amenities such as school, shop and poor bus service.</p>	<p>The initial site assessment identifies the site as unsuitable for development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, in the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority states that access is acceptable onto A684. If the development was to go ahead, they state that works would be required to improve the existing major road. They also note that a Travel Assessment and Travel Plan would be required.</p> <p>In terms of concern over footpaths, as stated in the initial site assessment, if any development was to go ahead, the Local Highway Authority note that works would be required to extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns regarding the capacity of the sewerage network, Yorkshire Water would advise the Council of any capacity issues and required works as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>In terms of concern that there are no local amenities to support a new development, it is noted that Scruton is identified in the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village. It is therefore considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. Further work is to be undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for each settlement.</p>
B/127/006 B/127/007 B/127/008	<p>No comments have been received either in support of or objecting to the allocation of these sites.</p>	N/A

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/127/009	<p>One comment has been received from a local resident objecting to the potential allocation of this site. This is for the following reasons;</p> <p>Ham Hall Lane is too narrow, has plenty of blind corners and has no passing places;</p> <p>Flooding;</p> <p>Sewerage system is not fit for purpose;</p> <p>Poor footpath connectivity;</p> <p>No local amenities such as school, shop and poor bus service.</p>	<p>The initial site assessment identifies the site as unsuitable for development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, in the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority states that access is acceptable onto A684. If the development was to go ahead, they state that works would be required to improve the existing major road. They also note that a Travel Assessment and Travel Plan would be required.</p> <p>In terms of concern over footpaths, as stated in the initial site assessment, if any development was to go ahead, the Local Highway Authority note that works would be required to extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns regarding the capacity of the sewerage network, Yorkshire Water would advise the Council of any capacity issues and required works as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>In terms of concern that there are no local amenities to support a new development, it is noted that Scruton is identified in the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village. It is therefore considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. Further work is to be undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for each settlement.</p>

Table 6.33 Thornton Watlass

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
B/160/001	<p>Comment from one local resident objecting to the site based on drainage and highways, specifically the narrow access road and congestion. Also comments from Parish Council in agreement with recommendation not to allocate the site.</p>	<p>The initial site assessment identifies the site as unsuitable for development. An individual consultee and Parish Council agree that the site is unsuitable. The individual consultee raises some concerns. These are addressed below.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and congestion, as mentioned in the initial site assessment, access on to Watlass Lane is identified by the Local Highway Authority, however, they note that the developer would need to demonstrate that a suitable and safe access could be achieved. Congestion is not commented on by the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over drainage, no flooding issues are identified in the initial site assessment. As the site exceeds 1 ha, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommends that a site specific flood risk assessment is carried out.</p>
B/160/002	<p>One comment received from a local resident stressing the importance of retaining the hedgerow for wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>This comment is noted and is something that can be considered at planning application stage. Biodiversity screening has been commissioned by the Council and this recommends a Preliminary Ecological Assessment would be required at planning application stage. Retention of boundary features would be addressed as part of this.</p>

Easingwold area

Table 6.34 Easingwold

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/041/001	No comments requested as site with planning permission at time of consultation.	N/A
E/041/002	No consultation responses received.	N/A
E/041/003	Consultation responses suggests the site would be suitable for 2 smaller dwellings.	Planning application submitted in 2016 for construction of 2 detached 4 bedroom dwellings and associated garages, and access (16/01593/FUL). Permission refused but appeal allowed.
E/041/004	Consultation responses suggest site may be suitable for self-build plot.	In terms of comments around self build plot, the site is disconnected from settlement and further development would serve to consolidate the existing sporadic form of development in this area.
E/041/005	Consultation responses are in relation to the conclusions of the initial site assessment and therefore only relate to the proposal of 30 dwellings on part of the site. Key issues identified through consultation responses, include the need to ensure adequate off-street parking within the development. Also views that if additional housing is needed, then it is best to locate it on York road to lessen the congestion that new developments on Stillington road are causing. There is concern that additional housing will add to problems with the sewerage system which it is stated is unable to cope, especially at times of heavy rainfall and that work is required to the sewerage system.	<p>In terms of the location of new housing, transport modelling work will indicate any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development in this location. In terms of need for off-street parking, all new developments will be required to conform to development management policies on parking requirements.</p> <p>In terms of local concern over capacity of sewage system, Yorkshire Water advise that any further development in the market town of Easingwold should not come forward until work has been undertaken to investigate and where necessary provide for additional capacity in the water and wastewater infrastructure serving the town. Any identified improvement works would not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. For any developments coming forward in advance of this work,</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.
E/041/006	Key issues identified through consultation responses, include concern over capacity of sewage system in Easingwold and impact of additional development on this. Also concern over surface water flooding issues affecting properties in and around Alne road. There is also concern that development along Alne road would represent urban sprawl.	<p>In terms of concerns that development of site would represent urban sprawl, residential development is on the opposite side of Alne road and extends beyond the extent of this site. If this site is developed with E/041/012 as part of one development, the development would fit well with form and character, providing sensitive areas which are important to the character and amenity of the area (hedgerows, mature trees and a small area of plantation woodland) are retained.</p> <p>In terms of concern over surface water flooding, updated surface water flooding mapping layers show susceptibility of surface water flooding is limited to a relatively small section in the far eastern end of the site and that this extends onto Alne road. Environment Agency data shows that the risk of surface water flooding on Alne road is low (1:1000 year event) and the part in the eastern edge of the site is shown to be in the majority low risk, with a small area as medium risk (1:100 year event) and marginal area as high risk (1:30 year event). The Hambleton District Council Drainage Engineer states site E/041/006 has some limited extents of surface water susceptibility on the site along the roadside. They state that in terms of Alne Road there is surface water susceptibility mapped to existing development on Gatenby Garth and along the highway, although that is to be anticipated as the highway surface can be a low area. However, they state that surface water</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>management on the development site should control flows and ensure it does not affect existing development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewage system in Easingwold, the Council has made Yorkshire Water aware of concerns put forward through the consultation. In terms of Yorkshire Water's comments on proposals for additional housing in the Preferred Options document, Yorkshire Water states that additional housing sites should not come forward until infrastructure requirements have been properly assessed. They state any identified improvement works will not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. They state that for any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p>
E/041/007	<p>In general, consultation responses received for this site were in support of the decision not to allocate the site for development. Reasons given for why the site should not be developed include the view that at any further development on Millfield Lane is inappropriate due to impact on green spaces of the Millfield wood and open spaces. There is concern that loss of farmland will increase flooding in Millfield Lane at times of heavy rainfall resulting in problems for properties downhill of the site and adding to drainage and sewage problems in the town. There is also a concern of loss of habitat for wildlife. Concern over the level of proposed development in Easingwold was raised in terms of impact on services and infrastructure. The spatial distribution of</p>	<p>In terms of comments which relate to the spatial distribution of proposed development, the Local Plan focuses new development on the market towns due to access to services and facilities and accessibility but recognises the need for some new development to meet the needs of local communities in the most accessible and sustainable villages.</p> <p>In terms of impact on drainage and sewage infrastructure, Yorkshire Water advise that any further development in the market town of Easingwold should not come forward until work has been undertaken to investigate and where necessary provide for additional capacity in the water and wastewater infrastructure serving the town. Any identified</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>proposed development in other settlements within the sub area and why development cannot be spread equally was questioned. Issue of road safety is raised which it is stated could be an issue with added traffic on Millfield Lane because the Lane is narrow and already partly affected by on-street parking of existing residents (where off-street parking not always available). Other responses showed support for development on site for reasons including proximity to GP surgery, open space and town centre.</p>	<p>improvement works would not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. For any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p> <p>While it is recognised the site has good connectivity to the town centre, the site does not relate well to the form and character of the settlement.</p>
E/041/008	<p>In general, consultation responses received for this site were in support of the decision not to allocate the site for development. Reasons given for why the site should not be developed include the view that at any further development on Millfield Lane is inappropriate due to impact on green spaces of the Millfield wood and open spaces. Issue of road safety is raised which it is stated could be an issue with added traffic on Millfield Lane because the Lane is narrow and already partly affected by on-street parking of existing residents (where off-street parking not always available). Some support for development on site for reasons including proximity to GP surgery, open space and town centre.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over highway safety, this has not been identified as an issue by the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>In terms of impact on drainage and sewage infrastructure, Yorkshire Water advise that any further development in the market town of Easingwold should not come forward until work has been undertaken to investigate and where necessary provide for additional capacity in the water and wastewater infrastructure serving the town. Any identified improvement works would not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. For any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p> <p>While it is recognised the site has good connectivity to the town centre, the site does not relate well to the form and character of the settlement.</p>
E/041/009	Site reference not allocated to a site.	N/A

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/041/010	<p>There was some support for development on this site as it is viewed as being small and well-contained in landscape terms, with good access. There are suggestions that it would be suitable for a small self-build scheme, possibly bungalows to blend in with existing dwellings on this side of the road. However, there is also concern about the speed of traffic at this section of road as traffic approaches Easingwold from the north and safety issues this may present. Suggestion made that any development would require measures to ensure proper safety for road users and pedestrians, including provision of a footway which does not currently extend to site frontage.</p>	<p>Development of this site alone would not relate well to the existing settlement form.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over highway safety issues, these are not picked up as issues by the Local Highway Authority.</p>
E/041/011	<p>The overriding view coming from the consultation was that of concern that the proposed site boundary for the extension of the surgery encompasses part of the adjacent open green space at Millfield Lane which is not deemed acceptable by the local community. Concern that the proposed boundary also encroaches on to the national cycle network, public access route and Millfield Lane car park. Loss of the public car park is off concern for some. The importance of the open space for recreational purposes and biodiversity is highlighted. There are some views that expansion of the existing premises is appropriate given its central location, providing redevelopment is within the existing site envelope, utilising the parking area at the rear as necessary. However, there were more responses which suggested the existing surgery building is not suitable for expansion and that there are better alternative sites for provision of</p>	<p>The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and NHS Property Services will need to provide further evidence of need for expanded health care facilities and justification for their preferred location for additional facilities.</p> <p>In terms of objections to encroaching into the recreational Land at Millfield Lane which is managed by the Town Council, the Local Green Space Recommendations Report (March 2017) recommends this recreational land is designated as local green space as it is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves and it is assessed as possessing local significance because of its tranquillity, biodiversity and recreational value. As such any redevelopment of this site will need to retain the area of open space which is part of this local green space designation.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	additional healthcare facilities, such as York road or the Copperclay Walk site (currently redundant NHS building).	
E/041/012	<p>Key issues identified through consultation responses, include concern that development along Alne road would represent urban sprawl, result in further loss of greenbelt and the site is not well related to town centre. There is also concern of adding development to an already overcrowded area and concern expressed over surface water drainage issues affecting properties in and around Alne road. Some support for site due to direct access on to Alne road and because this area is already developed.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns that development of site would represent urban sprawl, residential development is on the opposite side of Alne road and extends beyond the extent of this site. If this site is developed with E/041/012 as part of one development, the development would fit well with form and character, providing sensitive areas which are important to the character and amenity of the area (hedgerows, mature trees and a small area of plantation woodland) are retained.</p> <p>In terms of concern over surface water flooding, updated surface water flooding mapping layers show susceptibility of surface water flooding is limited to a relatively small section in the far western end of the site. This is mainly low risk (1:1000 year event and a small section at medium risk (1:100 year event). The part that extends onto Alne road is identified as having low risk of surface water flooding (1:1000 year event).</p> <p>The Hambleton District Council Drainage Engineer refers to limited surface water susceptibility on the adjacent site (E/041/006) along the roadside and acknowledges that in terms of Alne Road there is surface water susceptibility mapped to existing development on Gatenby Garth and along the highway, although that is to be anticipated as the highway surface can be a low area. However, they state that surface water management on the development site should control flows and ensure it does not affect existing development.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/041/013	Majority of consultation responses showed support for an employment site at this location due to transport links and proximity to Shires Bridge employment site. There are suggestions that the site should be used for petrol filling station due to good location for passing vehicles and to avoid traffic coming into town to use filling station which has been proposed on York road. Some objection to site on basis that development would not be in keeping with the character of the area.	While there is some support for an employment site in this location with particular regard to a petrol filling station, there is currently no known interest from developers for a filling station and the site is not regarded as a suitable general employment location in the Employment Land Review (2016).
E/041/014	The majority of consultation responses showed support for the conclusions of the initial site assessment. There was particular reference to the need to retain trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders within the site. An individual response showed support for site suggesting impact on landscape would be minimal because the site is part of the built form.	Given the location of the site, it is still considered to not relate well to existing form and character of this area of the settlement. This would be back land development.
E/041/015	<p>There is overall support within consultation responses for allocation of this site for employment use which is contrary to the conclusion of the initial site assessment. The general consensus emerging from consultation responses is that allocation of additional land for employment in this location is appropriate as it is adjacent to an established business park with good access to the A19 and avoids generating additional traffic into the town. There is suggestion that the land could be held in reserve to provide additional employment land once other allocations have been developed.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	The site is within an area identified as a general employment location within the new Local Plan where employment uses will be supported, subject to traffic and other amenity issues. Allocation of site would therefore not be necessary.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/041/016	<p>Through the consultation responses there is some recognition of the need for the expansion of the primary school amongst some consultees. However, there are a number of issues raised through other responses with some opposition to the proposal on E/041/016. There is some recognition that the church will need to increase the area of its churchyard at some point in the future and it is stated that land at the southern end of this site would be ideal. Key reasons given which are against housing development on this site include the negative impact on biodiversity and local wildlife and there are also concerns in relation to road safety as a result of additional traffic, particularly given the proximity to primary school. There is particular concern in relation to the increase in volume of traffic on Thirsk road and Long street. There are also views that development should be spread more evenly across the villages rather than focusing new housing development in Easingwold town and that development in this area would represent urban sprawl. There is concern that the proposed scale of housing on the site is too large and that this will increase shortages of school places. It is noted that housing development on the site was refused recently on the basis of shortages in school and health facilities, poor access and that there was not a need for additional housing. Where there is support for housing on this site, it is generally on the basis that there is a contribution towards provision of additional classroom space and recreational space for the school and there is also a view expressed that there should be two access points on to Husthwaite road. There is recognition that the site</p>	<p>In relation to concerns around traffic volume and road safety and comments around access points, the Local Highway Authority has advised on certain requirements to make the scheme acceptable in highway terms.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around ensuring there is expansion space for the churchyard, no evidence has been submitted to confirm the need for future expansion of the church yard.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the impact on wildlife and biodiversity, local biodiversity screening has been undertaken for this site and mitigation measures have been identified which will need to be fulfilled as part of any development.</p> <p>In terms of comments which relate to the spatial distribution of proposed development, the Local Plan focuses new development on the market towns due to access to services and facilities and accessibility.</p> <p>In relation to comments relating to the refusal of a previous planning application (15/02384/FUL) on this site, this decision was made within the planning policy framework of the current Local Plan (the Local Development Framework). This district council is now assessing sites to identify sites which are suitable for helping to meet the district's housing need within the new Local Plan period, up to 2035. This site assessment is part of this process.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>provides direct access to Husthwaite road and A19 which should avoid the need to go through town centre.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	
E/041/017	<p>There is overall support within the consultation responses that this site is not suitable for allocation in the Local Plan. Reasons around poor transport links and access and expansion into greenfield are highlighted.</p>	Noted.
E/041/018	<p>Key issues identified through consultation responses, include concern that the site does not have adequate accessibility to serve proposed development. It is noted that the junction on Raskelf road would need improving. Concern over road safety associated with additional volume of traffic and parked cars is raised. Congestion is identified as an existing problem in this location which it is stated would be made worse by new development, particularly as Knott Lane is narrow. If development is needed in this location, the importance of retaining mature trees and hedges is highlighted and the need for green corridors along northern and eastern boundary to provide buffer to existing housing and biodiversity is highlighted in the responses. There are objections to development in this location on the basis it represents extension into greenfield and historic strip fields and would impact on character of area. There is concern over inadequate infrastructure to support a development like this with particular reference to sewerage system and roads. York road is identified as a better location along the main access routes into the town. There is a view that the fields</p>	<p>Transport modelling work will address any highways issues and inform decisions on suitability of development at this location.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on biodiversity, the site has been the subject of biodiversity screening and this identifies any necessary mitigation measures.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water advise that any further development in the market town of Easingwold should not come forward until work has been undertaken to investigate and where necessary provide for additional capacity in the water and wastewater infrastructure serving the town. Any identified improvement works would not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. For any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over surface water flooding, any development will need to</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	flood regularly over the winter and one consultee suggests this is due to the high water table.	address issues and provide sustainable drainage measures.
E/041/019	Site reference not allocated to a site	N/A
E/041/020	Site reference not allocated to a site	N/A
E/041/021	<p>The general consensus from the consultation responses is that this site is not suitable for development. Objections to development of this site are largely in relation to concerns over poor accessibility and impact on the cross roads at Oulston and Uppleby road. There is also concern over impact on wildlife and biodiversity and the rural aspect of the site is seen as important to the character of the area and the adjacent Millfield recreation area.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over impact on biodiversity, the site has been the subject of biodiversity screening and this identifies any necessary mitigation measures.</p> <p>In terms of concern over the loss of the rural aspect of the site and impact on character, the importance of the rural aspect is identified in two studies. The Hambleton Landscape Character Assessment and Sensitivity Study (May 2016) and Hambleton Settlement Character Assessments (2016) identify the site and adjacent field to the east as former medieval strip fields which are identified as being important to the character of the area.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and highways issues, the Local Highway Authority do not identify this as a barrier to development but do state that visibility splays will be difficult to achieve due to existing buildings, boundary walls and the horizontal alignment of Copperclay Walk.</p>
E/041/022	Within the consultation responses, there was some suggestion that this site should be used to deliver the additional housing required in Easingwold as part of a mixed use scheme which included GP surgery, primary school and green spaces. However,	In terms of suggestions around use of the site as a large mixed use scheme including facilities such as GP surgery and primary school, development at this scale would be harmful to the character of the settlement.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	the general consensus from the consultation responses is that this site is not suitable for development due to scale.	
E/041/023	Within the consultation responses, there was some support for development on this site on the basis that the site is close to existing development and has access to Stillington road. However, these views were outweighed by objections to the site. This included the view that Stillington road is already over capacity as well as junctions at Crabmill Lane and Long Street.	In terms of concerns regarding capacity of highway, transport modelling will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development in this location.
E/041/024	There is some support for development on this site within the consultation responses on the basis that there is potential to access the site from York road which provides a direct link to the A19 without needing to travel through the town. It is suggested that fewer larger sites which provide good access to the A19 would be more appropriate than the number of smaller sites shown as preferred around the edges of the town in the Preferred Options document. This is on the basis that some consultees believe this strategy may encourage more traffic through the town and may increase costs of providing infrastructure to these sites. However, there are more consultation responses in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which did not deem the site suitable for development.	In terms of concerns around the spatial distribution of development sites in and around Easingwold town, sites will only be identified as an allocation in the new Local Plan where the final stages of the site assessment show that the site is available, deliverable and viable which includes consideration of access, impact on highway network and infrastructure and that the site is required to meet the housing requirement.
E/041/025	There is some support for development on this site within the consultation responses on the basis that there is potential to access the site from York road which provides a direct link to the A19 without needing to travel through the town. It is suggested the size of the site could provide for a mixed use scheme including facilities such as GP	In terms of suggestions around use of the site as a large mixed use scheme including facilities such as GP surgery and primary school, development at this scale would be harmful to the character of the settlement. In terms of concerns around the spatial distribution of development sites in and around

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>surgery, school and green spaces. There is also a view that that fewer larger sites which provide good access to the A19 would more appropriate than the number of smaller sites shown as preferred around the edges of the town in the Preferred Options document. This is on the basis that some consultees believe this strategy may encourage more traffic through the town and may increase costs of providing infrastructure to these sites. However, there are more consultation responses in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which did not deem the site suitable for development.</p>	<p>Easingwold town, sites will only be identified as an allocation in the new Local Plan where the final stages of the site assessment show that the site is available, deliverable and viable which includes consideration of access, impact on highway network and infrastructure and that the site is required to meet the housing requirement.</p>
E/041/026	<p>There is general support within the consultation responses for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified this site as not suitable for development. A contrary view was provided on the basis that it was felt the site is connected to the main settlement and would not impact on the appearance of the town. However, overall, the view is maintained that the site is not well related to existing residential development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
E/041/027	<p>There is some opposition to development on this site within the consultation responses largely due to highways issues. There is concern that the additional traffic generated by the development would present safety issues in light of the proximity to the entrance of the primary school and that Thirsk road and Long Street are already affected by heavy volumes of traffic. Loss of the school car park is raised as an issue. There is a view that the land should be retained for existing commercial/employment uses and that the car park should be retained in this location for pupil drop off and pick ups at the primary</p>	<p>In terms of concerns relating to highway safety and capacity, transport modelling will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development at this location.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the loss of the school car park, it is understood that there is no formal arrangement in place between the primary school and the land owners and therefore there is no restriction preventing the redevelopment of this area as part of a housing scheme.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the loss of employment use on the site, the site is</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>school. It is noted that the land levels drop down considerably into the field west of the current buildings but no further detail is given in relation to this point. However, there are more consultation responses in support of development on the site. The main reasons given are that the site has good access onto the main road, is close to the school, within walking distance of the town centre and relates well to existing developments.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>not in a general employment area within the district and providing there is an indication that the current use is not longer viable, residential use can be considered as an appropriate use for this location.</p>
E/041/028	<p>The general consensus from the consultation responses is that this site is not suitable for development due to scale. It was also noted that the area is just north of where sewers flood. There was some suggestion that this site should be used to deliver the additional housing required for Easingwold as part of a mixed use scheme which included GP surgery, primary school and green spaces.</p>	<p>In terms of suggestions around use of the site as a large mixed use scheme including facilities such as GP surgery and primary school, development at this scale would be harmful to the character of the settlement.</p>
E/041/029	<p>Consultation responses are in support of the conclusions of the site assessment to not allocate the site. Specific reasons include the view that the site is seen as being too far out of the centre of town and it is within the open countryside. There is some concern over how development at this location would be connected to key infrastructure such as sewers. It is also noted that the site is close to a beck which is known to flood into gardens of nearby properties.</p>	<p>The Employment Land Review (2016) does not identify a need for employment land at this location.</p> <p>The site is open and prominent in significant views towards the settlement. The scale and location of the site does not relate well to the existing built form and character of the settlement.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/041/030	<p>There is support within the consultation responses for the conclusions of the initial site assessment that concluded that this site is suitable for employment use.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Noted.
E/041/031	<p>There is general support within the consultation responses for employment use on this site subject to appropriate access arrangements. It is suggested that the site could be a reserve employment site that could provide additional employment land once allocations have been developed. There is a view that it may be appropriate for mixed employment and retail use.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>The Employment Land Review (2016) identifies Shires Bridge as being a general employment location. It supports the protection of the area for continued employment use.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion that retail use could be considered on the site as part of a mixed use scheme, the Retail and Leisure Study (2016) does not suggest there is sufficient capacity for retail use in this location. Any proposal would need to demonstrate that it could pass the sequential test. Town centre locations are prioritised.</p>
E/041/032	<p>No comments requested for this site. This is due to the fact that since the initial assessment of this site, the appeal on this site has been allowed and planning permission has been granted for the construction of up to 80 dwellings, convenience store, petrol filling station and healthcare facilities (See planning application reference 15/02419/OUT and Appeal Reference: 16/00039/REFUSE and APP/G2713/W/16/3161503).</p>	<p>Since the initial assessment of this site, the appeal on this site has been allowed and planning permission has been granted.</p>
E/041/033	<p>There are views for and against the development of this site within the consultation responses. There is some objection to development of the site largely due to views that the access is not suitable given that Knott Lane is a narrow road that</p>	<p>In terms of objections around the suitability of access, the Local Highway Authority has looked at the proposals on Knott Lane and based on the indicative housing yield of sites which were preferred at Preferred Options stage, the</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>is already heavily congested. There is a view that because houses front on to the access road, there is little that can be done to address the issues. It is also noted that development should be focused where there is good access to the A19 to limit impact on town and where infrastructure can be better planned. There is also concern over the impact on the green corridor in the locality.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of this site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Highway Authority states that to facilitate this level of increased trips Knott Lane will need to be widened from the site frontages to the junction with Raskelf Road. They state that Knott Lane has some localised pinch points across the site frontages and therefore the required highway widening is likely to be outside the available highway extents and within the development area and will require the removal of mature hedgerows and trees in locations. The Local Highway Authority also state that the cumulative impact of these sites will need to be accessed at the Knott Lane and Raskelf Road junction as well as the mini roundabout of Raskelf Road and Long Street. This will be addressed through transport modelling work that the Council has commissioned. In terms of comments which suggest development should be in locations with good access to the A19 and where infrastructure can be better planned, the transport modelling work will also inform decisions in relation to which sites are most appropriate for development.</p> <p>In terms of objections based on the impact on the green corridor, the district council has since received a proposal for an area of land adjacent to the western boundary of E/041/044 to be designated as local green space. The proposed area has been independently assessed and is recommended for designation as Local Green Space within the Local Plan (see assessment for ALT/E/041/058/G). Any development on E/041/033 will therefore need to provide links into the adjacent wooded area to the west of the site which has been identified for Local Green Space designation.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/041/034	<p>The majority of consultation responses received are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment that identified the site as not preferred. There is concern within the responses over loss of the open countryside and views as a result of any development on the site and proximity to the Howardian Hills is mentioned. There is also concern that many of the trees on site are protected by Tree Preservation Orders.</p> <p>Impact on sewerage infrastructure and flooding in the area was also raised and the issue of surface water flooding on the site is mentioned.</p> <p>There were a couple of consultation responses that put forward reasons as to why the site would be appropriate for development. This included the view that the site had good access to the public highway and that the site would tie in with other new development in the vicinity. There was a suggestion that bungalows should be included within the development to meet local need and also reduce impact of development on the landscape.</p> <p>There was a comment made about the consultation process which referred to the on line consultation method as inadequate for engaging local people.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of this site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over loss of open countryside and impact on TPOs, these aspects are already picked up in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of surface water flooding, updated GIS mapping layers do not indicate any part of the site as being susceptible to surface water flooding.</p> <p>In terms of sewerage infrastructure, Yorkshire Water advise that any further development in the market town of Easingwold should not come forward until work has been undertaken to investigate and where necessary provide for additional capacity in the water and wastewater infrastructure serving the town. Any identified improvement works would not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. For any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p> <p>In terms of consultation responses suggesting the site has good access, the initial site assessment stated that the site does have access to the highway.</p> <p>In terms of suggestion around the need for bungalows, policies in the new Local Plan will set out a requirement for bungalows on all new housing developments and therefore the need for bungalows across the district will be met through implementation of housing policies.</p> <p>In terms of criticism of the on line consultation, there was opportunity for consultees to view consultation</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		documents in the libraries and area offices and to submit written representations if necessary.
E/041/035	<p>Within the consultation responses for this site, there is mainly support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not preferred. However, there are a couple of comments which suggest the site is appropriate for development on the basis the site is adjacent to existing built development and that access could be possible to York road and A19. The point is made that it is important to focus new development on main access roads which provide good access to A19 to avoid bringing additional traffic through the town and to make the provision of infrastructure easier and cheaper. There is some criticism of the location of preferred sites in that they are edge of town and do not have good access to A19. There is suggestion green spaces could be part of the site. Reference to the planning application for housing and health facilities on the adjacent site (E/041/032) is made and it is suggested that this site would link well to that site.</p>	<p>In terms of those comments which suggest the site is appropriate for development, it should be noted that access to the highway has not been identified. New housing development at this location and at proposed scale would not fit well with the existing character and form of the settlement.</p> <p>Almost the entire site is susceptible to surface water flooding.</p> <p>In terms of provision of green space within a development in this location, sites will be identified for local green space within the Local Plan and requirements for open space provision within new housing developments will be set out in Local Plan policy.</p> <p>In terms of criticism of location of preferred sites, transport modelling and further site assessment work will inform decisions on where development is suitable.</p>
E/041/036	The site is the same as E/041/033. See site E/041/033 for comments.	N/A
E/041/037	<p>There are more consultation responses that support development on this site than those which are against development in this location. The key message coming from the comments is that the site is appropriate for development on the basis that access is possible on to York road providing a link to the A19. The point is made that it is important to focus new development on main access roads such as York road and</p>	<p>In terms of comments relating to flooding, updated GIS mapping layers show central area of site is susceptible to surface water flooding.</p> <p>In terms of comments suggesting development of this site would be preferable to lost of smaller sites, it can be noted that development at the proposed scale would have a negative impact on form and character.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Thirsk road which provide good access to A19 to avoid bringing additional traffic through the town and to make the provision of infrastructure easier and cheaper. It is suggested that if so much new housing is needed in the town, then development on a larger site such as this site which could include other facilities such as GP service, school and green spaces and has good access to A19 is the best approach. It is also suggested that the site is adjacent to site (E/041/032) which has been identified for development and is also in proximity to other new development. There is some criticism of the location of preferred sites in that they are edge of town and do not have good access to A19. It is also suggested that flooding issues referred to in the initial site assessment could be addressed given that site E/041/032 which is adjacent has been identified for possible development. There is a comment requesting the need to retain all trees.</p> <p>The site has submitted additional information in support of development on this site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of provision of green space within a development in this location, sites will be identified for local green space within the Local Plan and requirements for open space provision within new housing developments will be set out in Local Plan policy.</p> <p>In terms of criticism of location of preferred sites, transport modelling and further site assessment work will inform decisions on where development is suitable</p>
E/041/038	<p>There is strong objection to the development of this site within the consultation responses, largely due to concerns over the inadequacy of Knott Lane in terms of access and also due to flooding issues.</p> <p>Knott Lane is described as a narrow country lane and a common view is that it does not have capacity to absorb additional traffic. It is noted that Knott Lane is already congested which is caused by both traffic and parked cars. It is suggested that access could not be improved as existing houses front onto the road on both sides. There is</p>	<p>In terms of objections around the suitability of access and capacity of the highway, the Local Highway Authority has looked at the proposals on Knott Lane and based on the indicative housing yield of sites which were preferred at Preferred Options stage, the Highway Authority states that to facilitate this level of increased trips Knott Lane will need to be widened from the site frontages to the junction with Raskelf Road. They state that Knott Lane has some localised pinch points across the site frontages and therefore the required highway widening is likely to be outside the available</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>concern over how the increased volume of traffic generated would access both the A19 and the centre of Easingwold and implications of this, particularly if E/041/018 is also developed. There is a clear view that new development should have links to the A19 as oppose to Knott Lane which is described as a narrow country lane. One suggestion is that new housing should be on brownfield sites in locations close to York on the assumption that most new home owners will work in York.</p> <p>The other major concern is that the site is susceptible to flooding in winter. It is described as a water logged site with a high water table. Comments refer to a ditch which separates the bottom of the gardens of Whiteoak Avenue from the current fields and that this has caused problems with flooding in a number of gardens. Reference to the existence of a septic tank in the field behind Knott Lodge is made. It is stated that flooding is likely to increase with climate change and more development. Reference to other flooding issues in the town is made. It is noted that there are areas in the town affected by sewage back flow out of toilets. There is concern that more development may create such problems if this site is developed. There is a view that the infrastructure for drains and sewage cannot cope with all the new development.</p> <p>The site is described as including ancient hedgerows and trees which run through the site and there is a request for these to be retained if any development goes ahead. It is suggested that a green corridor should be maintained along the eastern edge of the site to promote biodiversity and to improve the aesthetics of the site.</p>	<p>highway extents and within the development area and will require the removal of mature hedgerows and trees in locations. The Local Highway Authority also state that the cumulative impact of these sites will need to be accessed at the Knott Lane and Raskelf Road junction as well as the mini roundabout of Raskelf Road and Long Street. This will be addressed through transport modelling work that the Council has commissioned. In terms of comments which suggest development should be in locations with good access to the A19, and concerns that comment on location of new development, the transport modelling work will also inform decisions in relation to which sites are most appropriate for development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of sewerage system in Easingwold, the district council has made Yorkshire Water aware of concerns put forward through the consultation. In terms of Yorkshire Water's comments on proposals for additional housing in the Preferred Options document, Yorkshire Water states that additional housing sites should not come forward until infrastructure requirements have been properly assessed. They state any identified improvement works will not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. They state that for any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p> <p>In terms of comments regarding hedgerows and green corridors, for any development that goes ahead on this site,</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>In terms of the spatial distribution of new housing sites in Easingwold, there is some concern that development along Knott Lane represents a significant extension to the settlement which could potentially lead to opening up the way to development across the the A19 and York road.</p>	<p>the local biodiversity screening requires retainment of important features of this nature and provision of ecological connectivity through green corridors.</p>
E/041/039	<p>Most of the consultation responses support the conclusions of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as not appropriate for development. However, there are some opposing the conclusion on the basis that the site could establish links to the highway and that the site could form part of a larger development delivering other key facilities such as GP surgery, school and green spaces alongside new housing.</p>	<p>In terms of those comments which suggest the site is appropriate for development, it should be noted that access to the highway has not been identified.</p> <p>New housing development at this location and at proposed scale would not fit well with the existing character and form of the settlement.</p>
E/041/040	<p>Most of the consultation responses support the conclusions of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as not appropriate for development. However, there are a couple of responses opposing the conclusion on the basis that the site could establish links to the highway and that the site could form part of a larger development delivering other key facilities such as GP surgery, school and green spaces alongside new housing.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of this site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of those comments which suggest the site is appropriate for development, it should be noted that access to the highway has not been identified.</p> <p>New housing development at this location and at proposed scale would not fit well with the existing character and form of the settlement.</p>
E/041/041	<p>Most of the consultation responses support the conclusions of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as not appropriate for development. However, there are a couple of responses opposing the conclusion on the basis that the site</p>	<p>In terms of those comments which suggest the site is appropriate for development, it should be noted that access to the highway has not been identified.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>could establish links to the highway and that the site could form part of a larger development delivering other key facilities such as GP surgery, school and green spaces alongside new housing.</p>	<p>New housing development at this location and at proposed scale would not fit well with the existing character and form of the settlement.</p>
E/041/042	<p>There is both support and objection within the consultation responses to the initial site assessment conclusion for this site which identified the site as not appropriate for development. The same number of consultation responses support the conclusion as those which do not.</p> <p>In terms of those comments suggesting the site is suitable for development, the main reason given is that the site is seen to have good access on Thirsk road and Husthwaite road which provide links to the A19. There is a suggestion that development of only the southern half of the site would be suitable for smaller starter homes with good access to the primary school. Another suggestion is that the size of the site and good links to the highway and A19 would make it suitable for housing including green spaces, GP surgery and other facilities.</p> <p>Other responses provide the view that the site will not be disconnected from the settlement as it will be close to the new development at E/041/016 which is identified as a preferred site in the Preferred Options document.</p>	<p>In terms of comments which are suggesting the site is suitable for development, it is possible to conclude that the location of the site means that development would be disconnected from the main settlement and the proposed scale would have a negative impact on form and character.</p>
E/041/043	<p>The majority of consultation responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which states the site is not appropriate for development.</p> <p>For the responses which suggest the site is suitable for development, this is on the basis that the site is deemed to have good access onto Thirsk and Husthwaite Road</p>	<p>In terms of comments which are suggesting the site is suitable for development, it is possible to conclude that the location of the site means that development would be disconnected from the main settlement and the proposed scale would have a negative impact on form and character.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>and that the site will be adjacent to E/041/016 which will mean the site will be close to other new development.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	
E/041/044	<p>There are more responses which do not support the conclusion of the initial site assessment than those that do support the conclusion. Reasons given for why the site is not suitable for development include the view that further development along Knott Lane would represent creeping extension of development towards the A19 and York road and the view that there is not a suitable access into the site as the access to the site is narrow, it is a congested road which is already used to access an extended area of housing.</p> <p>It is also noted that there are hedgerows and trees on the site which form part of the green corridor on this side of town.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns that development of site would represent creeping extension to the A19 and York road, it should be noted that allocation of the site does not presuppose that further development along Knott Lane would be supported.</p> <p>In terms of objections around the suitability of access and capacity of the highway, the Local Highway Authority has looked at the proposals on Knott Lane and based on the indicative housing yield of sites which were preferred at Preferred Options stage, the Highway Authority states that to facilitate this level of increased trips Knott Lane will need to be widened from the site frontages to the junction with Raskelf Road. They state that Knott Lane has some localised pinch points across the site frontages and therefore the required highway widening is likely to be outside the available highway extents and within the development area and will require the removal of mature hedgerows and trees in locations. The Local Highway Authority also state that the cumulative impact of these sites will need to be accessed at the Knott Lane and Raskelf Road junction as well as the mini roundabout of Raskelf Road and Long Street. This will be addressed through transport modelling work that the Council has commissioned.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>The transport modelling work will inform decisions in relation to which sites are most appropriate for development.</p> <p>In terms of objections based on the impact on the green corridor, the Council has since received a proposal for an area of land adjacent to the western boundary of E/041/044 to be designated as local green space. The proposed area has been independently assessed and is recommended for designation as Local Green Space within the Local Plan (see assessment for ALT/E/041/058/G). Any development on E/041/044 will therefore need to provide links into the adjacent wooded area to the west of the site which has been identified for Local Green Space designation.</p>
E/041/045	<p>The majority of consultation responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as preferred.</p> <p>For those consultation responses not in support of development on this site, this is largely on the basis of access issues and increased traffic and the implications this may have for the primary school and the nearby roundabout. It is suggested the access point and the additional traffic would present safety issues for those using the primary school, particularly in light of existing on street car parking and volume of traffic on Thirsk road and Long street. There is concern over safety of the access point in terms of visibility. Reference to the site creating urban sprawl behind existing properties was also made.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns relating to the highway access safety and capacity of the highway, transport modelling will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development at this location.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the site representing urban sprawl, the development would continue the established line of development following the Prospect Avenue development.</p>

Table 6.35 Brafferton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/018/001	<p>From the few consultation responses received, there was one in support of the allocation of the site on the basis that the site is adjacent to existing properties and would form a logical extension of the village envelope. By contrast another view presented was that development would have a negative impact on Conservation Area and character of the approach into the village and proximity to a pig farm was seen to present potential amenity issues for future residents.</p>	<p>In terms of concern over impact on the Conservation Area, Historic England have advised that an assessment of the impact of the development on the Conservation Area is required and that this would inform whether an allocation was appropriate or not. In terms the impact of neighbouring agricultural uses on amenity of residents, this was not identified as an issue during the site visit and is not known to be an issue for existing residents on the adjacent St Peter's Close.</p>
E/018/002	<p>In terms of consultation responses to the preferred sites, there is only one comment from an individual which shows support for development in the western end of the site adjacent to existing development which fronts onto Boroughbridge road, providing there was gradual release of the site over the plan period. The other two comments are representations from the site promoter in support of the site.</p>	<p>The initial site assessment recognises that development of the full site would have a negative impact on form and character and be prominent in views towards the settlement.</p>
E/018/003	<p>In terms of consultation responses to the preferred sites, there is only one comment from an individual and their comments are not in support of the allocation of this site. Their view is that the site lies outside the current village envelope and that development would make the village undesirably linear.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>The initial site assessment recognises that development of the site would have a negative impact on form and character of the settlement and be prominent in views towards the settlement.</p>

Table 6.36 Helperby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/063/001	<p>In terms of consultation responses to the preferred sites, there is only one comment from an individual and their comments are not in support of the allocation of this site. Their view is that the site is regularly water logged and that additional development will increase surface water run off on to the road where they state there are already problems of standing water. They also suggest that the settlement does not have the necessary facilities to support additional housing at this scale. They also have concern over loss of trees to create access on to Raskelf road which have biodiversity value. There objection is also on the basis of highway safety as they state there is a dangerous blind spot for traffic passing and accessing the site. They also show concern over new development on the site being highly visible on approach into and out of the village. The consultee suggests a more suitable area for housing development would be at Dishforth military base which they understand is due to be sold off suggesting this could be a mixed use site with other facilities and amenities with good access to the A1 and A19.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over surface water flooding, the initial site assessment noted that the central area of site is susceptible to surface water flooding. However, updated GIS mapping layers show that a reduced area is susceptible which is outside the area identified as preferred in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concern over lack of amenities in Helperby, the settlement together with Brafferton is identified as a service village within the district council's settlement hierarchy and therefore is deemed to be able to sustain some additional development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of trees, retainment of boundary features will be a requirement of any development other than that which is required to create an access.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over highway safety, the Local Highway Authority have identified a possible access from the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concern over the visibility of the site, the initial site assessment does note that development at the proposed scale would not fit with form and character of the settlement.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion of using Dishforth for a future mixed use site, this is outside the district boundary and therefore is not a site which is available to Hambleton for allocation.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/063/002	<p>There is only one response from an individual who provides support for allocation of this site on the basis that they believe that because the site is partly occupied by what they describe as unsightly and apparently redundant industrial buildings, that redevelopment would be desirable and would form a more attractive setting for the listed Old Star Cottage. They state that the site is also in close proximity to other residential properties on the opposite side of Back lane.</p> <p>The other consultation response was from the site promoter who submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>While it is recognised that the site already has some buildings within the site boundary, as the initial site assessment concludes, the site is disconnected from the main settlement and does not fit well with the character and form of the settlement.</p>

Table 6.37 Huby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/070/001	<p>There are four consultee responses from individuals who are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment. They also suggest that the site is in greenbelt and outside village boundary. One consultee suggests that land south of the Mended Drum public house taking access from School close would be a better alternative site. There is also a response from the Parish Council in support of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>There is also representation from the site promoter of site reference E/070/012. The site promoter of E/070/012 supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment for E/070/001.</p>	<p>In terms of the comment in relation to the site being in greenbelt and outside the village boundary, it should be noted that there is no greenbelt around Huby rather the site is categorised as greenfield. It is also worth clarifying that when identifying sites for allocation in the new Local Plan, the Council must consider sites outside the development limits set out in the current Local Development Framework.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/070/002	<p>In terms of responses referring to E/070/002, one individual questioned why this site had been identified as being prominent in significant views when the site on the opposite side of the road (site E/070/015) had not.</p> <p>The Parish Council also commented on the site noting that they support the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>There is also representation from the site promoter of site reference E/070/012. The site promoter of E/070/012 supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment for E/070/002.</p>	<p>It is noted that while prominence in significant views is not mentioned in the conclusion of the initial site assessment for E/070/015, under the section on 'impact on character and form', the site assessment does state that E/070/015 would be prominent in significant views towards the settlement.</p>
E/070/003	<p>The general consensus coming through the consultation responses is that the existing sports facilities on Robin Lane should be retained and improved and that there is no need to allocate E/070/003. The Parish Council also do not support allocation of new facilities at this site.</p> <p>One consultee understands that the Village hall Committee and the Sport's Club have stated that a combined village hall/sport's pavillion is no longer on their agenda and that they are both looking at the improvement of the current facilities. It is noted that the current sports field is of a high standard. Huby United Football Club representative does not support the proposal for a new facility at E/070/003.</p> <p>One response states that it is understood that the Playing Fields Association have not been consulted on the proposals at E/070/003.</p> <p>Concerns of the site being on a slope with poor drainage are highlighted as issues.</p> <p>It is noted that the site being on the edge of the village and with poor pedestrian connectivity to the village centre.</p>	<p>The District Council is now aware that there is no local support for allocation of a site for a new village hall and sports pavillion. Furthermore, since the initial site assessment for this site, an independent study has been completed on behalf of Hambleton District Council providing a comprehensive review of existing provision of open space and recreational facilities, playing pitches and indoor sports facilities across the district. The study has not identified a need for a new sports ground or sports pavillion at this location. The study concludes that the existing Huby Playing Fields and Social Club should be protected as playing pitches in the Local Plan.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>It also noted in a response that bats are known to be in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>Concerns are made in relation to the road being narrow and the view that the road is unable to absorb additional traffic associated with new development.</p> <p>It is also noted that the site would have a negative impact on form and character of the settlement.</p>	
E/070/004	<p>The general consensus coming through the consultation from individuals is that this site is not appropriate for development. This is contrary to the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>It is noted that Huby Parish Council agree with the recommendation of the initial site assessment subject to environmental and wildlife assessments and clarity on access routes.</p> <p>Reasons put forward by consultees for objecting to development on this site include suggestion that there are bats in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>There is concern that the site is disconnected from village facilities and that development on this site would have a negative impact on form and character of the settlement and be prominent in views towards the settlement. It is suggested that development of this site</p>	<p>In terms of concerns that development of the site would impact on bats, records of species of bats is picked up in the local biodiversity screening for the site and requirements for avoiding impact are set out as part of the mitigation measures.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over distances to village facilities, the Local Highway Authority have identified a requirement for provision of a footway to connect the sites to the existing pedestrian links.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on form and character, the site would come forward after development on E/071/008 meaning the site would relate well to the built form. In terms of prominence in views towards the settlement and concern over dwelling yield, retention of boundary features where possible will be required to reduce prominence.</p> <p>In terms of affordable housing provision, the developer will be required to deliver a mix of housing which meets the requirements of policy in the Local Plan.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>and adjacent site E/070/008 would lead to ribbon development. There is a view that the proposed yield (density) of housing on the site does not relate well to existing housing in the area. A consultee questioned whether affordable housing would be provided on site.</p> <p>Issues of flooding on the site are mentioned and there is concern over capacity of the highway.</p> <p>One consultee notes that based on evidence gathered as part of the Huby Neighbourhood Plan process, residents of the village believe too many houses are proposed for Huby in the Preferred Options document.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over flooding on site, the developer would be required to manage surface water run off in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to highways, the Local Highway Authority indicate that the cumulative impact of E/070/004 and E/070/008 (with total indicative dwelling numbers of 40) would need to be assessed through the provision of a collective transport assessment and that a transport statement will be required in support of any planning application. Highways also state that the access point onto Stillington Road will need to be considered collectively for sites E/070/004 and E/070/008.</p> <p>In terms of the view that too many new homes are being proposed for Huby, the village is identified as a service village in the district council's settlement hierarchy and is therefore considered an appropriate location for some additional development.</p>
E/070/005	<p>There are mixed views within the consultation responses. While responses from individuals and the Parish Council show some support for allocation of this site, this comes with a couple of conditions including the view that the drains and sewer system should be upgraded and that careful consideration is given to access and highways. There is some representation from site promoters of other sites in the village, which object to allocation of this site.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Since the initial site assessment, planning permission has been granted on this site (ref: 17/00585/FUL) for construction of eight house with garages and highway access.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/070/006	All consultation responses for this site supported the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not preferred.	Noted.
E/070/007	<p>The overall key message from the consultation responses is that the site is not suitable and the conclusion of the initial site assessment is supported.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Noted.
E/070/008	<p>Several consultation responses show concern about impact on biodiversity and archaeology of the proposed development.</p> <p>There is some concern about distance from the village centre and levels of traffic on the road and one consultee suggested that trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders will restrict any access.</p> <p>There are concerns by other consultees who suggests the need to ensure any new homes on the site do not overlook homes on Gracious street to help avoid impact on amenity of existing residents.</p> <p>Overall, there is concern about the proposed quantum of development on the site and the common view is that if development does go ahead, that numbers of dwellings should be reduced, with bungalows at the southern end of the site adjacent to existing properties on Gracious Street.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of biodiversity, screening of the site has concluded the need for a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal at planning stage and in terms of archaeological assets, the screening undertaken for the site assessments concludes that any development proposal would require further archaeological assessment in line with the advice given in the NPPF.</p> <p>In terms of access to village centre, a pavement would need to be added and in terms of traffic concerns, the Local Highway Authority will require a transport statement with any planning application. Any access would need to avoid impacting on TPOs.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions to reduce the density, additional housing at this location would not be out of character with the existing built form and layout of the settlement. The need for lower roof heights in areas of the site close to Gracious Street is noted and could be factored into the design of a scheme.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/070/009	<p>The majority of consultation responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as not preferred. There are a couple of responses that suggest the site could be developed on the basis they feel it is well located, accessible and fits well with form and character.</p>	<p>As outlined in the conclusion of the initial site assessment, this is not the right location for additional housing. The access road for two farms runs through the centre of the site, presenting issues of noise and odour and amenity issues for future residents. The site has a poor relationship with the existing built form and character of the settlement.</p>
E/070/010	<p>This site reference has not been allocated to a site.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
E/070/011	<p>All comments submitted during the consultation are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not preferred.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
E/070/012	<p>There are mixed views provided in the consultation responses for this site.</p> <p>A key message emerging is that there is a view that the site should have been granted permission previously when the developer applied for permission for 34 new homes in 2012 and reference to the community benefits this would have brought such as provision of an improved access to the sports pavilion are mentioned.</p> <p>Some of those suggesting that the site is suitable also state that they have not seen flooding on the site.</p> <p>There is a view that the site is well located within the village.</p> <p>However, there are contrary views provided which suggest the site is not suitable for development and the main reasons given relate to highways issues. There is a suggestion that additional traffic would be a hazard at this point in the road, particularly given the proximity to the school.</p>	<p>The initial site assessment identified extensive surface water flooding issues as one of the reasons for the site being identified as not preferred. However, updated GIS layers shows that a strip of land which is slightly west of the centre of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding rather than a significant proportion of the site as concluded by the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Further advice has also been given by Hambleton District Council's Drainage Engineer who advises that susceptibility to surface water flooding on its own would not preclude development of the site. They state that surface water issues could be managed with appropriate surface water drainage as part of any development.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>There are some that state the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.</p> <p>The Parish Council has mixed views on the site and suggests Hambleton District Council gives careful consideration to the site before drawing a final conclusion on the site.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Consultation responses suggest there are highway issues with the site, however the Local Highway Authority has identified an access on to Baston Lane and does not mention any other issues.</p> <p>As identified in the initial site assessment, while the site is adjacent to existing built development, the proposed scale of development does not fit well with form and character.</p>
E/070/013	<p>There are mixed views emerging from the consultation responses for this site. There was one view which questioned the rationale for approving some development along the frontage of the site but then deeming the remainder of the site as unsuitable. Another response suggested small scale development might be appropriate on the site. However, there were a couple of other responses in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable for development.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>A planning application (ref: 16/02247/FUL) for construction of 4 dwellings on the front section of this site was submitted just prior to the Preferred Options Consultation. This application was approved. The planning permission encompasses the majority of the front section of the site.</p> <p>In terms of comments which are questioning the rationale for the council granting permission for some frontage development while concluding the proposal for 25 dwellings is not appropriate, the Council's view remains that while some frontage development has been deemed appropriate, development beyond the existing planning permission would not be in keeping with the character or form of the settlement.</p>
E/070/014	<p>There was not a question asking for comments on this site.</p>	<p>Development of a new settlement is not a preferred option within the emerging Local Plan.</p>
E/070/015	<p>The majority of consultation responses did not support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as preferred for a small scale development.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns relating to the highway, the Local Highway Authority state that this site is unlikely to generate significant travel demand.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>A common concern raised was in relation to impact additional homes and traffic would have on what is referred to within many consultation responses as a hazardous stretch of road due to speed and volume of vehicles when entering and existing the village and this is complicated by the site being near the brow of the hill. Other common concerns relate to the location of the site with the view that the site is not well connected to the village centre. There is also concern that development of the site would represent undesirable ribbon development and would have a negative impact in terms of views into the village. Reference to flooding to the south of the site is also mentioned.</p> <p>There is some support for development of the site within some consultation responses but this is on the basis that any allocation was above 10 to ensure provision of affordable homes.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over impact of views into the settlement and ribbon development, these are aspects which the Council would need to review and consider further.</p>

Table 6.38 Husthwaite

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/071/001	<p>There are two consultation responses from individuals both supporting the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not being suitable for development. There is a view that highway access would present safety issues due to being opposite the school and on a hill and near a sharp bend. It is also noted that the site has biodiversity value and is prone to flooding.</p>	Noted.
E/071/002	<p>There is only one consultation response for this site but the comments support the conclusion of the initial site assessment. They also provide the view that access on to Gibbet Hill would be unsuitable and present safety issues as Gibbet Hill at this point is narrow, on a hill and the site entrance would be in proximity to a sharp blind bend.</p>	Noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	

Table 6.39 Linton on Ouse

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/093/001	Site promoter submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
E/093/002	Highways England had no comment as it is not of concern to them. Site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.

Table 6.40 Stillington

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/141/001	The Parish Council who support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable for development.	Noted.
E/141/002	There is only one consultation response on this site by an individual who suggests that the site should be considered as part of E/141/005 to form a more comprehensive development which could incorporate open green space at what they state is an important entrance to the village.	The site has been identified by the local community as an important green space which the community would like to see designated as green space and the site has been submitted for consideration as a local green space and independently assessed as site ref E/141/010/G for local green space designation. The site has been recommended for designation due its recreational value.
E/141/003	This site reference has not been allocated to a site.	N/A

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/141/004	<p>There is only one consultation response and this is from the Parish Council who state they would support development of the site subject to resolving flooding issues.</p>	<p>Since the initial assessment of this site, an outline planning application for 5 dwellings has been submitted (ref: 17/01102/OUT). The planning application was approved.</p>
E/141/005	<p>One consultee response sets out serious concerns about the ability of the South Back Lane/York Road junction to cope with significantly increased traffic movements from an additional 32 homes on E/141/005 over and above the existing development to the north. Another consultee response highlights capacity issues on South Back Lane as a result of increased traffic flow and on street parking. It is suggested that the best way that site E/141/005 can be developed would be via a comprehensive plan integrating this site with the adjoining site E/141/002, enabling the main access to be taken from York Road whilst allowing pedestrian and (weak) vehicular links through the adjacent development site to the north. It is suggested an open green space could still be incorporated on E/141/002.</p> <p>Another consultee notes concern that development on E/141/005 would result in flood risk on to York road. The site promoter has submitted a Flood Risk and Drainage Statement (dated February 2016) and will be required to manage surface water run off.</p> <p>It is suggested by the consultee that development on the site would create a larger housing estate and that there are other sites in the village which would be more in keeping with the character of the village. Small development on more than one site is suggested as being more appropriate.</p> <p>There is also concern within consultation responses that an access route into the sports and social club could present security problems for home owners and the club.</p>	<p>In terms of highway concerns, the Local Highway Authority states subject to access being achieved through the third party land onto South Back Lane, the site would require a transport statement which would need to consider the existing site as a committed development to assess the cumulative impact on the surrounding road network.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions the development would result in flood risk on to the highway, as part of any planning application on the site, the developer would be required to demonstrate how surface water run off would be managed.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion of smaller developments in the village, this is only possible if land has been put forward for assessment and sites have been identified as suitable for development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to the site, the exact route of the footpath to the club will be agreed at planning application stage when impact on amenity of residents will be considered.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	

Table 6.41 Alne

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/006/001/E	There were no consultation responses for this site.	N/A

Table 6.42 Crayke

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/034/001	There are two consultation responses on this site. One from the Parish Council and one from the Howardian Hills AONB, both of which support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable for development.	Noted.
E/034/002	There are two consultation responses on this site. One from the Parish Council and one from the Howardian Hills AONB, both of which support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable for development.	Noted.
E/034/003	There are three consultation responses on this site. One from the Parish Council and one from the Howardian Hills AONB, both of which support the conclusion of the initial site assessment. One other comment supports the conclusion of the site assessment and also adds that development of the site may add to flooding on Daffy Lane.	Noted.
E/034/004	There are two consultation responses on this site. One from the Parish Council and one from the Howardian Hills AONB, both of which support the conclusion of the initial site assessment.	Noted.

Table 6.43 Raskelf

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/122/001	Only the site promoter has submitted representation in response to the consultation and in doing so has identified an alternative site which they suggest would be suitable for development.	This alternative site has been assessed as ALT/E/122/003 (see chapter 7).
E/122/002	Only the site promoter has submitted representation in response to the consultation and in doing so has identified an alternative site which they suggest would be suitable for development.	This alternative site has been assessed as ALT/E/122/003 (see chapter 7).

Table 6.44 Shipton by Benningborough

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/131/001	The site promoter has provided additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted
E/131/002	The site promoter has provided additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted
E/131/003	The site promoter has provided additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
E/131/004 E/131/005	No consultation responses submitted for these sites.	Noted.
E/131/006	In terms of consultation responses for this site, there is a response from the site promoter of the site on Main Street which makes a case against the allocation of E/131/006. Another consultee objects to additional development in the village on the basis that they believe there is insufficient capacity in the sewerage disposal system and mains water supply. This is a concern echoed by the Parish	In terms of comments on capacity of sewerage system and mains water supply, Yorkshire Water will advise on this at planning application stage. In terms of concerns over biodiversity value of the site, local biodiversity screening concludes that a Preliminary Ecological

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Council who state that an infrastructure improvement plan should accompany any plans for additional housing development in the village.</p> <p>The Parish Council also identify issues around access to the site, access onto the A19 from the site due to the volume and speed of traffic on the A19.</p> <p>Issues of flooding at the eastern end of the site are also referred to.</p> <p>The biodiversity value of the site is raised.</p> <p>It is also noted that there is various utilities infrastructure affecting the site that will need addressing.</p> <p>It is noted that a public right of way passes through the site.</p>	<p>Appraisal and possible Ecological Impact Assessment will be required at planning stage.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, the Local Highway Authority are not objecting to a development of up to a maximum of 25 dwellings on this site.</p> <p>In terms of the public right of way, Local Plan policy will require the footpath to be retained and respected.</p> <p>In terms of flooding at one end of the site, GIS layers show that this is not within the site. As standard, the developer will have to manage any surface water from the new development and any existing surface water on-site, this will include ensuring it does not flood elsewhere (including existing development).</p> <p>Comment regarding utilities infrastructure is noted.</p>
E/131/007 E/131/008 E/131/009	No consultation responses submitted for these sites.	N/A
E/131/010	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
E/131/011 E/131/012	No consultation responses have been submitted for these sites.	N/A
E/131/013	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
E/131/014	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/131/015	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted
E/131/016	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
E/131/017	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site as part of the consultation. There is one consultation response for this site from an individual suggesting that the site should be considered appropriate given that it has been out of agricultural use for some years.	The site is entirely within the York Green Belt and is therefore identified as being unsuitable for development in the initial site assessment.

Table 6.45 Sutton on the Forest

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/144/001	<p>A key message coming through the consultation responses is that if additional development is to go ahead, then this should consist of smaller units which are suitable for first time buyers. The need for homes which are in line with local salaries of younger, working people and families was highlighted.</p> <p>The Parish Council also highlighted the need for additional family housing, some affordable housing and some smaller houses suitable for elderly people to downsize within the village.</p> <p>Another consultee suggested that the site at Seniors Farm (E/144/003) would provide a better alternative site for new homes and that there is also a need for business units for small start ups. Their suggestion is that this site would see the use of land already in use as agricultural buildings, avoiding loss of farmland and there is a view this site would not</p>	<p>In terms of suggestions around the tenure mix and type of new homes needed in the village, the Council will seek to achieve an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure on allocated sites.</p> <p>Requirements for this will be set out in housing policies within the new Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion that E/144/003 provides a better alternative for new housing than E/144/001, site E/144/003 as submitted has been identified as unsuitable for development in the initial site assessment due to impact on the character of the settlement, including the conservation area.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>impact on views into the village. The Parish Council also acknowledged potential for development on this site at some point in the future in the form of an infill development which could complement rather than detract from the character of the village.</p> <p>One consultee highlights concern over loss of established hedgerows and farmland on a key entrance to the village.</p> <p>There is a view that the highway is not deemed suitable for additional traffic generated by a new development. The concern is that the highway is already over capacity with existing traffic and that it is becoming hazardous for cyclists and pedestrians. The consultee notes that new pavements and lighting will impact on this entrance to the village and it is noted that residents of the new homes would have to cross the busy road to access village facilities.</p> <p>Issue of flooding on the highway is noted and concern that additional housing will exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>The Parish Council submitted additional comments which identified the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. The district council has considered the sensitivity of the character of the village in identifying sites for allocation and suggests only E/144/001 is suitable for development.</p>	<p>In terms of consultee concerns that new development at E/144/001 would impact on a key entrance to the village, the local biodiversity screening sets out a requirement for retention of key features (where possible) such as boundary hedgerows and mature trees. Removal would only be to the extent required to achieve appropriate visibility splays as required by the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity and safety of the highway, the Local Highway Authority states that improvement to the existing major road may be required, Carr Lane, and a 2m wide footway will need providing on the site frontage to link into the existing provisions. They note that a pedestrian crossing point will be required to link to existing footway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns of flooding on the highway, any new development will be required to manage surface water run off to ensure it does not affect the local highway.</p>
E/144/002	This site reference has not been allocated to a site.	N/A
E/144/003	There was only one consultation response and this was from the Parish Council. There is recognition by the Parish Council that there is some potential for development on E/144/003 at some point in the	Noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	future in the form of an infill development which they state could complement rather than detract form the character of the village.	
E/144/004	<p>The Parish Council support the conclusion of the initial site assessment. They note the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. For this reason, the Parish Council identify only site E/144/001 as suitable for development.</p> <p>The Environment Agency questions why the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommends water compatible uses only.</p>	<p>In terms of the comment by the Environment Agency, it is noted by the Council that the proposed use of the site had been categorised as recreation when the assessment of flood risk was undertaken. The flood risk has since been reviewed on the basis of a proposed use as caravan / holiday park and the updated assessment concludes that development could be permitted subject to Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
E/144/005	<p>The Parish Council supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment. They note the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. For this reason, the Parish Council identify only site E/144/001 as suitable for development.</p>	Noted.
E/144/006	<p>There are only two consultation response submitted for this site. The Parish Council supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment. The Parish Council states that whilst it is not necessarily opposed to a modest utilisation of part of this area for enhanced tourist development, the Parish Council cannot support the allocation of the entire area for this use.</p> <p>The Parish Council note the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not</p>	<p>In terms of the comment by the Environment Agency, it is noted by the Council that the proposed use of the site had been categorised as recreation when the assessment of flood risk was undertaken. The flood risk has since been reviewed on the basis of a proposed use as caravan / holiday park and the updated assessment concludes that development could be permitted subject to Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. For this reason, the Parish Council identify only site E/144/001 as suitable for development.</p> <p>The Environment Agency questions why the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommends water compatible uses only.</p>	
E/144/007	<p>There is only one consultation response submitted for this site and this is from the Parish Council which supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The Parish Council note the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. For this reason, the Parish Council identify only site E/144/001 as suitable for development.</p>	Noted.
E/144/008	<p>The Parish Council supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment. They note the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. For this reason, the Parish Council identify only site E/144/001 as suitable for development.</p> <p>Highways England do not identify any issues.</p>	Noted.
E/144/009	<p>There are only two consultation response submitted for this site. The Parish Council supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The Parish Council note the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. For this reason, the Parish Council identify only site E/144/001 as suitable for development.</p>	<p>In terms of the comment by the Environment Agency, it is noted by the Council that the proposed use of the site had been categorised as recreation when the assessment of flood risk was undertaken. The flood risk has since been reviewed on the basis of a proposed use as caravan / holiday park and the assessment concludes that the</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	The Environment Agency questions why the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommends water compatible uses only.	updated assessment concludes that development could be permitted subject to Flood Risk Assessment.
E/144/010	The Parish Council supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment. They note the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. For this reason, the Parish Council identify only site E/144/001 as suitable for development.	Noted.
E/144/011	<p>The Parish Council supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The Parish Council note the importance of preserving the character of the village, respecting the Conservation Area and other sensitive areas in the village and ensuring new development does not result in coalescence of the village with neighbouring villages. For this reason, the Parish Council identify only site E/144/001 as suitable for development.</p> <p>There is also an individual response which supports the decision not to allocate this site largely on the basis of unsuitable access.</p> <p>Highways England do not identify any issues.</p>	Noted.

Table 6.46 Tollerton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
E/162/001	<p>The Parish Council object to further housing development in the village.</p> <p>Historic England require an assessment of impact of any development on the Tollerton Conservation Area.</p> <p>Highway England do not identify any concerns.</p>	Since the Preferred Options consultation, planning permission has been granted for a doctors surgery and residential development (20 units) with associated infrastructure and landscaping (ref: 16/02013/OUT).



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Over and above the statutory responses, there are two additional consultee responses from individuals which both object to additional housing in the village. There is objection to the site based on the view that the site is prone to flooding after heavy rain and that it has poor drainage. There is reference to capacity issues at the sewer on Alne road which is said to have caused flooding on the road. There are also a number of highways issues identified including the view that the site has a dangerous exit on to Alne road, that there are problems with turning vehicles at the junction with Alne road and Forge Lane and that Alne road is affected by heavy commercial transport coming off A1 / A168 Dishforth. It is also noted that there is no footpath on North side of Alne Road between Moorlands Lane and the bus stop.</p> <p>There is reference to a planning application (ref: 16/02013/OUT) for a doctors surgery and an additional 20 homes on this site which has been submitted to the district council since the Preferred Options consultation. This differs to the initial proposal for 30 dwellings on the site. While one of the consultation responses does not object to a doctors surgery on the site, they do not accept the quantum of housing proposed on the site, largely due to concerns over access to the site and highway safety issues. There is further concern of on street parking caused by those using the doctors surgery on the highway which they state consists of narrow lanes and presents safety issues for pedestrians. There is also concern</p>	<p>In terms of the comments provided in response to the initial site assessment as part of the Preferred Options consultation, these are addressed below.</p> <p>In terms of objections to additional housing based on concerns of access and highway safety, as part of the initial site assessment work, the Local Highway Authority identified an access from Forge Lane and Tennis Court Lane. The Local Highway Authority also provide a more detailed response to the planning application on this site referred to above. They stated that no development shall take place until details of the proposed highway layout and construction including a timetable for their delivery have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>In terms of objections based on flooding, drainage and capacity of sewer, Yorkshire Water advise on such matters as part of the planning application process. Yorkshire Water provide a response to the planning application referred to above. They recommended conditions to any permission granted. This included a requirement for the site to be developed with separate systems of drainage for foul and surface water on and off site. Yorkshire Water also stated that no piped discharge of surface water from the application site shall take place until works to provide a satisfactory outfall for surface water, other than the public sewer, have been completed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority before development commences.</p> <p>In terms of objections based on the infrastructure and services in the village not being unable to support additional</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	that there is no need for additional housing in Tollerton as the infrastructure and services are already stretched.	development, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.
E/162/002	This site reference has not been allocated to a site.	N/A
E/162/003	The Parish Council object to further housing development in the village. Highway England do not identify any concerns. The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.
E/162/004	The Parish Council object to further housing development in the village. Historic England require an assessment of impact of any development on the Tollerton Conservation Area. Highway England do not identify any concerns. The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. Following the Preferred Options consultation, an outline planning application for the construction of 5 dwellings was submitted to the Council (ref:17/00943/OUT). This has subsequently been withdrawn.
E/162/005	The Parish Council object to further housing development in the village. Highway England do not identify any concerns.	In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Over and above statutory responses, there is one additional consultee response from an individual suggesting the site may be an appropriate site for a new doctors surgery.</p> <p>There is also representation from the site promoter who submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of the suggestion that the site could be used for a doctors surgery, since the Preferred Options consultation, planning permission has already been granted for a doctors surgery (and residential development) on site E/162/001 (ref: 16/02013/OUT).</p>
E/162/006	<p>In terms of consultation responses, the Parish Council object to further housing development in the village.</p> <p>There was one other consultee response from an individual which suggests that as some of this site is brownfield, it would be more suitable for development than other greenfield sites. They state that this would also result in removal of derelict land which may have environmental issues in the future.</p>	<p>In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion that some of the site is suitable for development as it is brownfield, as identified in the initial site assessment, the site has been identified as unsuitable for development largely on the basis that the site as a whole has a poor relationship with the existing built form and the proposed scale of development is not desirable in this location.</p>
E/162/007	<p>The Parish Council object to further housing development in the village.</p> <p>Historic England require an assessment of impact of any development on the Tollerton Conservation Area.</p> <p>Highway England do not identify any concerns.</p> <p>Over and above statutory responses, there is a consultee response from an individual and a response from the site promoter.</p>	<p>In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of Back Lane, the Local Highway Authority note that there is not adequate carriageway or footway provision either side of the site frontage of E/162/007 to enable the passage of vehicles on South Bank Lane,</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The individual objects to housing on the site on the basis that they believe Back Lane does not have adequate access, particularly at the Newton road junction. There is also concern development on the site would impact on the character of the settlement and lead to additional development along Back Lane. Furthermore, they have concern that the sewerage works are already overstretched with overflows and localised flooding after heavy rain. They suggest that any future development in the village would need extensive surface water and foul drainage upgrades by service providers for it to be fit for purpose.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>the Local Highway Authority would not be supportive of a development resulting in the significant increase in trips on South Back Lane without appropriate footway and carriageway provisions linking into existing services.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of sewers, Yorkshire Water advise on such matters as part of the planning application process.</p>
E/162/008	<p>There are only two consultation responses to the Preferred Options consultation. One from the Parish Council which objects to further housing development in the village and one from the site promoter who has made representation in support of the site.</p>	<p>In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p>
E/162/009	<p>There is only one consultation response to the Preferred Options consultation for this site and this is from the Parish Council which objects to further housing development in the village.</p>	<p>In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p>
E/162/010	<p>There is only one consultation response to the Preferred Options consultation for this site and this is from the Parish Council which objects to further housing development in the village.</p>	<p>In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.
E/162/011	<p>The Parish Council objects to further housing development in the village.</p> <p>Historic England require an assessment of impact of any development on the Tollerton Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	In terms of objections from the Parish Council on the village reaching saturation point, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore deemed to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.
E/162/012	Comments were not requested for this site as a site visit revealed the site had already been developed on.	N/A

Northallerton area

Table 6.47 Northallerton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/110/001	Comments not requested for this site as site below threshold for allocation.	N/A
N/110/002 N/110/003 N/110/004	Site references allocated to Local Green Space sites	N/A
N/110/005	Three responses received from local residents in agreement with the Council's initial assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. One comment stated there is sufficient land available elsewhere within the north of Northallerton and that development of this site would further extend the urban sprawl of the town.	Noted.
N/110/006	Three responses received from local residents in agreement with the Council's initial assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. One comment stated there is sufficient land available elsewhere within the north of Northallerton and that development of the site would contribute tot the urban sprawl of Northallerton.	N/A
N/110/007 N/110/008	Site references allocated to Local Green Space sites	
N/110/009	<p>The majority of consultation responses are in objection to development of the site.</p> <p>One respondent questioned the need for this site stating there is no need for this site owing to the other sites in close proximity.</p> <p>A further comment was that the site would further extend the urban sprawl of Northallerton.</p>	<p>In terms of the consultee concern over whether there is need for the site, there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. This site has been identified as a suitable site in the initial site assessment, however further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>In terms of the comment suggesting development of the site would result in urban sprawl, it is noted that this site is</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>There was concern over the impact that development of the site would have on neighbouring residents.</p> <p>One respondent considered that the site is located in an unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>Two respondents questioned the existing infrastructure suggesting there is inadequate road infrastructure and connectivity within Northallerton.</p> <p>The North Northallerton Residents Association was of the understanding that no vehicular access would be taken from the Winston Road cul-de-sac. In addition, one comment was received stating access could be achieved from Stokesley Road and could serve a development of 8 dwellings.</p>	<p>within the existing developments and part of an existing allocation NM5C in the LDF Allocations DPD (2010). It is considered that the development would form infill development and if NM5C did not come forward the development of this strip of land would sit well with the existing form of development at this location.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on neighbouring residents, it is noted that part of the site has previously been allocated for development within the existing LDF Allocations DPD (2010). Further there is an existing green boundary to the site with hedgerow and hedgerow trees. This hedgerow could be maintained as part of any future allocation to minimise any impact.</p> <p>In terms of the comment suggesting Northallerton is an unsustainable location, it is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of the comments relating to capacity of road infrastructure, it is noted that the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development at this location.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to connectivity, it is noted that Northallerton is relatively well connected to the strategic highway network. The site itself is on the A 684 which connects to the A19 and to the town centre. There is a footpath connection to the town centre and its wider services and amenities. The site is also</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>within development limits and part of the site forms part of an existing allocation NM5C (Allocation DPD, 2010).</p> <p>In terms of the comments around access, the Local Highway Authority have stated that it would be preferred for the site to come forward with other allocations in the area and for a collective access strategy onto the A684 to be established instead of numerous separate access points onto the A684. On the basis of the Local Highway Authority response, the access to the site could be from Stokesley Road or ideally through the allocation to the North of the site and N/110/011. Transport modelling work will identify any issues and help to inform decisions on suitability of development at this location.</p>
N/110/010	<p>Three consultees generally supported the site. Four consultees did not support development of the site.</p> <p>There is concern that there is sufficient land within the north Northallerton scheme to meet the needs of the population. A response on behalf of a residents group suggests that the need is not related to Northallerton need and questions how the need is calculated and how it is distributed across the the District.</p> <p>One respondent considered that development in this area was like developing between Thornton Le Moor and South Otterington.</p> <p>The Environment Agency states that any development of this site should not have a detrimental impact on the Flood Alleviation Scheme on Sub beck and Turker Beck or interfere with its operation.</p>	<p>In terms of the consultee concern over whether there is need for the site, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Part of the site has been identified as a suitable site in the initial site assessment, however further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to flood risk, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment that was commissioned by the Council as part of the initial site assessment, recommends that there is a review of site layout and / or design and that this should be informed by a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment or site specific Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to sewerage capacity, Yorkshire Water indicate that reinforcement of the network is likely to be</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>One respondent indicates that flood risk routing should be carried out to determine the properties at risk and mitigation.</p> <p>One respondent considers that there is no spare capacity at Romanby Sewerage Treatment Works and in the sewers connecting to it. They suggest that major re-sewering and capital works at Romanby Sewerage Treatment works would be required.</p> <p>Consultation responses state that there is a need to ensure that infrastructure and services to support development are in place. There is particular concern over the capacity of schools and the capacity of the hospital.</p> <p>There are a number of comments which relate to landscaping and design.</p> <p>One respondent considers that the site would be a reasonable extension to the built up area subject to achieving high standards of design, layout and landscaping and would not have a significantly harmful impact on the character of Northallerton or the countryside.</p> <p>There is a suggestion within one consultation response that careful planning of the potential 100 dwellings, such as making them bungalows, would reduce the visual impact on the approach to Northallerton and also the view afforded from the higher ground to the east.</p> <p>Another respondent also commented on visual impact and considered that development should be kept below the viewing ridgeline/horizon line.</p> <p>One respondent indicated that the balancing ponds (Flood Alleviation Scheme on Turker Beck) are identified as</p>	<p>required and that this is likely to have an impact on the timing/phasing of any development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over infrastructure provision, the Council has liaised with statutory bodies regarding the need for infrastructure. The CCG have indicated that the existing health infrastructure requires some significant investment.</p> <p>In terms of comments around landscaping and design of the development, these aspects would be considered as part of the masterplanning of any development at this location. Mitigation measures such as landscaping treatment and reduced density of development can be used.</p> <p>In terms of concerns that the site is in an unsustainable settlement, it is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to the capacity of the highway network, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development at this location.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>landscape protection areas. The respondent indicates that this should extend beyond the area of the pond and link to the Bullamore Road and Scholla lane. They suggest this should include a Landscape buffer and green infrastructure Corridor following the route of Turker Beck.</p> <p>There are a couple of comments which relate to connectivity and sustainability of the location.</p> <p>One respondent suggests that the site is close to services and facilities in Northallerton and that residential development in this area would be sustainable. However, another respondent considers that the site is unsustainable and in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity. There is suggestion that there is insufficient employment in Northallerton which will result in commuting to other locations.</p> <p>One respondent suggests the highway network is inadequate. The respondent questions how adequate the proposed link road will be in north Northallerton and suggests that more development in the north east of the town will lead to serious increase in traffic demand on the road network.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	
N/110/011	There were comments from five individuals plus the the Environment Agency.	In terms of the responses which suggest there is no need for development on this site, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Two consultees suggested there is no need for this site owing to sufficient sites elsewhere to the north, south and west of Northallerton. One group response indicates that the need is not related to Northallerton need and questions how the need is calculated and how it is distributed across the the District.</p> <p>Within the consultation responses, there is concern over the impact on amenity of residents on residents along Winton road, Thorntree road and Turker Lane. particulalry in relation to vehicle pollution. The Environment Agency states that any development of this site should not have a detrimental impact on the Flood Alleviation Scheme on Sub beck and Turker Beck or interfere with its operation.</p> <p>One respondent indicates that flood risk routing should be carried out to determine the properties at risk and mitigation.</p> <p>One respondent indicates concern in relation to ground conditions. They suggest that some areas flood but there are high levels of silts, sand and water lenses which affect the stability of structures. There is concern that the structure of existing development will be impacted by development. The respondent states that this was an issue when the Environment Agency constructed the alleviation works at Turker Beck. There is a request that survey work is carried out.</p> <p>One respondent considers that there is no spare capacity at Romanby Sewerage Treatment Works and in the sewers connecting to it. They suggest that major</p>	<p>Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Part of the site has been identified as a suitable site in the initial site assessment, however further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over vehicle pollution, the Council is required to review and assess the air quality in the area against objectives for seven air pollutants, If any of the objectives are unlikely to be met then the Council must declare an Air Quality management Area and produce an Air Quality Management Area plan to set out measures that will improve air quality.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to flood risk, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment that was commissioned by the Council as part of the initial site assessment, recommends that there is a review of site layout and / or design and that this should be informed by a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment or site specific Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to ground conditions, the developer would be required to carry out survey work to inform further site assessment work for this site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to sewerage capacity, Yorkshire Water indicate that reinforcement of the network is likely to be required and that this is likely to have an impact on the timing/phasing of any development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over infrastructure provision, the Council has liaised with statutory bodies regarding the need for infrastructure. The CCG have indicated that the existing health infrastructure requires some significant investment.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>re sewerage and capital works at Romanby Sewerage Treatment works would be required.</p> <p>Consultation responses state that there is a need to ensure that infrastructure and services to support development are in place. There is particular concern over the capacity of schools and the capacity of the hospital.</p> <p>One respondent was concerned about the scale of development and considered that the site is too big. Another had concerns that development of the site would contribute to further urban sprawl. One respondent considered that development in this area was like developing between Thornton Le Moor and South Otterington.</p> <p>Another suggested that development of part of the site may be appropriate and that careful planning and design could reduce impact on the landscape.</p> <p>One consultee stated they were unclear what 'mixed-use' constitutes.</p> <p>One respondent indicated that the balancing ponds (Flood Alleviation Scheme on Turker Beck) are identified as landscape protection areas. The respondent indicates that this should extend beyond the area of the pond and link to the Bullamore Road and Scholla lane. They suggest this should include a Landscape buffer and green infrastructure Corridor following the route of Turker Beck.</p> <p>There are a couple of comments which relate to sustainability of the location.</p> <p>One respondent considers that the site is unsustainable and in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road</p>	<p>In terms of concerns relating to the scale of development, it is noted that the character and form and visual impact of the development are important considerations when assessing the scale of the proposals. The initial site assessment concludes that development of the whole site would be inappropriate due to impact on forms and character and recommends that only part of the site would be suitable for development. Mitigation measures such as landscaping treatment and reduced density of development can be used.</p> <p>In terms of the mix of development, the site is promoted as predominantly residential, however the scale of development provided has potential to support additional neighbourhood provision such as a small convenience store to meet the needs of the new residents, a school, open space and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Suggestions relating to inclusion of a landscape buffer and green infrastructure corridor are noted and would be considered as part of the masterplanning of any development on the site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns that the site is in an unsustainable settlement, it is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to the capacity of the highway network, the Council has commissioned transport</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>infrastructure and connectivity. There is suggestion that there is insufficient employment in Northallerton which will result in commuting to other locations.</p> <p>One respondent suggests the highway network is inadequate. The respondent questions how adequate the proposed link road will be in north Northallerton and suggests that more development in the north east of the town will lead to serious increase in traffic demand on the road network.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development at this location.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority have stated that this site would require a transport assessment, travel plan and comprehensive masterplanning to be submitted as part of any application, the scope of which should be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.</p>
N/110/012	<p>Three responses received from local residents generally supported the Council's initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>One comment stated there is sufficient land available elsewhere within the north of Northallerton and that the development of the site would further extend the sprawl of Northallerton.</p> <p>Another respondent considered that the site was unsuitable and in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has commented and states that the Agency has an existing Flood Alleviation Scheme for Northallerton on Sun Beck and Turker Beck. They state that any development of sites N/110/010, N/110/011, N/110/012 & N/110/014 must ensure that they do not have a detrimental impact on the Flood Alleviation Scheme or interfere with its operation.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusions of the initial site assessment, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>The Environment Agency's comments are noted and if the site was allocated the development guidelines would ensure that</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>any development would not have a detrimental impact on the Flood Alleviation Scheme at Sun Beck.</p>
N/110/013	<p>Three responses received from local residents generally supported the Council's initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>One comment stated there is sufficient land available elsewhere within the north of Northallerton and that the development of the site would further extend the sprawl of Northallerton.</p> <p>Another respondent considered that the site was unsuitable and in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusions of the initial site assessment, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>
N/110/014	<p>Two responses received from local residents both in agreement with the Council's initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>One respondent considered that the site was unsuitable and in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusions of the initial site assessment, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.
N/110/015	<p>Two responses received which are in support of the Council's initial assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>One consultee stated that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton which is designated for housing. They suggest the site would further extend the urban sprawl of Northallerton.</p> <p>Another respondent considers that the site is in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>There is a further comment from a consultee in support of the site. This is due to the proximity of the site to existing development, including employment land and also due to connections to Darlington and access to a Public Right of Way with potential for an enhanced cycle route. The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusions of the initial site assessment, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>
N/110/016	<p>Two comments received from local residents.</p> <p>One comment is in support of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable as the area is already established for employment use and keeps industrial use within a confined area.</p> <p>The other comment is in opposition to development on the site on the basis that the site is in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>
N/110/017	<p>Three comments received from local residents in support of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable for development. Consultees suggest the site is an important amenity / nature area and should be kept as such. They note the site is in close proximity to Castle Hills. They recommend that vehicular access is improved.</p> <p>The other comment is in opposition to development on the site on the basis that the site is in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>The Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>
N/110/018	<p>Three responses received from local residents, two of which are in agreement with the Council's initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable. One comment stated there is sufficient land available elsewhere within the north of Northallerton.</p> <p>The third comment stated this site should be allocated. This is due to its proximity to existing development, its accessibility for commuting north to Darlington, the site is accessible due to footpath provision and Public Right of Way access and improved cycle links could be formed with development.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.</p> <p>Objection by one consultee is noted. However, the Council notes that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/110/019	<p>Three comments from residents in support of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. The following reasons are provided:</p> <p>It is suggested that there is no need for this additional land due to the availability of sites elsewhere within Northallerton.</p> <p>It is suggested that it is important to retain green areas to protect the rural character.</p> <p>It is suggested that the development would cause a serious loss to the historical heritage of Northallerton.</p> <p>Additionally, Romanby Parish Council have commented that the site should be dismissed as it is a greenfield site with historical significance.</p> <p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust commented on the site in relation to its potential as a Green Space allocation, stating; "The suggested site at Castle Hills N/110/019 is supported by the Trust however the value of the site for biodiversity will be limited as the railway lines surrounding it and the industrial site to the north will limit connectivity to the wider environment."</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of the responses which suggest there is no need for development on this site, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>The comments in relation to rural character and heritage are noted.</p>
N/110/020	<p>One comment is in support of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as suitable for employment use. The consultee states that an employment use will keep the industrial area in the same location.</p> <p>One comment objects to the site as they suggest that it is in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of the comment relating to sustainability, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.
N/110/021	<p>Three responses received from local residents in agreement with the Council's initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>One comment stated there is sufficient land available elsewhere within the north of Northallerton.</p> <p>Another respondent considered that Northallerton is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusions of the initial site assessment, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>
N/110/022	<p>One comment received in support of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. This is on the basis that the consultee believes that the site is located in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusions of the initial site assessment, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.
N/110/023	No comments requested for this site as planning permission has been approved as part of the North Northallerton Scheme and development has started (15/01083/HYB).	N/A
N/110/024	<p>One comment is in support of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable for development.</p> <p>The consultee suggests redevelopment of the site is needed as it is no longer suitable for its use as the historic Mart. They suggest there is an opportunity to relocate the Mart to a more suitable site (the respondent suggests site N/110/026 off Darlington Road).</p> <p>Two respondents did not support the conclusion of the initial site assessment. One respondent suggested that redevelopment of the site with modern housing would be out of character with the surrounding heritage assets such as Old Theatre and Zion Sunday School. Furthermore, they believe the auction mart is part of the historic charm of Northallerton as an historic market town.</p> <p>Another respondent stated that the site is in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>Historic England has noted that an assessment of the impact of any redevelopment of the site on heritage assets is required. They state that development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over the impact on the historic assets and heritage of the town, as required by Historic England, an assessment of the impact of any redevelopment on heritage assets will need to be undertaken. The outcome of this assessment will need to inform final decisions as to whether or not this site is deemed suitable for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>contribute to the significance of designated heritage assets are not harmed.</p>	
N/110/025	<p>There was one comment in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as preferred. The consultee suggests that the development could help fund the move of the Auction Mart and is a better use of the area in what is a predominately residential area. They suggest that this area is more suitable for housing and would help to reduce the green field site allocation required hopefully.</p> <p>Two respondents objected to the potential allocation of the site. One respondent linked the site to removing the potential to develop N/110/024 and considered that a modern housing estate on this site would be out of character with the surrounding dwellings. They suggest that any houses should be no more than 2 storeys, not like the town houses further to the west along Romanby Road.</p> <p>Another respondent stated that the site is in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>Historic England has noted that an assessment of the impact of any development of the site on heritage assets is required. They state that development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation area are not harmed.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns that development of the site with a modern housing estate would be out of character with the surrounding area, as required by Historic England, an assessment of the impact of any development on heritage assets will need to be undertaken. The outcome of this assessment will need to inform final decisions as to whether or not this site is deemed suitable for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/110/026	<p>One consultee supported the conclusion of the initial site assessment that identified the site as suitable for employment use. They note that the site is adjacent to an industrial area already.</p> <p>One respondent objected to the conclusion of the initial site assessment on the basis that they believe Northallerton is a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>

Table 6.48 Romanby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/123/001	<p>A key message coming through consultation responses is that the site should be safeguarded as an important green space between Northallerton and Romaby, The importance of wildlife along the Beck is also mentioned. Romanby Parish Council are keen to develop this site alongside Wensleydale Railway with a view to maintaining public open space and allotments. Within the consultation responses, housing is identified as being unsuitable at this location.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over loss of an important green space, the retention of a green corridor through this key site and open space will be a key requirements of any development on the site.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Network Rail have commented that they would not support housing, mixed use or employment development on the site due to the proximity of any site entrance to the level crossing.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	
N/123/002	<p>The main message coming through consultation responses was that this site is not suitable for development. This supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>The importance of retaining open green space between Northallerton and Romanby wherever possible was highlighted.</p> <p>A view was given that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater for needs at present.</p>	<p>In terms of comments relating to the importance of the open green space, this is also mentioned in the conclusion of the initial site assessment which stated that the open space is important to the character of the Romanby Conservation Area.</p> <p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p>
N/123/003	Site reference not allocated to a development site.	N/A
N/123/004	<p>The main message coming through consultation responses was that this site is not suitable for development. This supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>The importance of retaining open green space because of its importance to the character of the town was highlighted in consultation responses.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The concern of flooding on the site was also raised, particularly in the centre of the site which is recognised as being considerably lower than the rest of the site which it is noted could present challenges for drainage.</p> <p>There was mixed views on accessibility.</p> <p>One view was that the site had poor road infrastructure and connectivity and that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>Another view given was that the site provides good access to the A1.</p> <p>A view was given that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater of needs at present.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. The Local Highway Authority would require footways to be provided to link the site into the existing footways into the town centre to promote connectivity. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around flooding, the issue around surface water flooding is recognised in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to loss of open space, it is noted that this site is privately owned and is not a functional open green space.</p>
N/123/005	<p>There was mixed response to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable for development.</p> <p>The importance of retaining open green space because of its important to the character of the town was highlighted in consultation responses.</p> <p>There was one view that the site had poor road infrastructure and connectivity and that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The Parish Council support development on the site.</p> <p>There was a question on delivery of affordable housing in the consultation responses.</p> <p>A view was given that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater for needs at present.</p> <p>One response refers to the drainage of the site and in line with the initial site assessment notes that the central area of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. The Local Highway Authority would require footways to be provided to link the site into the existing footways into the town centre to promote connectivity. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of open space, the initial site assessment notes that any development on the site should be of low density and should retain significant open space. It is also noted that Local Plan policy will require new housing development to incorporate or otherwise make provision for open space and this should be on site provision where possible.</p> <p>In terms of questions around delivery of affordable housing, any development on the site will be required to provide affordable housing in line with policies within the new Local Plan.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		The comment relating to drainage of the site is noted.
N/123/006	<p>There is some support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable for development.</p> <p>There was mention that new development should be accompanied by suitable amenity provision including sufficient healthcare facilities.</p> <p>However, there were other views that the site is not suitable due to flood risk.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>The site promoter of other sites in the town provides some comments on the site and refers to the flood risk associated with N/123/006 as a reason to not allocate the site.</p>	<p>Provision of any amenities on site such as healthcare facilities would only be considered if there was evidence of need for such provision at this location.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to flood risk, this issue is already addressed in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. The Local Highway Authority would require footways to be provided to link the site into the existing footways into the town centre to promote connectivity. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/123/007	<p>Overall the consultation responses do not support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable for development.</p> <p>Key issues identified through consultation responses, include concern over flooding. Photos have been submitted showing surface water flooding issues.</p> <p>There is also concern raised about archaeological potential of site and the belief that Spittal House was a former Spittal Fever Hospital use.</p> <p>Concern over loss of open countryside and suggestion that development should be low density to reduce prominence in views towards the settlement.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>A view was given that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater of needs at present.</p> <p>The site promoter of other sites in the town provides some comments on the site and refers to the flood risk associated with N/123/007 as a reason to not allocate the site.</p>	<p>In terms of comments relating to flood risk, this issue is already addressed in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to archaeological potential and the listed building, this issue is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Comments relating to the need for a lower density development are noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. The Local Highway Authority would require footways to be provided to link the site into the existing footways into the town centre to promote connectivity. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/123/008	<p>There were very few consultation responses and there was mixed response to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable for development.</p> <p>One consultee notes that the site was considered for development recently and was refused and there is a question over what has changed.</p> <p>Another view presented is that the site seems a suitable location, although it was noted that additional traffic from the site would add to congestion in the town.</p> <p>There is some mention of proximity to Sewage Treatment Work and potential odour issues.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p>	<p>In terms of the question about why this site should be identified for potential allocation but refused planning permission in 2016 for 56 dwellings (ref:14/02609/FUL), it should be noted that the application was refused for reasons including that the site was beyond the development limits of Romanby as identified in the current Local Development Framework and that at the time of determining the application, the Council could demonstrate a housing land supply well in excess of the required 5 years. The site has been submitted by the site promoter as part of the call for sites exercise and has been assessed for possible inclusion in the plan. Site allocations must look beyond existing development limits if this is necessary to deliver the development requirements of the new plan.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional traffic, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over odour from the Sewage Treatment Works, Yorkshire Water would object to any proposal to extend the site that would bring sensitive receptors any closer to the Works than as proposed in the previous and current application layout. They state that as the boundary currently stands, this is not a reason to not allocate this site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p>
N/123/009	<p>Within the consultation responses, there is some support for the Council's proposal to safeguard part of the site which is also N/123/001 for enabling future development of the Wensleydale Railway station.</p> <p>However, there is objection to any development on the larger area of N/123/009 on basis this is deemed an important open green space separating Romanby and Northallerton.</p> <p>There is concern that there is no capacity in the local highway for the additional traffic N/123/009 would generate with specific reference to existing pressures at The Green in Romanby and Yafforth road.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>Network Rail have commented that they would not support housing, mixed use or employment development on the site due to the proximity of any site entrance to the level crossing.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over loss of open green space, the importance of retaining the open countryside which the majority of N/123/009 comprises of is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway network, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail.</p>
N/123/010	<p>There is a mixed response to conclusions of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>There are a few responses which support the preferred approach to not allocate the site.</p> <p>This is on the basis of matters such as the open green space being important to keeping the rural feel of Northallerton.</p> <p>There is a concern over the potential impact of the football club lights and crowd noise on any new housing development.</p> <p>A view is also given that the site is dislocated from the centre of Romanby and this may mean people choose their car over walking leading to congestion.</p> <p>There is a view that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater for needs at present.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes those responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>In terms of comments which suggest development would be possible on the site, this is largely on the basis that there is a view that the site is well located in terms of access</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>By contrast, contrary to the conclusion of the initial site assessment there were a few responses which suggest development on the site would be possible.</p> <p>It is noted that the site is in proximity to a pavement and that the site is on a good bus route between Bedale & Northallerton (every 1/2 hour).</p> <p>There is a suggestion that the site is in a good location with the A684 road providing good access to the A1, albeit they suggest that any development of the site may require the existing 'T' junction to be replaced with a roundabout.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, based on local knowledge of the area, there was a view given that there is no known history of flooding on the west side of N/123/010 and that Willow Beck has not flooded here. They note that flooding does occur much further to the west where the beck meets the River Wiske, however they believe this would have no effect on the site.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>to pavements, bus routes and the highway network. These points are noted.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to flood risk, the Council has based the initial site assessment on the findings of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which was commissioned by the Council and which does identify flooding issues. If further evidence of flood risk is made available to the Council, this would be considered.</p>
N/123/011	<p>There is a mixed response to conclusions of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>There are few responses which support the preferred approach to not allocate the site.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes those responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>This is on the basis of matters such as the open green space being important to keeping the rural feel of Northallerton.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>There is also a view that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater of needs at present.</p> <p>By contrast, contrary to the conclusion of the initial site assessment there were a few responses which suggest development on the site would be possible.</p> <p>It was suggested that the site is in a good location with direct access to the A684 road which provides good access to the A1, and so reducing traffic in the town.</p> <p>It was suggested new links to footpaths, cycle routes and pavements could be provided to provide connectivity to the town centre.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, based on local knowledge of the area, there was a view given that contrary to the initial site assessment, there is no history of flooding in the eastern part of the site. They note that the field level is much higher than the bank of College Stell.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>In terms of comments which suggest development would be possible on the site, this is largely on the basis that there is a view that the site is well located in terms of access to the highway network and that there is potential to add new footpath and cycle links. These points are noted.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to flood risk, the Council has based the initial site assessment on the findings of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which was commissioned by the Council and which does identify flooding issues. If further evidence of flood risk is made available to the Council, this would be considered.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/123/012	<p>The general view point coming through from consultees is that the playing pitches and training ground should be protected.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation. They are promoting other leisure uses and also housing development at some point in the future, if the football facilities are relocated.</p>	<p>Since the initial site assessment, a Playing Pitch Strategy (2017) has been prepared by consultants on behalf of Hambleton District Council as part of the evidence base to support the preparation of the Local Plan. The study concludes "This site (Northallerton Town Football Club Grounds) should be protected as playing pitches in the Local Plan. It is home to Northallerton Town Football Club, who manage the site and have recently negotiated a 25 year lease with the ground owners."</p> <p>Leisure uses would not be supported on this site.</p>
N/123/013	<p>The general consensus from the consultation responses is that the site is not suitable for development which is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>This is on the basis of matters such as the open green space being important to keeping the rural feel of Northallerton.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>There is also a view that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater for needs at present.</p> <p>It is also noted that the site would be disconnected from the settlement.</p> <p>By contrast, there was one view that suggested the site could be suitable for development on the basis that the site is in a good location with direct</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes those responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>access to the A684 road which provides good access to the A1, and so reducing traffic in the town. It was suggested new links to footpaths, cycle routes and pavements could be provided.</p>	<p>In terms of comments which suggest development would be possible on the site, this is largely on the basis that there is a view that the site is well located in terms of access to the highway network and that there is potential to add new footpath and cycle links. These points are noted.</p>
N/123/014	<p>Consultation responses identified the site as not suitable for development which is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>This is on the basis of matters such as the open green space being important to keeping the rural feel of Northallerton.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>There is also a view that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater of needs at present.</p> <p>It is also noted that the site would be disconnected from the settlement and that traffic would be an issue.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes those responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>Other comments are already addressed in the initial site assessment.</p>
N/123/015	<p>The general consensus within consultation responses was that the site is not suitable for</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes those responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>development which is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>This is on the basis of matters such as the open green space being important to keeping the rural feel of Northallerton.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>There is also a view that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater of needs at present.</p> <p>By contrast, there was one view which suggested the site should be looked as a possible allocation as it is to the south of the town with good access to Thirsk road and the A19, albeit it was recognised that an access to the highway would need to be resolved and new links to pavements, cycle routes and footpaths would need to be established.</p>	<p>around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>In terms of comments which suggest development would be possible on the site, this is largely on the basis that there is a view that the site is well located in terms of access to the highway network and that there is potential to add new footpath and cycle links. These points are noted.</p>
N/123/016	<p>The general consensus within consultation responses was that the site is not suitable for development which is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes those responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Northallerton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Northallerton is a county town and is identified</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>This is on the basis of matters such as the open green space being important to keeping the rural feel of Northallerton.</p> <p>One view referred to poor road infrastructure and connectivity and suggested that the proposed site was in a relatively unsustainable settlement.</p> <p>There is also a view that there is plenty of land to the north of Northallerton designated for housing with planning permission to cater for needs at present.</p> <p>There was a view that development was not wanted in this location on the basis of loss of views from existing properties, increased traffic and pollution and loss of arable crops.</p> <p>By contrast, there was one view which suggested the site should be looked as a possible allocation as it is to the south of the town with good access to Boroughbridge road and A1 and it is suggested the site is close to a good bus route between Northallerton and Bedale (every 1/2 hour), albeit it was recognised that new links to pavements, cycle routes and footpaths would need to be established.</p> <p>One comment was critical of the consultation process.</p>	<p>within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Northallerton does have good connectivity which includes public transport for both road and rail. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Council has commissioned transport modelling work. This will identify any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development on sites within the town.</p> <p>In terms of the responses which suggest there is already plenty of land designated for housing in the town, it is noted that there is need to allocate additional housing sites in the new Local Plan to meet the Council's housing need up to 2035. Further work will be undertaken before the final list of sites for allocation is identified.</p> <p>It is noted that loss of a private view is not considered a material planning consideration when assessing the suitability of a site for development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over increased traffic, transport modelling work will identify any issues and inform decisions on site allocations in the town.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of arable crops, agricultural classification has been considered as part of the site assessment process.</p> <p>In terms of comments which suggest development would be possible on the site, this is on the basis that there is a view that the site is well located in terms of access to the highway network and that there is potential to add new footpath and cycle links. These points are noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns regarding the consultation process, the consultation was carried out in</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (2013).

Table 6.49 Brompton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/020/001	One comment has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.	Whilst the Council welcomes the response which is in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Brompton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Brompton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Brompton does have good connectivity to Northallerton town centre via footpaths and cycle routes. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, Brompton has close links to the A19 and Northallerton. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.
N/020/002	One comment has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.	Whilst the Council welcomes the response which is in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Brompton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Brompton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Brompton does have good connectivity to Northallerton town centre via footpaths and cycle routes. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, Brompton has close links to the A19 and Northallerton. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/020/003	One comment has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.	Whilst the Council welcomes the response which is in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Brompton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Brompton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Brompton does have good connectivity to Northallerton town centre via footpaths and cycle routes. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, Brompton has close links to the A19 and Northallerton. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.
N/020/004	One comment has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.	Whilst the Council welcomes the response which is in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Brompton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Brompton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the Council notes that Brompton does have good connectivity to Northallerton town centre via footpaths and cycle routes. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, Brompton has close links to the A19 and Northallerton. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.

Table 6.50 East Cowton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/042/001	<p>One respondent commented that the drainage infrastructure is at capacity and they believe that the ongoing development at Bungalow Farm (see planning permission reference 10/01716/DCN) has been designed to alleviate the problems that the centre of the village encounter in heavy rain and not to accommodate a significant increase of properties within a known problem area.</p> <p>East Cowton Parish Council support the conclusion of the initial site assessment as it would add to the current form and townscape of East Cowton however, as is the case with all development in the village, they state that drainage issues must be fully addressed prior to development.</p> <p>One comment was received in objection to the site as it is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes those comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Local concern in relation to surface water drainage in the centre of the village is noted. If any additional development is permitted, the developer would be required to introduce mitigation to manage surface water run off.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Cowton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Cowton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>
N/042/002	<p>East Cowton Parish Council agree with the assessment and recommendation for this site.</p> <p>One comment was received in objection to the site as it is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>Support for the site from the Parish Council is noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Cowton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Cowton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		to the village centre via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.
N/042/003	<p>One comment supported the conclusion of the initial site assessment stating that the site was always likely alongside the Bungalow Farm development and infrastructure takes this in to account.</p> <p>East Cowton Parish Council agree with the assessment and recommendation for this site.</p> <p>One comment was received in objection to the site as it is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes those comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Cowton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Cowton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>
N/042/004	<p>Two comments from respondents including East Cowton Parish Council in agreement with the assessment and recommendation for this site.</p> <p>One further comment was received in objection to the site as it is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes those comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Cowton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Cowton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.
N/042/005	<p>East Cowton Parish Council agree with the assessment and recommendation for this site.</p> <p>One comment was received in objection to the site as it is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes those comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Cowton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Cowton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>
N/042/006	<p>Two comments received including East Cowton Parish Council who agree with the area but have specific concerns and a local resident who objects to the proposed allocation of the site. This is for the following reasons:</p> <p>The site is visible from some distance away.</p> <p>The highway at the proposed access in to the site has flooded in the past.</p> <p>Visibility is poor and may require the demolition of two existing properties.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes those comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over visibility of the site, it is noted in the initial site assessment that the site is set behind existing residential development so there is only limited visibility of the site from the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns in relation to flooding at the proposed access and general surface water drainage capacity issues in the village, the developer will be responsible for managing surface water flooding issues associated with development of the site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to the site and visibility, the Local Highway Authority has noted there is direct access to the highway. Other</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Additionally, the access is in close proximity to the access in to the Bungalow Farm development opposite which may cause further highways issues.</p> <p>Surface water drainage capacity issues.</p> <p>One comment was received in objection to the site as it is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>concerns are not identified at this stage. The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on any other access issues to inform further site assessment work.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Cowton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Cowton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>
N/042/007	<p>East Cowton Parish Council query the comments relating to access and flooding from the Council's initial assessment and recommendation of the site.</p> <p>One comment was received in objection to the site as it is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of Parish Council concerns relating to access and flooding, the initial site assessment for these matters is based on advice from the Local Highway Authority and findings of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Further site assessment work will help to inform decisions on suitability of development on this site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Cowton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Cowton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/042/008	<p>Two comments from respondents including East Cowton Parish Council in agreement with the assessment and recommendation for this site.</p> <p>One comment was received in objection to the site as it is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes those comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Cowton is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Cowton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>

Table 6.51 Morton on Swale

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/102/001	<p>One comment has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Morton on Swale is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Morton on Swale is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre and to the village of Ainderby Steeple via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>
N/102/002	<p>One comment has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable</p>	<p>In terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Morton on Swale is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Morton on Swale is identified within the Council's</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.	settlement hierarchy as a service village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. In terms of concerns around connectivity, the site does have good connectivity to the village centre and to the village of Ainderby Steeple via footpaths. In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.

Table 6.52 Appleton Wiske

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/008/001	Two comments in agreement with the Council's recommendation in the initial site assessment. One comment stated the site is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity. The second comment said the site was clearly detached from the village itself.	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Appleton Wiske is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Appleton Wiske is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around connectivity, this issue is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>
N/008/002	Two comments in agreement with the Council's recommendation in the initial site assessment. One comment stated the site is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity. The second comment	Whilst the Council welcomes the responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Appleton Wiske is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Appleton Wiske is identified within the

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>agreed that the site would be prominent in significant views towards Appleton Wiske when approaching the settlement from the south. Also commented that the site is very large and would result in a development inappropriate to the character and form of the village.</p>	<p>Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around connectivity, this issue is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>
N/008/003	<p>Four comments received from local residents. Three of which are in support of the recommendation in the initial site assessment. One comment confirmed the site had been selected by residents as an appropriate site for development within the Appleton Wiske Plan. This considered the site would be suitable for a development that included affordable housing to meet the needs of local residents. The site could also include some car parking to help alleviate the ongoing parking issues elsewhere within the village.</p> <p>One comment objecting to the site has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that Appleton Wiske is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that Appleton Wiske is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around connectivity, this issue is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the site has direct access to the highway. The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>

Table 6.53 East Harlsey

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
N/043/001	<p>Four comments have been received from local residents which support the Council's recommendation in the initial site assessment. This is on the basis that the site is greenfield, the site has poor access, there is an issue with road infrastructure including proliferation of parked cars and dangerous crossing of the A19 nearby. It is also noted that housing would overwhelm the row of traditional cottages and that the site is in close proximity to a number of heritage assets including the Church, the Vicarage and the Dovecote. Potential loss of mature trees around the site is also noted.</p> <p>One comment has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council welcomes the responses which are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, in terms of concerns around the sustainability of the settlement, the Council does not consider that East Harlsey is an unsustainable settlement. It is noted that East Harlsey is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village. It is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around connectivity, this issue is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to road infrastructure, the Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters. However, the initial site assessment notes that the site has no connection or frontage to the highway.</p>
N/043/002	<p>Six comments have been received from local residents, two of which are in agreement with the Council's recommendation. This is due to perceived access and highway difficulties due to the proximity of the A19 crossing and Baulk Bridge. Additionally, it is noted that development would be out of character with the linear pattern of East Harlsey. One comment has been received from a local resident stating the site should not be allocated as it is an unsuitable site in a relatively unsustainable settlement with poor road infrastructure and connectivity.</p>	<p>The Council notes that a number of consultees do not support the conclusion of the initial site assessment. The consultees suggest that a small development of up to 6 dwellings would be suitable as this would improve the appearance of the brownfield site.</p> <p>The Council notes that the initial site assessment was based on a proposal for up to 12 dwellings.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The remaining four comments are in support of the redevelopment of the site. This is due to the current appearance of the brownfield site. The views consider the site offers an opportunity for a sustainable development that could improve the appearance of the area, particularly important due to the sites location in the centre of the village and in close proximity to the village hall. They consider that the argument that the linear form of the site would be out of character with the form of the village is not relevant as it is a brownfield site. They also note that access would also not be an issue if development was limited to approximately 6 dwellings.</p>	<p>Applications for smaller developments, typically up to 5 dwellings could be considered under the Councils interim planning guidance which is part of the current Development Plan.</p>

Stokesley area

Table 6.54 Stokesley

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/142/001	<p>There are 10 responses to the consultation on this site. One is from Highways England and one is from the site promoter. The general consensus amongst individual respondents is that this is not a suitable site for development.</p> <p>Concerns raised are summarised below:</p> <p>It is suggested that 226 dwellings cannot be achieved on site due to the flood risk. It is noted that the land around Peacocks Field and Tanton Grove continues to be water-logged and there is concern that development would cause flooding issues to impact on adjacent areas.</p> <p>Respondents note that the site is in close proximity to Teesside authorities, notably Middlesbrough. They suggest that there is a need to take account of nearby development in adjacent authorities. They note that the B1365 is inappropriate for this level of development.</p> <p>There is concern that the site is distant from town centre services and facilities and will therefore generate more car trips. Respondents note that there is no public transport or suitable foot paths into the town. They suggest that there will be an increase in commuting trips. They suggest that this is not in line with Hambleton policies to promote low carbon environment.</p> <p>Respondents noted that the green corridor of the B1365 to and from Stokesley gives the market town town it's historically appropriate setting.</p> <p>A local planning group in Stokesley has commented to say that they have identified more suitable sites for additional housing in the area of Stokesley Business Park and Station Road and also along the corridor towards Kirkby. They suggest that these offer a more symmetrical expansion based on the central High Street and</p>	<p>The comments by residents are noted however the site benefits from an extant permission and since the Preferred Options consultation the Reserved matters application 16/02756/REM has been determined and there is a resolution to grant planning permission (25th May 2017) for 225 dwellings.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Market Square. They also note that this area is nearer the town centre and has greater facility to absorb additional traffic.</p> <p>Highways England note that this proposed allocation is for a large housing development which will generate a significant number of trips. They note that as the main trip attractors are accessed via the SRN, this site is potentially of concern. However, as it already has planning consent it is understood that Highways England has already had opportunity to comment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	
S/142/002	<p>There are six responses to the consultation on this site. Respondents suggest development of the site is not suitable which is line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Concerns raised are summarised below:</p> <p>Respondents consider the site may be more suitable for school expansion.</p> <p>There is concern that the site is detached from the town.</p> <p>There are concerns over highways safety along station road.</p> <p>A high risk of flooding is noted and it is suggested that the site should remain in current use.</p> <p>One respondent considers it is a brownfield site and suggests that developers will pay to mitigate against the floodrisk.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has provided comment and notes that whilst these sites (refers to S/142/002, 003, 007 and 022) are not recommended for development, if this were to change as the site assessment work progresses, these developments could potentially have a detrimental impact on the future flood alleviation works planned for the Stokesley area.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Concerns raised are addressed below:</p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council will advise the Council if and when there is a requirement for school expansion.</p> <p>Comments around the site being detached are noted.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to access, road safety and capacity of highway.</p> <p>Flooding issues are identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The site is currently in horticultural uses and is not considered to be previously developed land.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.	Environment Agency advice is noted.
S/142/003	There are two responses to the consultation on this site. Both respondents agree with the conclusions of the assessment.	Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.
S/142/004	<p>There are three responses to the consultation on this site. The two individual responses challenge the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable. The third response from the Environment Agency reiterates the flooding issues on site.</p> <p>One respondent suggests that the developer would need to address flooding issues and suggest that if this could be done then the site may be achievable.</p> <p>Another respondent note that they disagree with the suggestion that site S/142/004 is not suitable for development. They suggest that the future of this part of Stokesley needs to be comprehensively planned. They suggest that the future of this site needs to be considered in conjunction with other sites in the vicinity including S/142/005, S/142/010, S/142/011 and S/142/012.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has provided comment and notes that whilst these sites (refers to S/142/002, 003, 007 and 022) are not recommended for development, if this were to change as the site assessment work progresses, these developments could potentially have a detrimental impact on the future flood alleviation works planned for the Stokesley area.</p>	<p>Comments from two respondents suggesting that the site could be developed are noted. However, in line with the findings of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the advice from the Environment Agency, the site is not deemed suitable for development.</p> <p>The Council will need to adopt a sequential approach to the allocation of sites with regards to flood risk. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified sites within Stokesley that are at lower risk of flooding than the proposed site.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/142/005	<p>There are two responses to the consultation on this site. Both responses challenge the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>One respondent suggests that the developer would need to address flooding issues and suggest that if this could be done then the site may be achievable.</p> <p>The other respondent note that they disagree with the suggestion that site S/142/005 is not suitable for development. They suggest that the future of this part of Stokesley needs to be comprehensively planned. They suggest that the future of this site needs to be considered in conjunction with other sites in the vicinity including S/142/004, S/142/010, S/142/011 and S/142/012.</p>	<p>Comments from two respondents suggesting that the site could be developed are noted.</p> <p>The Council will need to adopt a sequential approach to the allocation of sites with regards to flood risk. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified sites within Stokesley that are at lower risk of flooding than the proposed site.</p>
S/142/006	<p>There are three responses to the consultation on this site. All responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>There is concern over access to site being dangerous and concern that connectivity to the town is limited.</p> <p>One respondent notes that the A172 Stokesley by-pass is a natural, logical development limit and they suggest that any developments, either housing or employment in this area would fundamentally affect the character of the town. They note that the views across to the Cleveland hills are of great local value and they suggest that separation from neighbours in Great Ayton should be maintained for the benefit of both communities. They also note that the land is detached from the town and its infrastructure.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on matters such as access.</p> <p>The poor relationship to character and form is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The comments relating to views and separation from Great Ayton are noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/142/007	<p>There are four responses to the consultation on this site. The three individual responses challenge the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable. The fourth response from the Environment Agency reiterates the flooding issues on site.</p> <p>One respondent notes that they do not support any development to the East of the A172 Stokesley by-pass. They note that this is a natural, logical development limit and suggest that any developments, either housing or employment in this area would fundamentally affect the character of the town. They note that the views across to the Cleveland hills are of great local value and suggest that the separation from neighbours in Great Ayton should be maintained for the benefit of both communities. They also note that the land is detached from the town and its infrastructure.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has provided comment and notes that whilst these sites (refers to S/142/002, 003, 007 and 022) are not recommended for development, if this were to change as the site assessment work progresses, these developments could potentially have a detrimental impact on the future flood alleviation works planned for the Stokesley area.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The poor relationship to character and form is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The comments relating to views and separation from Great Ayton are noted.</p> <p>Environment Agency advice is noted.</p>
S/142/008	<p>There are three responses to the consultation on this site. All responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>There is concern over access to site being dangerous and concern that connectivity to the town is limited.</p> <p>One respondent notes that they do not support any development to the East of the A172 Stokesley by-pass. They note that this is a natural, logical development limit and suggest</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on matters such as access.</p> <p>The poor relationship to character and form is identified in the initial site assessment.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>that any developments, either housing or employment in this area would fundamentally affect the character of the town. They note that the views across to the Cleveland hills are of great local value and suggest that the separation from neighbours in Great Ayton should be maintained for the benefit of both communities. They also note that the land is detached from the town and its infrastructure.</p>	<p>The comments relating to views and separation from Great Ayton are noted.</p>
S/142/009	<p>There are three responses to the consultation on this site. All responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>There is concern over access to site being dangerous and concern that connectivity to the town is limited.</p> <p>One respondent notes that they do not support any development to the East of the A172 Stokesley by-pass. They note that this is a natural, logical development limit and suggest that any developments, either housing or employment in this area would fundamentally affect the character of the town. They note that the views across to the Cleveland hills are of great local value and suggest that the separation from neighbours in Great Ayton should be maintained for the benefit of both communities. They also note that the land is detached from the town and its infrastructure.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority advises the Council on matters such as access.</p> <p>The poor relationship to character and form is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The comments relating to views and separation from Great Ayton are noted.</p>
S/142/010	<p>There are two responses to the consultation on this site. Both responses challenge the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>One respondent suggests that the developer would need to address flooding issues and suggest that if this could be done then the site may be achievable.</p>	<p>Comments from two respondents suggesting that the site could be developed are noted.</p> <p>The Council will need to adopt a sequential approach to the allocation of sites with regards to flood risk. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified sites</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The other respondent note that they disagree with the suggestion that site S/142/010 is not suitable for development. They suggest that the future of this part of Stokesley needs to be comprehensively planned. They suggest that the future of this site needs to be considered in conjunction with other sites in the vicinity including S/142/004, S/142/005, S/142/011 and S/142/012.</p>	<p>within Stokesley that are at lower risk of flooding than the proposed site.</p>
S/142/011	<p>There are five responses to the consultation on this site. Four responses are from individuals who each challenge the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable. One is from the site promoter.</p> <p>One respondent suggests the site could be suitable for development due to its good location. They note that this area is well located close to the town centre to access infrastructure and facilities. They note that the recent Leven Mews development has demonstrated that good, high quality housing can be developed in a nearby plot. They state that the fields are not farmed and currently used for fly tipping and fly grazing as well as a cut through with associated ASB issues for the allotment holders. They suggest that the 'historic strip fields' have little or no local value and are therefore not relevant as a reason for restricting development. They suggest that flooding issues can be dealt with through engineering solutions - as for Leven Mews. They note that the key issue would be access versus the numbers of houses to be built.</p> <p>Another respondent suggests that development of this area would benefit the town as accommodation provided would be in easy pedestrian access of the town centre, and they suggest that it would enhance the local economy.</p> <p>The other respondent note that they disagree with the suggestion that site S/142/011 is not suitable for development. They suggest the future of this</p>	<p>Comments from the four individual respondents suggesting the site could be developed are noted.</p> <p>However, the Council will need to adopt a sequential approach to the allocation of sites with regards to flood risk. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified sites within Stokesley that are at lower risk of flooding than the proposed site.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>part of Stokesley needs to be comprehensively planned. They suggest that the future of this site needs to be considered in conjunction with other sites in the vicinity including S/142/004, S/142/005, S/142/010 and S/142/012.</p> <p>Another respondent recognises flooding issues and poor access but does not rule out site.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	
S/142/012	<p>There are two responses to the consultation on this site. Both responses challenge the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>One respondent suggests that the land owner / developer would need to address flooding issues and suggest that if this could be done then the site may be achievable.</p> <p>The other respondent note that they disagree with the suggestion that site S/142/0012 is not suitable for development. They suggest the future of this part of Stokesley needs to be comprehensively planned. They suggest the future of this site needs to be considered in conjunction with other sites in the vicinity including S/142/004, S/142/005, S/142/010 and S/142/011.</p>	<p>Comments from two respondents suggesting that the site could be developed are noted.</p> <p>The Council will need to adopt a sequential approach to the allocation of sites with regards to flood risk. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified sites within Stokesley that are at lower risk of flooding than the proposed site.</p>
S/142/013	<p>There are four responses to the consultation. One of these is from the site promoter. The other three responses are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which concludes the site is not suitable.</p> <p>The respondents agree that the site is liable to flooding, has poor access and poor connectivity.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/142/014	<p>There are six responses to the consultation on this site. One of the responses is from the site promoter of S/142/014 and another response is from the site promoter of an alternative site in Stokesley suggesting that additional sites need to be allocated to ensure sufficient housing is provided in Stokesley. Another response is from Highways England who do not consider the site to be a concern to them. The other three responses are from individuals.</p> <p>One of the individual responses considers that the site is too far out from town and agrees with the conclusion of the initial site assessment which states that development of the whole site would lead to the coalescence of Stokesley and Tamebridge which is undesirable.</p> <p>Another respondent considers the site has poor access and connectivity and is prone to flooding.</p> <p>The other respondent has indicated that the site is prominent in views towards the edge of the settlement. They suggest that a development on the site would not relate well to the existing built form and would lead to coalescence with Tame Bridge.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>The site assessment concludes that part of the site may be appropriate for development. The Council notes objection to development on this site by individual consultees.</p> <p>The coalescence issue is recognised in the initial site assessment and this is why the assessment considers only limited development along the eastern edge may be acceptable.</p> <p>In terms of concerns of flooding, the Council notes that the part of the site that is identified as suitable is in floodzone 1.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and connectivity, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on these matters. They advise that the existing footway and street lighting would need to be extended to serve the site. Transport modelling work will also inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p> <p>The issues around form and character and prominence in views are recognised in the site assessment and this is why the assessment considers only limited development along the eastern edge may be acceptable.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/142/015	<p>There are five responses to the consultation on this site. One of the responses is from the site promoter of S/142/015 and another response is from the site promoter of an alternative site in Stokesley suggesting that additional sites need to be allocated to ensure sufficient housing is provided in Stokesley. Another response is from Highways England who do not consider the site to be a concern to them. The other two responses are from individuals.</p> <p>One of the respondents notes that the site is in the flood zone, has poor access and poor connectivity to the town.</p> <p>The other respondent has indicated that the site is prominent in views towards the edge of the settlement. They suggest that a development on the site would not relate well to the existing built form and would lead to coalescence with Tame Bridge. They also note flooding issues.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>The site assessment concludes that the site may be appropriate for development. The Council notes objection to development on this site by individual consultees.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over flooding, the assessment notes that development may be appropriate subject to the findings of a sites specific flood risk assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and connectivity, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on these matters. They advise that the existing footway would need to be extended to serve the site. Transport modelling work will also inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p> <p>The issues around form and character and prominence in views are recognised in the site assessment. However, the assessment concludes that there is a natural field boundary to the site which may serve to limit the impact of development of the site.</p>
S/142/016	<p>There are six responses to the consultation on this site. One of the responses is from the site promoter of S/142/016. Another response is from Highways England who do not consider the site to be a concern to them. The other four responses are from individual consultees.</p> <p>Two of the consultees disagree that the site is suitable for development due to access issues.</p> <p>The other two consultees support development of the site.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>The site assessment concludes that the site is within the existing development limits, is an existing LDF allocation for employment and has an extant planning permission for housing (25 units).</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/142/017	<p>There are six responses to the consultation on this site. One of the responses is from the site promoter. Another response is from Highways England who do not consider the site to be a concern to them. The other four responses are from individual consultees, however, one response is a duplicate.</p> <p>The individual consultees do not support development on the site. One of the responses notes flooding issues and the other is concerned over dangerous access. The other consultee is concerned over access, flooding issues and suggests the schools and other amenities cannot cope with additional development.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>The site assessment concludes that the site may be appropriate for development. The Council notes objection to development on this site by individual consultees.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over flooding, the assessment notes that no residential development should take place in the area of land that is liable to flooding. It also concludes that a site specific flood risk assessment will be required to determine whether development is appropriate.</p> <p>The Council notes concerns over access. The Local Highway Authority advise the Council on these matters. Transport modelling work will also inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns that there is no need for additional development in this area, the Council notes that Stokesley is identified as a service centre in the Council's settlement hierarchy so is considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. However, the Council is undertaking further work to determine what level of development is appropriate for the different locations in the district.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/142/018	<p>There are four responses to the consultation and all agree with the assessment and consider that the site is not suitable.</p> <p>One respondent does not support any development East of the A172 Stokesley by-pass as they consider that this is a natural and logical development limit.</p> <p>There is concern that development in this area would close the gap and risk coalescence with neighbours in Great Ayton.</p> <p>There is concern over access to the highway.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Impact on form and character is noted in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The Council notes concerns over access. The Local Highway Authority advise the Council on these matters. Transport modelling work will also inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p>
S/142/019	<p>There are four responses to the consultation and all agree with the assessment and consider that the site is not suitable.</p> <p>Respondents indicate that the A172 is a natural, logical development limit and any development in this area would fundamentally affect the character of the town. They suggest that the views across to the Cleveland Hills are of great local value and the separation from neighbours in Great Ayton should be maintained for the benefit of both communities.</p> <p>Respondents consider that the site is detached from the town and its infrastructure.</p> <p>Other responses consider that the access is dangerous and access to the site would interrupt the busy flow of traffic.</p> <p>One respondent indicates that the land is liable to flooding.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Impact on form and character and prominence of views is noted in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Poor relationship with the existing built form is noted in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The Council notes concerns over access. The Local Highway Authority advise the Council on these matters. Transport modelling work will also inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p> <p>The initial site assessment states that the site is in floodzone 1 but recognises that part of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/142/020	<p>There are three responses to the consultation. Respondents supported the conclusions of the site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Respondents indicate that the B1365 is a natural and logical development limit. They suggest that the site is part of the rural approach to Stokesley and the open greenspace is of great value to the community.</p> <p>Respondents indicated that the site has a history of flooding and that this is frequent, severe flooding. Concerns were also expressed that development of the site would increase the risk of flooding at Meadowfield.</p> <p>Respondents considered that the site is detached from the town and its infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Impact on form and character including the loss of an open area which could harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Grade II listed building are identified in the site assessment.</p> <p>The initial site assessment states that the site is in floodzone 1 but recognises that there is significant risk from surface water flooding.</p> <p>Poor relationship to the existing built form is noted in the site assessment.</p>
S/142/021	<p>There are five responses to the consultation on this site. Three responses represent the interests of the site promoter. Two other responses are from individual consultees.</p> <p>One individual consultee notes objection due to flooding and poor connectivity.</p> <p>The other supports the findings of the site assessment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support from individual consultees for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p>
S/142/022	<p>There are five responses to the consultation on this site. One of the responses is from the site promoter.</p> <p>Another response is from the Environment Agency which refers to sites S/142/002, S/142/003, S/142/007, S/142/022 and states that whilst these sites are not recommended for development, the Environment Agency would like to highlight that if this were to change as the site</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support from individual consultees for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Poor connectivity and flooding issues are identified in the site assessment.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>assessment work progresses, these developments could potentially have a detrimental impact on the future flood alleviation works planned for the Stokesley area.</p> <p>The other three responses are from individuals who all support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>One of the respondents notes poor connectivity and flooding issues.</p> <p>One respondent also expressed concern regarding accidents on the A172 and the junction of the A172 and Thirsk Road. The respondent considers that any new access would necessitate a new roundabout and a new footpath along the A172. The respondent also indicated that lorries entering and leaving the sewerage treatment works posed an health and safety issue. They consider access from Malvern Drive to be unsuitable due to the narrowness and u bend and roads joining Malvern Drive.</p> <p>The respondent also suggested that development of the site would have a detrimental effect on visual impact looking towards and away from Stokesley. They commented on the loss of the greenfield site and what appears to be good agricultural land. They also commented on the proximity of the sewerage treatment works.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters of access and road safety. Transport modelling work will also inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p> <p>Prominence in views is noted in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of agricultural land, the land is identified as grade 3a and 3b. However, the Council notes that it is not always possible to meet all housing requirements on brownfield sites. In terms of concerns over proximity to the sewerage works, it is noted that if development was to be considered, then</p> <p>Northumbrian water have indicated that an odour assessment would be required.</p>
S/142/023	<p>There are eight responses to the consultation. One of the responses is from the site promoter. Another response is from the site promoter of an alternative site in Stokesley and they are commenting on where and how access should be taken to the site. Another response is from Highways England who do not consider the site to be a concern to them.</p>	<p>The site assessment concludes that part of the site may be appropriate for development.</p> <p>Of the five individual consultees that have responses, three of the consultees object to development on the site. Reasons for their objections are noted.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>There are five other responses from individual consultees. Two of the individual consultees support development on the site. The other three individuals object to development on the site.</p> <p>One individual consultee objects to development on the site beyond the part which is an existing allocation in the LDF. This is to avoid a significant expansion to the settlement and also due to flooding issues.</p> <p>Another individual consultee objects due to access issues and concern over capacity of the highway.</p> <p>Another consultee objects to development on the site due to impact on the adjacent wooded area and associated biodiversity. They also believe the wooded area helps to alleviate flooding. They are also concerned over access issues and capacity of the highway.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over the scale of the site, the initial site assessment recognises that development of the whole site would have an impact on form and character.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over flood risk, the site assessment concludes that the area in flood zone 1 may be appropriate for some development but that is subject to findings of further work on flood risk.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, further work would need to be undertaken to identify an appropriate access. The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>Transport modelling work will also inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p>
S/142/024	<p>There are five responses to the consultation. All responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which concludes the site is not suitable for development.</p> <p>Primary reasons given for objecting to development on the site include the need to protect educational land and playing fields and also concerns over access and flooding.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support from consultees for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p>
S/142/025	<p>There are ten responses to the consultation. One of the responses is from the land owner and another from the site promoter of S/142/025. Another response is from a site promoter of an alternative site in Stokesley. They are questioning the deliverability of the site as they are suggesting the site is dependent on the delivery of an adjacent site which they state does</p>	<p>The Council notes the level of objection to development on the site as set out within the consultation responses from individual consultees.</p> <p>The concerns raised are addressed below:</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>not yet have reserved matters. They also suggest that if the site was developed, the removal of the designated tree plantation would result in unnecessary ecological and visual harm. Another response is from Highways England who do not consider the site to be a concern to them.</p> <p>The other six responses are from individual consultees who object to development on the site. One of the consultees suggests that further assessment work is required with regards to flooding issues on the part of the site which is preferred in the site assessment.</p> <p>One of the consultees provides a detailed response setting out reasons as to why the site is unsuitable for development. They suggest the site is located too far away from the town centre. They are concerned over the impact on the landscape and environment and loss of footpaths and amenity use of the land. They also note the site is in a minerals safeguarding area and that there are more suitable sites in Stokesley.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over flooding, the site assessment recognises that development of the small section to the south of the site would be subject to the findings of a stage 2 flood risk assessment or site specific flood risk assessment.</p> <p>The site assessment recognises that development of the whole site would impact on form and character of the settlement. It is recognised that works would be required to extend the footway to serve the site.</p> <p>Concerns relating to the distance of the site from the amenities in the town centre and likely increase in reliance on car use is noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of footpaths, any site allocation would seek to retain or divert public rights of way.</p> <p>The Waste and Minerals team at North Yorkshire County Council have not objected to development of any part of the site.</p>
S/142/026	<p>There are four responses to the consultation. Each consultee suggests that development may be possible on site. This is contrary to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which concludes the site is not suitable.</p> <p>One consultee notes flooding is an issue but suggests that it is possible that flooding could be mitigated and managed and if this was achieved then some development could go ahead.</p> <p>Another consultee suggests the site is suitable. They note the site is well located close to the town centre and existing housing and suggests access appears to be possible.</p>	<p>The Council notes the level of objection to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which concludes the site is not suitable for development.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions that flood risk could be mitigated. The Council will need to adopt a sequential approach to the allocation of sites with regards to flood risk. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified sites</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Another consultee suggests the site could be developed but does not give reasons as to why they do not support the conclusion of the site assessment.</p> <p>Another consultee suggests the future of this part of Stokesley needs to be comprehensively planned. They suggest the future of this site should be considered in conjunction with other sites in the vicinity including S/142/004, S/142/005, S/142/010 and S/142/012.</p>	<p>within Stokesley that are at lower risk of flooding than the proposed site.</p> <p>Comments on location of site are noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
S/142/027	<p>There are four responses to the consultation.</p> <p>Two consultees suggest development of site could be possible, one consultee suggests access could be achieved through Hambleton Gate / Station Road.</p> <p>Two consultees agree with the conclusion of the site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>The site owner / site promoter has since withdrawn the site from the site assessment process.</p>	<p>The site owner / site promoter has since withdrawn the site from the site assessment process.</p>
S/142/028	<p>There are four responses to the consultation. All four consultees support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>One of the consultees provides several reasons for their view. They suggest that the B1365 is a natural and logical development limit. They suggest that the site is part of the rural approach to Stokesley and that the open greenspace is of great value to the community. They note that the site is detached from the town and too far out to access infrastructure and services without car journeys. They also suggest the site is susceptible to frequent severe flooding. Another consultee suggests that development would increase risk of flooding at Meadowfield.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support from consultees for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Comments relating to impact on form and character are referred to in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Reliance on car journeys are noted.</p> <p>The site assessment notes that the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	Poor connectivity is also noted by another consultee.	
S/142/029	<p>There are four responses to the consultation. One response is from the site promoter. The other three responses are from individuals who agree with the conclusion of the site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Reasons given for objection to development include impact on form and character of the town, poor relationship to the town and access issues.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support from consultees for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over form and character, the site assessment notes that development of the site would have a modest impact on the character and form of development. It recognises that some development may be appropriate subject to retention and conversion of existing barns.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters of access. Transport modelling work will also inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p> <p>The main concern in the site assessment is flood risk. It notes further assessment is required with regards this issue.</p>

Table 6.55 Great Ayton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/058/001	11 respondents comments on the the allocation of the site. The majority of respondents supported the conclusions of the preferred options assessment which identified the site as not suitable.	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>Comments regarding the appeal are noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>A number of respondents including the Parish Council referred to the reasons referred to in the appeal decision for the whole site.</p> <p>A couple of respondents supported the development of part of the site referring to notice provided to current tenants and indicated that development restricted to the area that is currently occupied by the existing buildings may be appropriate. They indicated that between 10 and 20 dwellings could be considered and that it may be suitable for older people who could walk into town.</p> <p>A respondent suggested the site would not have a significant impact on the village.</p> <p>One respondent indicated that the development of the whole site would put pressure on the existing infrastructure of the village.</p>	<p>The initial site assessment considers that impact on form and character is an issue.</p> <p>The initial site assessment considers that impact on form and character is an issue. The site promoters have sought the consideration of a reduced site and the merits of this is considered in the assessment of the site referenced ALT/S/058/019.</p> <p>The Council is engaging with utility providers to identify any capacity issues and any improvements that may be required to support additional development. This includes engaging with the Local Education Authority and health providers. The discussions will inform further site assessment work.</p>
S/058/002	<p>Seven people responded to the preferred options consultation on this site. 6 were in support of the preferred options assessment that indicated that the site was not preferred. A couple of respondents commented on the distance to the village centre.</p> <p>One respondent considered that the site would be suitable for a number of homes and indicated that it is close to Roseberry school and has good access to the A173.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The proximity to the A173 is noted. The Council considers that this does not outweigh the concerns identified in the preferred options assessment.</p>
S/058/003	<p>There were 9 responses to the preferred options assessment, all supporting the preferred options assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Five commented on the remoteness/distance from Great Ayton, four commented that the development of the site would lead to unwanted ribbon development and reduce the gap to the between Great Ayton and the neighbouring conurbation and they also commented on the scale of the site.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>Impact on form and character is noted in the initial site assessment.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/058/004	Site reference not allocated to a site.	
S/058/005	<p>The majority of respondents supported the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable for development.</p> <p>Respondents commented that development on site would lead to additional surface water and flooding which is already a common occurrence in Easby Lane. They note that many properties are low lying along Easby Lane and at risk of flooding. They note that this is also an issue in the wider area (Angrove Close / Angrove Drive). It is suggested that the topography of the area means development of this site may exacerbate the issue.</p> <p>Respondents indicate that development would impact on the character of Great Ayton including the proximity to the Conservation Area and is also near to the site of the former home of Captain Cook. Respondents also consider that it would lead to over development of Great Ayton and intrusion in to the open countryside. They suggest it would also lead to the loss of views towards Roseberry Topping and Captain Cooks Monument. It is noted that the site is also prominent when viewed on the approach from the National Park to the south.</p> <p>Some respondents noted that many properties in close proximity are bungalows. Any development should be restricted to single storey properties.</p> <p>One respondent notes that the site is in/adjacent to a minerals safeguarding area.</p> <p>There is concern that local services such as health care, shops and schools will be overwhelmed by increase in population. There is concern that there may be an</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable for development is welcome.</p> <p>There are some concerns raised and these are addressed below:</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment does not note significant risk of surface water flooding within the site, however, as the site is over one hectare a site specific flood risk assessment is required. Concerns regarding surface water flooding are noted and the Council will need to explore this issue further. The developer will be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding issues will be managed in a sustainable manner, including how to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p> <p>Concern over impact on form and character and prominence in views is noted. In the initial site assessment, development of the whole site is considered to impact on the overall form of the settlement of Great Ayton. It is noted that there are views to Roseberry Topping and Captain Cooks monument from the site, these are identified within the Council's Settlement Character Assessment and therefore the Council notes that the design of any scheme will need to retain and make the most of the views towards these features giving full consideration to them through the design approach of the scheme. The Council notes that any development will be required to consider the local context</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>increase in crime. Respondents note that telegraph poles run through the site and question what would happen to these.</p> <p>There is concern about prohibiting access to the football and cricket pitches (mentioned that the sole access is at the landowners permission through the site).</p> <p>The cricket club consider that the site will offer the least disruption to the village and realise significant opportunities in enhancement of the sports facilities and walk ways to and from the sports fields. They suggest that discussions with the developers regarding improved vehicular access can take place.</p> <p>Respondents state that the T-junction at Easby Lane / Bridge Street leading on to main road is of particular concern. They state that Easby Lane is narrow in sections and that the road is considered to be dangerous and a fatality recently occurred. They suggest that parking restrictions along Easby Lane / Levenside would be needed. They note that an increase in vehicular movement would increase noise and air pollution.</p> <p>However of the 29 respondents who supported the site, respondents indicated that the site has good access from both north and south directions along Easby Lane and that there were opportunities to upgrade the footpath into the village and improve access to Great Ayton Cricket Club. Respondents suggested the extension of 30mph area and increased footpath provision would be of benefit to pedestrians. They suggest that construction traffic could be managed to minimise impact due to the availability of alternative access arrangements.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>when developing proposals for the site, this includes the height of neighbouring properties which are a mix of one and two story properties. It should also be noted that whilst the Settlement Character Assessments identify the views as important the sites itself is not identified as being within a sensitive area.</p> <p>Comments regarding design are noted.</p> <p>The location of a site within or adjacent to a safeguarding area is not likely to prohibit development given that the site is immediately adjacent to an existing settlement.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over local services, the Council has consulted with infrastructure providers in order to ensure that any requirements resulting for development can be identified and addressed. This includes health care providers and North Yorkshire County Council in terms of education provision, extra care requirements and capacity of local schools. Utility companies have been contacted in order to identify potential capacity issues or location of their infrastructure. Where there is apparatus on site infrastructure providers comment on the necessary easements or requirements for diversion. The developer is required to fund any diversion of existing infrastructure and connection to the infrastructure.</p> <p>Concerns regarding access to the football and cricket pitches is noted and will be explored further.</p> <p>Comments relating to enhancement of sports facilities is noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>Concerns relating to access and capacity of road network are noted. The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>Suggestions relating to access and capacity of road network are noted. The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p>
S/058/006	<p>The Council received around 73 comments in relation to this site, of which around 40 comments were not in agreement with the preferred options assessment which identified part of the site as suitable. Around 30 comments were in support of the preferred options assessment.</p> <p>Respondents indicate concern about the loss of Wildlife Habitats.</p> <p>Respondents commented that development on site would lead to additional surface water and flooding which is already a common occurrence in Easby Lane. They note that many properties are low lying along Easby Lane and at risk of flooding. They note that this is also an issue in the wider area (Angrove Close / Angrove Drive). It is suggested that the topography of the area means development of this site may exacerbate the issue.</p> <p>Respondents indicated concern about the over development of Great Ayton and intrusion in to the open countryside. They suggest it would also lead to the loss of views towards Roseberry Topping and Captain Cooks Monument. They also note the site is prominent when viewed on the approach from the National Park to the south. It is noted that many properties in close proximity are bungalows and that any development should be restricted to single storey properties.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes those comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment but also notes the level of objection to any development on the site.</p> <p>The concerns raised are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on biodiversity, the Council has commissioned local biodiversity screening of the site. This concludes that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment will be required at planning stage.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment does not note significant risk of surface water flooding within the site, however, as the site is over one hectare a site specific flood risk assessment is required. Concerns regarding surface water flooding are noted and the Council will need to explore this issue further. The developer will be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding issues will be managed in a sustainable manner, including how to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p> <p>Concern over impact on form and character and prominence in views is noted. In the initial site assessment, development of the whole site is</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Respondents indicated that Great Ayton does not have the infrastructure to cope with further development and that there are not enough schools, shops and public transport is poor, particularly on an evening.</p> <p>Respondents note that the T-junction at Easby Lane / Bridge Street leading on to main road is of particular concern. They note that Easby Lane is narrow in sections and that the road is considered to be dangerous and a fatality recently occurred. They note that parking restrictions along Easby Lane / Levenside would be needed.</p> <p>Respondents note that an increase in vehicular movement would increase noise and air pollution.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of development on the site.</p>	<p>considered to impact on the overall form of the settlement of Great Ayton. It is noted that there are views to Roseberry Topping and Captain Cooks monument from the site, these are identified within the Councils Settlement Character Assessment. The Council notes that the design of any scheme will need to retain and make the most of the views towards these features giving full consideration to them through the design approach of the scheme. Any development will be required to consider the local context when developing proposals for the site, this would include the scale, height and massing of development. It should also be noted that whilst the Settlement Character Assessments identify the views as important, the site itself is not identified as being within a sensitive area. The council considers that the site visibility will be against the context of modern expansion of the settlement.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over local services, the Council has consulted with infrastructure providers in order to ensure that any requirements resulting for development can be identified and addressed. This includes health care providers and North Yorkshire County Council in terms of education provision, extra care requirements and capacity of local schools. Utility companies have been contacted in order to identify potential capacity issues or location of their infrastructure. The Council notes that the 2016 settlement hierarchy review indicated that Great Broughton remains a service village based on current methodology. Service villages are considered to have some capacity</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>to take additional development over the Local Plan period. However, the Council notes that further work is being undertaken to consider what level of development is appropriate for the different locations.</p> <p>Concerns relating to access and capacity of road network are noted. The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>Concerns over noise and air pollution are noted.</p>
S/058/007	<p>Two comments were submitted in support of the allocation, disagreeing with the Council's initial assessment which concluded the site was not suitable. These comments considered that the site would be preferential to others in Great Ayton as it is positioned on the Middlesbrough side of the village and therefore traffic going to Middlesbrough would not cause further congestion in the village centre. They consider that development of this site creates a more natural expansion to Great Ayton.</p> <p>Approximately 35 comments were submitted in agreement with the Council's initial assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that the northern and western parts of the site are subject to regular, extensive and prolonged periods of flooding.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>Any concerns raised are addressed below:</p> <p>Concerns over flooding are noted. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment did not indicate that the surface water flooding affected a significant part of the site. The Council will need to explore this issue further. The developer will be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding issues will be managed in a sustainable manner, including how to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p> <p>Concerns over loss of allotments are noted. The Green space assessment of the site Alt/S/058/028/G recommends the designation of the part of the site on the basis of its current recreational value. This site has been consulted on again under ALT /S/058/038.</p> <p>Concern over impact on setting of Great Ayton and views are noted. This concern is identified in the initial site assessment.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>There is concern that the loss of allotments would be a damaging loss of an important resource, particularly as an increase in the population of the village means the allotment could be a highly valued source of food and recreation.</p> <p>There is concern that development would further reduce the green corridor between Great Ayton and Middlesbrough.</p> <p>There is concern that development would impact upon the setting of Great Ayton and detract from views involving Roseberry Topping and Cliff Ridge.</p> <p>There is concern over loss of valuable Agricultural Land.</p> <p>There is concern over loss of public footpaths including the Public Right of Way Network.</p> <p>There is concern that there would be a detrimental impact on heritage assets as the site is near the Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings including the Church of All Saints and buildings at Ayton Hall and Langbaugh Hall.</p> <p>Poor access to the villages facilities, which would lead to an over reliance on car journeys and more traffic congestion.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that the curvature / sight line at this location on the A173 makes it difficult to see oncoming traffic when turning right into the Skottowe Estate. They note that the Skottowe Estate can not take through traffic due to the condition of the roads and the safety of residents.</p>	<p>It is noted that the site is identified as being classed as Grade 3 Agricultural Land and does not form best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>In terms of concern over loss of footpaths, the Council notes that if the site was allocated, the Council would seek to retain the the Public Rights of Way wherever possible.</p> <p>Historic England have noted the proximity to a listed building and seek to ensure that prior to allocation of land that an assessment has been carried out to determine the impact on the setting of the Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Poor access to village facilities is noted.</p> <p>Concern over access is noted. The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/058/008	<p>Thirteen respondents have commented on the preferred options assessment. All respondents support the conclusion not to prefer the site.</p> <p>The majority of respondents comment that the tennis courts are an important recreational facility which should not be lost and contribute to the health and wellbeing of people.</p> <p>Two respondents comment on the the impact of the loss of the tennis courts and development of the site on the character and local environment on Low green. One respondent stating that the area is popular with visitors outside the village.</p> <p>Two respondent's comment on the access and consider that the access from Mill Terrace onto the main road is dangerous and there is restricted vision.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>Comments regarding the tennis court are noted.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p>
S/058/009	<p>There were around 12 respondents to the preferred options assessment of this site. 12 respondents supported the preferred options assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Two commented on the open nature of the site and the impact of development on the character of the Low Green Area.</p> <p>A few commented on the loss of the car park, indicating that the car park is currently in use and is not vacant by the pub and the loss of the car park for the pub and resultant reduction in spaces would lead to additional on street parking causing conflict.</p> <p>A couple of respondents commented on the suitability of the access onto the highway and the proximity to the pub and consider that the site would be congested and dangerous.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>Comments on the impact on character noted.</p> <p>Comments regarding car parking are noted.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/058/010	<p>There were eight responses to the consultation. All respondents supported the preferred options assessment of the site which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Two commented on the scale of the site and the distance to the village and one respondent also noted the likely increase in traffic on Yarm Lane and expressed concern regarding the blind bends on the road congested.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters as access and capacity of highway.</p>
S/058/011	<p>There were six responses to the consultation. All respondents supported the preferred options assessment of the site which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Parish Council notes development would mean an unwanted extension of the village to the west. The site is a long way from the centre of the village and has access problems.</p> <p>Other respondents note concern of flooding.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The parish council's comments are noted.</p> <p>Flooding concerns are noted.</p>
S/058/012	<p>There were six responses to the consultation. All respondents supported the preferred options assessment of the site which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Parish Council notes development would mean an unwanted extension of the village to the west. The site is a long way from the centre of the village and has access problems.</p> <p>Other respondent is concerned over access and road safety.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The parish council's comments are noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters as access and capacity of highway.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/058/013	<p>There are 42 responses which includes a response from the Parish Council. There are a further two responses from the site promoters.</p> <p>Of the 42 responses, five responses, including that from the Parish Council are in support of development on the site. The remaining 37 responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>There is concern over loss of public footpaths including the Public Right of Way Network.</p> <p>There is concern that there would be a detrimental impact on heritage assets as the site is near the Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings including the Church of All Saints and buildings at Ayton Hall and Langbaourh Hall.</p> <p>There is concern over flooding on the site.</p> <p>There is concern over reducing the green gap between Middlesbrough and Great Ayton.</p> <p>There is concern over access to the site, road safety and capacity of the highway with on road parking highlighted as an issue.</p> <p>Two respondents are concerned over how the consultation on sites has taken place.</p> <p>The Parish Council suggest the site is a possibility and provides a rounding off of the village. Another three respondents suggest the site is one of the best sites as it is close to village facilities and has good road access. Another respondent considered that the site would be preferential to others in Great Ayton as it is positioned on the Middlesbrough side of the village and therefore traffic going to Middlesbrough would not cause further congestion in the village centre.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>Comments from those respondents suggesting the site is suitable are noted.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters as access, road safety and capacity of highway.</p> <p>If the site was to be developed, the Council would seek to ensure that any public rights of way are protected.</p> <p>Other points raised are generally picked up in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>For any concerns relating to the consultation on sites, individuals should liaise with the Parish Council in the first instance.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/058/014	<p>There were six responses to the consultation. One was a duplicate. All respondents supported the preferred options assessment of the site which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Parish Council notes development would mean an unwanted extension of the village to the west. The site is a long way from the centre of the village and has access problems.</p> <p>Other respondent is concerned over access and road safety.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The parish council's comments are noted.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters as access and capacity of highway.</p>
S/058/015	<p>There are 10 responses to the consultation. However, two responses are duplicated. Therefore there are four individual responses which object to development on the site.</p> <p>Four of the responses are from the Parish Council (different Parish Councillors) which do not believe the site is the most appropriate for development. Three of the responses from the Parish Council state that the site is an unwanted extension of the village to the west. They state that the site is a long way from the centre of the village and has access problems. However, two of the Parish Council representations also state that if the site has to go ahead, that there are possibilities for affordable housing on the site.</p> <p>A further response is from the site promoter. The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>The general message is that respondents support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>Other comments are noted.</p>

Table 6.56 Great Broughton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/057/001	<p>There were eight responses to the preferred options consultation. Seven agreed with the findings of the preferred options consultation assessment. A summary of the key issues is provided below.</p> <p>Two respondents expressed concern regarding the access. They note that Kirkby lane is narrow with a busy primary school. They suggest that building along the lane would increase volume of traffic along this busy lane which would be dangerous for children and parents. There is concern that there is likely to be increased parking along the lane which is likely to create more traffic congestion during school drop off and pick ups.</p> <p>Four respondents indicated that they were concerned that the development would lead to coalescence. One respondent indicated that every effort should be made to keep the two villages separate.</p> <p>Another respondent stated development of the site would effectively join the settlements of Kirkby in Cleveland and Great Broughton and that this is the only remaining green space between the villages. The parish council also expressed concern and stated it is the only green space between the settlement and building on the site would conjoin the two.</p> <p>One respondent stated that development does not relate well to the existing character of the village.</p> <p>The parish council and another respondent indicated that the site is outside the development limits.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>The Council notes the comments made by a respondent which disagreed with the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The points raised are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of the comments suggesting that coalescence would not be an issue, the Council considers that the site currently provides a separation from the main form of development in Kirkby which is linear in nature around the cross roads and the main form of development in the settlement of Great Broughton. The Council considers that development of the site could lead to inappropriate continuous ribbon development along Kirkby Lane between Kirkby and Great Broughton.</p> <p>In terms of access, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of impact on heritage assets, Historic England will advise the Council on these matters.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>One respondent stated that agree with the assessment and refer to the visual impact of the development.</p> <p>One respondent disagreed with the findings of the preferred option assessment and suggested that the site is suitable for development. The reasons given include:</p> <p>They consider the site to have good road access.</p> <p>The respondent believed that the site is not nearer to a listed building than site S/057/008.</p> <p>They also suggested that the site is within the boundary of Kirkby (approx 500m) and therefore it would not contribute to the coalescence of the two villages.</p>	
S/057/002	<p>The Council received nine comments in response to the preferred options consultation on this site. Eight respondents supported the councils initial assessment of the site which concluded the site was not suitable for development.</p> <p>One respondent considered that the site was suitable for a few houses. They suggest that the existing trees will hide the development from any views.</p> <p>The points raised by respondents in support of the Council's initial assessment are summarised below:</p> <p>Two respondents indicated that the village should not be a service village based on its amenities.</p> <p>One respondent indicated concern about the impact on the amenities of the village, that the Holme is a safe place to play and walk and that additional traffic would have a detrimental impact on this. Two other respondents</p>	<p>The Council welcomes comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>There are a couple of points raised which are addressed below.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion that Great Broughton should not be a service village, the Council note that the categorisation was based on a audit of amenities completed by the Council in 2016. Service villages are considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. However, the Council is undertaking further work to consider what level of development is appropriate for the different locations.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and capacity of the highway, the Local Highway Authority have noted that there is no link from the site to an adopted road. The Local Highway</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>indicate that the introduction of extra traffic along the Holme would have road safety implications.</p> <p>Another respondent indicated that the development of the site would have a detrimental effect on the village and surrounding green space agreeing with the reasons in the conclusions of the preferred options assessment.</p> <p>The Parish Council also consider that development would impact on the Holme and the Conservation Area which is a valued asset of the village.</p> <p>Two respondent comments consider that the development limits should continue into the new plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council consider that the site is outside the development limits.</p>	<p>Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to access and capacity of the highway.</p> <p>Comments relating to impact on landscape and the Conservation Area are noted in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of the comment relating to development limits, sites outside development limits should be considered for allocation within the new Local Plan if necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>The preferred approach is to replace development limits with a criteria based approach.</p> <p>There is one respondent which suggests the site is suitable for development suggestion that existing trees will hide the development from any views. The Council notes that it did not conclude that the site was particularly prominent in key views towards the settlement.</p>
S/057/003	<p>The council received 11 responses to the preferred options consultation. All of the responses did not support development at this site which is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment. The reasons are summarised below.</p> <p>Two respondents indicated that the village should not be a service village based on its amenities. One respondent indicates that the village has a part time shop, no place of worship, no petrol station, no medical centre. They state it is congested on the highstreet and that public transport is inadequate. They state the school and sport club are shared with Kirkby and that the school is fully</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>There are a couple of points raised which are addressed below.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion that Great Broughton should not be a service village, the Council note that the categorisation was based on a audit of amenities completed by the Council in 2016. Service villages are considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. However, the Council is undertaking further work to consider</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>subscribed. They suggest that the development would place additional burden on B1257 and Kirkby Lane.</p> <p>Five respondents commented on the development limits, four commenting that the site is outside development limits and one considers that the existing development limits should be maintained.</p> <p>One respondent states that the land is agricultural and that there are several mature trees on the plot and the eastern boundary.</p> <p>One respondent considers that the site is too large. The village is too small and linear. One respondent commented that there are views from Kirkby Lane to the Cleveland hills that would be impacted on if the site was developed. Two respondents indicate that development would impact on the peace and tranquillity of Kirkby and Great Broughton Sports and Social Club. One respondent considers that the site is prominent in views towards the settlement from public rights of way and form the sports club and that the development is out of the character and form of a rural North Yorkshire village.</p> <p>One respondent states that there is a need to retain separation between Great Broughton and Kirkby. They suggest that allowing development here would depart from longstanding position and would have the effect of leaving only one small agricultural field in the buffer zone and it would be difficult to resist further development.</p> <p>One comment suggests that the proposed development would adversely affect the Conservation Area. One respondent states that the site is an old Quaker Burial Site.</p> <p>Four respondents comment on flooding. Two respondent indicates that the site contributes to excess flooding of the area at the entrance</p>	<p>what level of development is appropriate for the different locations. The Council also liaises closely with the Local Education Authority regarding capacity of schools. The Local Education Authority will advise on the level of development that is appropriate in this regard.</p> <p>In terms of concern over the capacity of the highway, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of the comment relating to development limits, sites outside development limits should be considered for allocation within the new Local Plan if necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>The preferred approach is to replace development limits with a criteria based approach.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to agricultural land, the Council notes that it is not always possible to meet housing need on brownfield sites. However, where there is a choice, brownfield would typically be prioritised.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to impact on form and character, these points are addressed in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of the concern relating to coalescence, the Council notes the response. However, the Council would note that the site is located to the rear of existing development and whilst the council considers that the site will impact on form and character of the</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>of the Holme. There is concern that development would increase the run off and exacerbate the flooding of nearby properties.</p> <p>One respondent indicates that there is no footpath on this side of Kirkby Lane and it is impossible to provide one other than immediately in front of the development as Kirkby lane is narrow. Two respondents indicated that a footpath crosses the site linking to other footpaths, a diversion along or through the development would remove the amenity.</p> <p>Seven respondents (including the Parish Council) comment on access. One considers that the access is restricted. Five (including the Parish Council) comment on the nature of Kirby Lane (narrow and busy). One respondent states there is no realistic access onto Kirkby Lane. They note that planning permission has previously been refused nearby due to lack of safe access onto Kirkby Lane. Two respondents consider that development along the lane would be dangerous for children and parents and increased parking along the lane is likely to create more congestion during pick up and drop offs. One respondent considers that this makes Kirkby Lane into a single lane road rather than a two way road. Another respondent indicates that Kirkby Lane is well used and peaks twice a day at school drop off and pick up. They note that the road is a bus route and is used for the double decker school bus (Stokesley School). They note that access from the Holme is hazardous and further development along Kirkby Lane would increase the problem. One respondent indicated that visibility from the site is severely limited by hedges outside of the control of the owners.</p>	<p>settlement, the Council does not consider that the development of the site alone will lead to coalescence.</p> <p>In terms of the comment relating to impact on the Conservation Area, Historic England have not identified any issues at this stage. Historic England will advise the Council on these matters. North Yorkshire County Council archaeologist will advise on other matters.</p> <p>The surface water flooding maps held by the Council do indicate that the site is liable to surface water flooding. This is limited to the northern boundary of the site. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required if the site was to be considered further. The developer would be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding would be managed in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over footpaths, the Council notes that any public rights of way affected by development would need to be retained or diverted. A loss would not be acceptable.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and capacity of the highway, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>Only those sites that have been put forward to the Council by land owners or site promoters as part of the Call for Sites exercise undertaken as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan have been assessed and considered.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>One respondent stated that the sites to the north of Great Broughton would be better as the traffic created by the development would not impact on the village itself and the drainage looks better too.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	
S/057/004	<p>Comments were received from 14 respondents in response to the consultation for this site. All respondents object to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable.</p> <p>The reasons for objection are summarised below:</p> <p>Two respondents indicated that some of the plots owned within the village are not owned by residents in the village.</p> <p>A number of respondents consider that Great Broughton should not be a service village and that the hierarchy should be revisited. Respondents note that Great Broughton should not be considered as a service village and is not suitable for taking further development due to the nature and level or services and facilities available within Great Broughton at present. Respondents comment on the level of facilities and services available. Respondents state that the remaining shop is in danger of closing and there are now only 2 pubs, and the church has closed. They note that the school and sports club are shared with Kirkby. Respondents consider that the village has the same level of services as Kirkby, Busby, Carlton and Faceby, but surprised that it is identified as the same position in the hierarchy as Great Ayton. One respondent considers that the proportion of development supported in Great Broughton is disproportionate to the level of development</p>	<p>The Council notes the objections to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable.</p> <p>The concerns raised are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over ownership, the Council does not consider the location of the site owner when determining the suitability of a site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the position of Great Broughton within the Council's settlement hierarchy and the proposed level of development within the village, the Council notes that the categorisation was based on a audit of amenities completed by the Council in 2016. Service villages are considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. However, the Council is undertaking further work to consider what level of development is appropriate for the different locations.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over infrastructure, particularly the capacity of the local road network and capacity of the school, the Council liaises closely with infrastructure providers. The local highway authority will advise the Council on any improvements required to facilitate required</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>being promoted in Great Ayton when you consider the size of the settlement and level of facilities. A couple of respondents indicate that the village is being asked to take more development than it can accommodate.</p> <p>One respondent indicates that there is not sufficient infrastructure at present to allow expansion of the village. A couple of respondents indicate that road infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate additional development. One respondent notes that the village is linear with a central crossroads. They note that the road has narrow bridges and is a single carriage way and that each of the four entrances to the village are bottle necks. Respondents note that the village is over laden with cars and heavy traffic. Three respondents indicate that the school is fully subscribed and two indicate public transport is inadequate. They note that Great Broughton is off gas with a consequent increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>A number of respondents (including the Parish Council) indicate that the site is outside development limits and that the development limits should remain. Respondents indicated that development limits provide clarity on planning matters. One respondent indicated that development of the site would set a precedence for further development along Kirkby Lane.</p> <p>Three respondents indicated that an officer of the council had indicated that there was a question in the consultation about the retention of development limits, and if respondents indicated that they should remain they would .</p> <p>A respondent indicated that there are more appropriate brownfield sites in Middlesbrough where there is a local requirement for</p>	<p>development. The Local Education Authority will advise the Council on how school places will be affect.</p> <p>When considering sites for allocation in the new Local Plan, the Council should consider sites outside existing development limits, if this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>The preferred approach is to replace development limits with a criteria based approach.</p> <p>The Council is required to demonstrate how it will meet the district's housing requirement within the district boundary. The Council is undertaking further work to determine what level of development is appropriate for the different settlements and to identify which sites are most suitable for allocation in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The response regarding the National Park is noted. However, the Council notes that Great Broughton is outside the National Park and that there is is no proposed review to amend or provide a buffer to the boundary. The Council consults with the National Park planning authority and the National Park will inform the Council of any concerns in terms of visual impact of new development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over footpaths, the Council notes that any public rights of way affected by development would need to be retained or diverted. A loss would not be acceptable.</p> <p>Historic England advise the Council on heritage matters. The Council notes the advice from Historic England. The Council has commissioned a heritage</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>additional housing. They note that Great Broughton does not have a local requirement for development.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the site is only 3km away from the National Park and they suggested that Great Broughton should be included in the National Park.</p> <p>One respondent indicated that there is a footpath and they suggest that the loss of the footpath would be a loss of amenity for the village.</p> <p>Eleven respondent indicated that the site is a well used site and is considered as part of the rural area. Three respondents indicate that the used pubic right of way is well used which connects the site to millennium wood. Two respondents expressing concern that mature trees and hedges will be degraded by development. Two respondents consider that diversion of the footpath would take away the rural amenity.</p> <p>Historic England have responded to the consultation and stated that the site adjoins the boundary of Great Broughton Conservation Area. They state that an assessment of the impact of new development on heritage assets would be required.</p> <p>Six respondents (including the Parish Council) have indicated that the site is next to the Conservation Area and that development would have a significant negative impact. Three respondents (including the Parish Council) state that the site would dominate the entrance and have an adverse impact. They note that the indigenous wood which adjoins the eastern boundary of the site provides an attractive rural edge to this part</p>	<p>impact assessment for all sites that are being considered as part of the site assessment process. The impact assessment will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns regarding the archaeological value of the site, the Council will seek further advice from the archaeology team at North Yorkshire County Council. This will inform decisions when considering the the suitability of the site for allocation.</p> <p>The Council notes the concerns regarding impact on form and character. As noted in the initial site assessment, the Council considers that the site will have limited impact on form and character of the settlement. It notes that careful design of the scheme should ensure that development does not cause harm to elements that contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area and landscape. The Council has commissioned a heritage impact assessment for all sites that are being considered as part of the site assessment process. The impact assessment will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over visual amenity, the Council notes the comments made. The Council acknowledges that there are views across the site to the hills and moors beyond. The Council's Settlement Character Study (2016) indicates that there is an opportunity to retain and enhance the green setting of the village and retain views to south of North York Moors.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>of the village and to the Conservation Area. They note that new development would obscure that view.</p> <p>Three respondents indicated that the site is part of a quaker Burial Ground. The OS map indicates that it is part of a burial ground and would require a license from the Home office for development to take place. The site promoter has indicated that local residents have stated that part of the field may once have been used as a burial ground associated with a former Quaker meeting house. In practice, however, the burial ground lays within the field immediately to the west, as shown on the 1893 OS map, and there are unlikely to be any burials within the site.</p> <p>Six respondents consider that the development would be out of keeping with the character of Great Broughton. One respondent expressed concern with new infill development is not in keeping with the style and character of the village, and two commented the development would be too dense. One respondent indicated that 9 dwellings is not consistent with the character and form of the area, but that fewer than 9 would not be optimal. One respondent indicates the view towards Wainstones would be obliterated by building on the site for residents of Kirkby Lane. Two respondents state that the school was limited in height to alleviate impact on view from the moors. Respondents suggest that development of the site would have a devastating impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Three respondents indicate that the site would have impact on the character and form, one considering that the site is an elevated position and is prominent. Two respondents</p>	<p>The concerns regarding loss of a greenfield between the two settlements are noted. The Council notes that careful design of the scheme should ensure that development does not cause harm to elements that contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area and landscape. This may include retention of green spaces.</p> <p>Concerns over flooding are noted. The Council is aware that surface water mapping indicates that marginal areas of the site are liable to surface water flooding. The developer will be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding issues will be managed in a sustainable manner, including demonstrating that development will not increase flood risk elsewhere. The Council will need to explore the flood risk issue further as part of more detailed site assessment work.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and capacity of the highway, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>Other sites in Great Broughton that have been assessed can be viewed in this section.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>consider that development would have an adverse impact on the street scene and character and style.</p> <p>Six respondents indicate that the site contributes to the visual amenity. One respondent states that the green buffer fronts the road with hedges for its entire length (except the school). They suggest that it adds to the character of the village and frames the hills beyond. They suggest that development would detract from it and that it dominates the view of the village when approaching from the north on the footpath system and borders the Conservation Area. They note that development would impact on the feel of the village. Respondents note that the view towards the moorland would be altered and these views contribute towards the character of the village.</p> <p>Nine respondents (including the Parish Council) are concerned about the loss of a green field between the two settlements and consider the field important to maintaining separation. Two respondents consider that Kirkby and Great Broughton should be distinctive villages and are concerned about the impact of development on the south side leading to coalescence. Two respondents noted that the school is an acceptable exception as there is a buffer on each side of the school. They note that views into the site when travelling towards Great Broughton are limited by the natural boundary, however development would be higher than than the boundary and would be visible on the approach.</p> <p>Ten respondents (including the Parish Council) comment on flood risk. It is indicated that the site is prone to flooding due to run off. They note that properties on the Holme at this location experience substantial and frequent</p>	

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>flooding. Three respondents express concern that development of the site would exacerbate flooding and flooding of neighbouring properties and further down the Holme. There is concern that sub surface culverts don't work in a rural setting and that run off will be accelerated by sealing of roads. Three respondents (including the Parish Council) consider flood risk could not be mitigated due to the levels on the site. One respondent states that a stream bed runs through the site and drains the land to the south west. They state that run off from the site flows into neighbouring properties. One respondent states that the field does flood and has been unpassable and disagrees with the findings of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which stated that the site is in Flood Zone 1 with minimal risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p>All respondents (including the Parish Council but excluding Historic England) indicate concern regarding the access, indicating the narrowness of Kirkby lane. Respondents express concern about level of traffic by variety of types of vehicles (including large agricultural vehicles), congestion on Kirkby lane around school pick up and drop off time, the number of parked cars, the narrow bend on Kirkby Lane and limited visibility. They suggest that extra traffic would result in increased accidents, and accidents involving children. Four respondents note that there is no footpath. Two respondents indicate that there is no footpath to south side of Kirkby Lane and that there are poor sight lines. The respondent considers that safe access and egress might require a mini roundabout and straightening and widening of Kirkby Lane. They suggest that this would not relate well to the character and form of development. Two Respondents consider that the proposal</p>	

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>would lead to an additional 27 cars on site and therefore there is a potential for additional parking on Kirkby Lane.</p> <p>One respondent indicates other sites in the village would be more suitable for development such as site S/057/014 as this could accommodate additional properties without additional traffic in the village .</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	
S/057/005	<p>The Council received five responses to the consultation on this site. All respondents agreed with the findings of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Two respondents including the Parish Council stated that the site was outside the development limits.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the site is in the greenbelt.</p> <p>One respondent notes that the village has few local amenities to support an increase in the population and that the local school may not be able to take any further children.</p> <p>One respondent states that the field floods.</p> <p>One respondent indicates that the trees and hedgerows are old and that there are fantastic views over the Cleveland Hills.</p> <p>A respondent notes the presence of a public right of way through the site.</p> <p>A respondent noted that Back Lane is narrow and considers access would be limited and dangerous. They note that there is no pedestrian footway along Back Lane and insufficient space to create one without damaging the ancient hedgerow.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits, the Council notes that when considering sites for allocation in the new Local Plan, the Council is able to consider sites outside development limits, providing they meet key assessment criteria, including how well the site relates to form and character.</p> <p>The site is not in greenbelt, but is a greenfield site and classed as grade 3 agricultural land. There is no greenbelt designation in this location.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over school places, the Local Education Authority will advise the Council on the level of development that is appropriate for the school and if and how additional school places can be provided.</p> <p>In terms of concerns of flooding, as noted in the initial site assessment, there is a small area of the site to the south east which is susceptible to surface water flooding. The developer</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>would be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding would be managed in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The comment regarding views is noted. The council would seek the retention of substantial trees and hedgerow within the layout of any scheme.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over footpaths, the Council notes that any public rights of way affected by any development would need to be retained or diverted. A loss would not be acceptable.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, as noted in the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority have advised that the site has a frontage on Back Lane which is narrow and would require upgrading. They note that the junction of Back Lane/ Green Balk may have insufficient visibility. They conclude that Back Lane is narrow and would require upgrading to provide a sufficient carriageway width and footways to serve the site.</p>
S/057/006	<p>There have been 14 responses to the preferred options site assessment for this site, two of which were duplicates and one was from the Parish Council. All respondents disagreed with the findings of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable.</p> <p>The main issues are summarised below:</p> <p>One respondent indicated that the site is not within the development plan.</p> <p>A few respondents have commented that the site is outside development limits (including the Parish Council).</p>	<p>The Council notes the objections to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable.</p> <p>In terms of the concern that the site is not within the development plan, the Council notes that the emerging Local Plan is considering options for new development to meet the needs of the District to 2035, and is considering the allocation of new sites beyond the existing allocations made within the</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>A couple of respondents consider that Great Broughton should not be a service village. They suggest that the infrastructure and amenities do not support the designation. Respondents considered that the level of development supported is disproportion when compared to other service villages, and a respondent indicated that Great Broughton does not have the same facilities as Great Ayton so it is difficult to understand why they have the same status.</p> <p>Three respondents comment that the site would have a detrimental impact on the character and form of the settlement. Points raised included that it is prominent in views towards the settlement and would extend the form of the settlement northwards and one respondent considered the site forms an entrance to the National Park</p> <p>One respondent indicated the proposed development of the site could lead to a loss of privacy.</p> <p>A couple of respondent considered that the site would reduce the separation between Great Broughton and the Industrial Area.</p> <p>Three respondents consider that the site is not capable of providing 10 dwellings. A few respondent note that the site is prone to flooding.</p> <p>Respondents indicate that the access would be at a dangerous point on a busy road, a number referring a blind bend, and railway bridge, the need for a right turn into the site after a bend and the access being near to neighbouring properties. A respondent considered that realignment may be necessary and difficult to achieve. A couple of respondents note the lack of Public right of way or footpath access to the site and are concerned regarding the pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>Local Development Framework Allocations Development Plan Document (2010)</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits. the Council should considering sites outside existing development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the position of Great Broughton within the Council's settlement hierarchy and the proposed level of development within the village, service villages are considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the plan period. However, the Council is undertaking further work to consider what level of development is appropriate for the different locations.</p> <p>In terms of concerns regarding form and character, the Council notes that if the site is allocated, the existing landscaping to the boundary should be retained and enhanced. This is also consistent with the findings of the review of biodiversity data on the site.</p> <p>Any development allocation of the site for development would be accompanied by a design brief which would set out the basic requirements for the site. This could include set back from existing properties in order to protect the amenity.</p> <p>It is noted in the preferred options assessment that the site would extend the settlement northwards. It is not considered that it would have the effect</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>of significantly reducing the separation between the settlement and the business park.</p> <p>The council notes the need to consider the shape of the site and surrounding development when calculating the eventual yield of a site. The capacity of the site was based on applying a generic density of 25 dwellings per hectare, this would equate to over 12 dwellings on the site. Having regard to the shape of the site and the landscaping to the boundary it was considered appropriate to reduce this to 10 dwellings. At this stage, this did not fully account for the character and form of the settlement although had regard to the preferred option policy mix to provide smaller dwellings. Thought the consideration of design briefs for proposed allocations a realistic approach to yield will be taken.</p> <p>As stated in the preferred options assessment the site is within flood zone 1. It is noted that the road is liable to surface water flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment indicates that the site is at minimal risk to surface water flooding. Should further evidence indicate that the site is at risk of flooding then the council can consider whether a site specific flood risk assessment is required.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters such as access and capacity of the road network.</p>
S/057/007	The council received four comments on the preferred options assessment of this site. One respondent disagreed with the findings of the initial site assessment which identified part of	The Council welcomes general support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable for development.



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>the site as suitable. Three respondents supported the findings of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Three respondents (including the Parish Council) that supported the allocation of the site stated that they consider that the site should be landscaped. Two respondents requested a landscape buffer of 10 metres to the boundary of the site. One respondent suggested a mix of bunds and tree planting.</p> <p>One respondent stated the design of buildings should be of a high standard, including pitched roofs and ensuring that the park is attractive and responds to the rural setting.</p> <p>The respondent who did not agree with the findings did not support the scale of the site and considered that it would adversely affect the area.</p>	<p>The Council notes objection by a respondent.</p> <p>Comments raised are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of comments regarding landscaping, the Council notes that should the site be allocated, consideration to the landscaping on the northern boundary should be included within the development requirements and design criteria for the site.</p> <p>In terms of comments regarding design of buildings, the Council notes that this could be included within the development requirements and design criteria for the site with criteria ensuring that development responds to its setting. Consideration will need to be given to the roofscape and massing of development in order to reduce/limit the visual impact.</p> <p>In terms of the respondent who objects to development on the site, the Council notes that the scale of new employment land required has been informed by the Council's Employment Land Review (2016) and Industrial Estates Review. Any further work will inform decisions regarding the suitability of this site.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/057/008	<p>There were 13 responses to the preferred options consultation assessment of which there was one duplicate response, one neither supporting or disagreeing with the conclusions, one supporting (the site promoter) and the remainder not supporting the conclusions.</p> <p>A respondent considers that the scale of development would impact on the village. A couple of respondents considers that development should no be extended beyond the existing LDF allocation, suggesting that more development will lead to traffic problems, damage to parked cars and population problems. A respondent considers that the level of development proposed for Great Broughton is not proportionate when compared to Great Ayton. Respondent indicates that no more than 25 dwellings should be provided on the existing site. One respondent indicates that smaller sites will have less impact.</p> <p>A couple of respondents state that the site is outside the development limits for the settlement.</p> <p>Respondents have expressed concern about the level of services available in comparison</p>	<p>The Council notes that the majority of respondents objected to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable.</p> <p>The concerns raised are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the proposed level of development within the village, Great Broughton is identified as a service village within the Council's settlement hierarchy. Service villages are considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. However, the Council is undertaking further work to consider what level of development is appropriate for the different locations. The Council will continue to liaise with the Local Highway Authority regarding the capacity of the highway and levels of development in the village. This will inform decision on which sites are deemed appropriate for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits, the Council should consider sites outside existing development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the level of services in the village, the Council is undertaking further work to consider what level of development is appropriate for the different locations.</p> <p>If the site is allocated the density will be controlled through appropriate development requirements. The density will reflect the need for a viable scheme that responds to the local surroundings.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>to other service villages (Great Ayton) and the proportion of development proposed. There is concern that there is a lack of facilities in the village and people have to drive to Stokesley. It is noted that there is poor mobile reception and low speed broadband, that the settlement is not on the gas network, and that it has limited public transport services. There is concern that the the shop will close.</p> <p>A respondent stated that the existing linear form of development should be maintained and that development should not extend beyond development limits. Respondents indicate that the number of houses proposed is too dense for the character of the village.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the development of the site would impact on elements that contribute to the significance of Broughton Grange. They suggest that the site is prominent from significant views, of local interest (from Wainstones, the Cleveland Way and the Coast to Coast path). They consider that the National Park should be consulted. It is noted that in response to the consultation on the planning application 17/00941/FUL North Yorkshire County Council Heritage Services indicated that the site has archaeological potential in association with Broughton Grange associated with Rievaulx Abbey and for Prehistoric and Romano - British activity occupying a favourable location on a plateau at the confluence of two becks. Historic England state that the site is just over 100 metres from Grade II listed Building Broughton Grange. They state that an assessment of the impact on heritage assets is required.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over impact on heritage assets, in line with the advice of Historic England, the Council has commissioned an assessment of the impact of development on heritage assets. This will inform decisions regarding as to whether the site is suitable for allocation.</p> <p>The Council will seek advice from the archaeological team at North Yorkshire County Council regarding archaeological value of the site.</p> <p>The Council will continue to liaise with Natural England regarding the potential impact on the National Park. The National Park have also been consulted as part of the consultation on the Preferred Options document. Advice from these partners will inform decisions on the suitability of the site and inform the design of any scheme that may go ahead.</p> <p>Comments regarding light pollution are noted.</p> <p>Comments regarding noise pollution are noted.</p> <p>As noted in the conclusion of the initial site assessment, development should not take place in areas of the site which are liable to flooding. This will reduce the yield of the site. The developer will be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding will be managed in a sustainable manner, including demonstrating that development will not increase flood risk elsewhere. The Council will need to explore the flood risk issue further as part of more detailed site assessment work.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>One respondent considers that the impact of the site from the National Park has been underestimated. They suggest that development will appear large and not in keeping with the village. One respondent stated that sites to the north would have less impact on the National Park. It is noted that Natural England in response to 17/00941/FUL advise that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be carried out to assess the potential impact of the proposal on the setting on the National Park and users of the National Trail.</p> <p>Concern about light pollution emitted from new development.</p> <p>Concern about noise pollution.</p> <p>One respondent indicates that the site floods, one notes that this is in the summer and development limits respond to this. The respondent expresses concern regarding the impact on existing properties and houses down stream and consider it is possible that this impact has been underestimated. A respondent noted that the storm water runs down the High Street.</p> <p>Respondents note that access via the high street is busy, narrow and winding with limited visibility and is therefore dangerous. They note that traffic already speeds along the section of the road. It is suggested that additional development would lead to increased road traffic accidents. One respondent considers that new properties should be built near the main road to avoid increasing the heavy traffic in the village. There is concern that all the traffic will flow north through the village towards Stokesley and there are already issues with parked cars. It is suggested that sites to the north will have less of an impact on traffic flow through the</p>	<p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters such as access and capacity of the road network.</p> <p>Only those sites that have been put forward to the Council by land owners or site promoters as part of the Call for Sites exercise undertaken as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan have been assessed and considered.</p> <p>Other sites in Great Broughton that have been assessed can be viewed in this section.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>village. Respondents comment on the narrowness of the footpaths opposite the site and through the village.</p> <p>One respondent stated sites on Kirkby Lane would be more suitable as near to four roads out of the village and residents can walk children to school.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	
S/057/009	<p>Seven comments were received in response to the consultation on this site. All agreed with the conclusions of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable. A summary of the comments is provided below:</p> <p>A respondent noted that the site is not in development limits.</p> <p>Respondents consider the Holme forms a local amenity, a natural play space and walking route. They suggest that the narrowness and grass verges add to the character and state that development would not be in keeping with the village.</p> <p>A respondent notes that the Holme is in the conservation area and that development would have an impact on the conservation area.</p> <p>Respondents note concern regarding the potential loss of a local footpath.</p> <p>Respondents consider that access from the Holme is unsuitable. They suggest it is narrow and lacks pavements. They note that additional traffic would impact on road safety as the Holme is used for children walking and playing. They note that upgrading the Holme would impact on the character of the area and the conservation area.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits. the Council should consider sites outside development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>Support for the councils conclusions regarding character and form are welcomed.</p> <p>If the site was allocated an assessment of the impact on heritage assets would be required.</p> <p>In any allocation of land affecting a public right of way the council would in the first instance seek retention of the public right of way.</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters such as access and capacity of the road network.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/057/010	<p>There were six responses to the consultation on the preferred options. Five residents supported the conclusions of the preferred options assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Reasons included that the scale and location of the site were not suitable.</p> <p>Two respondents (including the Parish Council) noted that the site was outside the development limits for Great Broughton.</p> <p>One respondent whilst agreeing with the Preferred Options assessment considered that the western part of the site could be an appropriate alternative to the development of site S/057/008.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits, the Council should consider sites outside development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>Further site assessment work would be required to determine the suitability of the western part of the site.</p>
S/057/011	<p>The Council received eight comments on the preferred options assessment. All agreed with the findings of the preferred options assessment which identified the site as not suitable. A summary of the main comments is provided below:</p> <p>Comments noted that the site is outside development limits.</p> <p>Comments suggested the site is too large for the village.</p> <p>Respondents suggested that the Holme is an amenity for residents providing a natural play space along the beck, and well used by walkers. It is noted that the green area is important for the character of the village and protection of the gap between Great Broughton and Kirkby. Respondents suggested that development would not be in keeping with the village. They note that grass verges along the Holme are part of the character and that removal or further damage would impact on the character.</p>	<p>The Council welcome support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>A couple of points that are raised are covered below.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits, the Council should consider sites outside development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>In terms of the comments relating to flooding, the Council notes that the site is over 1 hectare and as such a site specific flood risk assessment would be required. The mapping data indicates that the access is liable to surface water flooding.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Respondents noted that the Holme is in the Conservation Area. They note that undesirable access would impact on the Conservation Area. They also note that the grass verges along the Holme contribute to the Conservation Area and are being damaged by traffic.</p> <p>Respondents note that the site tends to flood in winter and suggest that removal of a soakaway would increase flooding elsewhere along the Holme.</p> <p>Respondents note that access along the Holme is unsuitable. They note that it is a single track, narrow, with no footpaths, with soft grass verges, and they note that access along here would have safety implications (Children playing and walkers). One respondent indicated that the verges are unstable due to bank erosion. They also note that vehicles end up in the street and that additional traffic could make this worse. They note that loss of the verges for widening would impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site promoter has not responded to the preferred options consultation.</p>	
S/057/012	<p>The Council received seven comments on this site. All the respondents agreed with the conclusions of the preferred options assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Respondents note that the site is outside development limits.</p> <p>Respondent considers that Great Broughton is not a service village. They note that the 2016 review of the settlement hierarchy notes that there is a change in facilities but the village still remained a service village based on current methodology.</p> <p>There are concerns about the loss of prime agricultural land.</p>	<p>The Council welcome support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable.</p> <p>A couple of points that are raised are covered below.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits. the Council should consider sites outside development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over whether Great Broughton should be a service village, the Council notes that there will</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Respondents suggest that the scale of the proposal is not in keeping with the village. They note that development of the site would extend the settlement towards the proposed expansion of Stokesley Business Park. They note that it would not be in keeping with the form character and style of the village.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that the proposal would impact a number of public rights of way.</p> <p>One respondent indicated southern part of the site is subject to ground heave. They suggest that bore holes at a neighbouring plot indicated structure of clay, gravel and water requiring piling.</p> <p>Respondents note that there would be a significant increase in traffic along Kirkby Lane. They note that Kirkby Lane is narrow, busy and congested especially at drop off and pick up times. They suggest that there would be road safety implications. Respondents comment on the lack of access to the site. Respondents also question the suitability of an access between 20 and 24 Kirkby Lane.</p>	<p>be further reviews of facilities in villages at some point. However, in the interim as part of the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council is undertaking further work to determine what level of development is appropriate for the different locations.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the loss of prime agricultural land, the Council notes that the land is classified as grade 3.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the public right of way, the Council note that where any public rights of way are on development sites, the Council seeks to retain the public way.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over ground conditions, the Council notes that a ground condition report could be required. Any works may have implications on viability.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, this concern is noted in the initial site assessment.</p>
S/057/013	<p>The Council received four comments in relation to the preferred options site assessment. Three respondents supported the findings. The Environment agency was neither in support of or in disagreement with the assessment. A summary of the responses is below.</p> <p>Three respondents supported the allocation but indicated that a landscaping strip would be required and should include a mix of landscape bunding and tree planting in order to reduce the visual impact and noise of the site and this should be considered in relation to site S/057/007.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes general support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions around landscaping and design, the Council notes that this can be incorporated into the design brief in order to reduce the visual impact and support the retention of boundary features and protection and enhancement of habitats for native species.</p> <p>In terms of the comment stating that there should be no retail use on the site, the Council notes that the area if</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Respondents note that consideration of the design is required.</p> <p>One respondent commented that there should be no retail use.</p> <p>The Environment Agency states that they would welcome discussions with the developer at the earliest opportunity as the development could affect their future flood alleviation plans along Eller Beck.</p>	<p>allocated would fall within a proposed key employment area and within these areas the emerging Local Plan would resist the loss of employment use.</p> <p>The Council will continue to engage with the Environment Agency.</p>
S/057/014	<p>The Council received eight responses to the preferred options assessment which identified the site as not suitable. Seven broadly supported the conclusion of the assessment. One respondent disagreed with the conclusions of the assessment. A summary of the main points is provided below.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that the site is outside development limits.</p> <p>One respondent indicated that the site is adjacent to development limits and disagrees with the conclusions of the assessment. There is concern that there are not enough services, or services with sufficient capacity in the village to support a larger population (shops, schools, bus services).</p> <p>Respondents note that development at proposed scale would impact on the character of the village. They note that the site is at the entrance and would be the first thing you would see. One respondent indicated that the site boundary could be reduced to limit the extent of the expansion of the settlement northwards. The respondent considers that the site has a good relationship with the existing built form and concurs that it could be possible to mitigate impact through careful consideration of the design.</p> <p>There is concern that the site is a green belt site.</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits, the Council should consider sites outside development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the level of services and facilities in the village, the Council notes that the 2016 settlement hierarchy review indicated that Great Broughton remains a service village based on current methodology. Service villages are considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. However, the Council notes that further work is being undertaken to consider what level of development is appropriate for the different locations.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the impact on the character of a gateway site are noted. The Council's Settlement Character Assessment for Great Broughton indicates that the screened approach</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Respondents note that the site is susceptible to flooding. They note that surface water flooding affects properties to the south of the site which is on lower ground than the proposed site. There is concern that there would be an increase in run off to the south of the site which would worsen the situation. C</p> <p>Respondents note that there is potential of significant traffic safety issues. They note that the B1257 is a dangerous road, (lack of visibility, proximity to the bridge) and do not consider that there are any suitable alternative access points. They note that Back Lane is narrow and that there are no pedestrian footways. There are no pedestrian access points to the site. One respondent indicated that reducing the boundaries of the site would negate concerns regarding visibility to motorists and suggest that there is an existing access to the south of the site with a good connection to the highway.</p>	<p>from the north should be maintained and the rural character of Back lane should be preserved. The potential to reduce the site area is considered within the Alternative Sites consultation document and the response is summarised under ALT/S/057/023.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over green belt, the Council notes that the site is a green field site and it does not fall within a designated green belt.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over flood risk, concerns are noted. The Council note that the site is over 1 hectare in size and a site specific flood risk assessment would be required. The developer would be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding would be managed in a sustainable manner, including enduring development does not increase flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>In terms of concern over highways and road safety, these concerns are noted in the initial site assessment. The implications for a reduced boundary on highways access are responded to under ALT/S/057/023. The Local Highways Authority would advise on all such matters.</p>

Table 6.57 Hutton Rudby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/073/001	13 comments received in support of the allocation of the site. The support for the site was split between people that support the development of the whole	Comments noted.



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>site and the small part of the site that has been identified as preferred in the initial site assessment. Comments included that the site is a good in-fill between existing housing developments along Garbutts Lane. There is a view that development of this site would impact the least amount of residents and would result in the least impact on traffic within the village. Comments refer to the site being bounded by hedgerows which could be retained and that the site has good pedestrian access to services.</p> <p>4 comments received from local residents objecting to the allocation of the site. Respondents considered that development of the whole site would be a significant intrusion in to the open countryside and lead to the loss of wildlife habitats. The view was that the scale of development was not proportionate to the size of the village and that the site is too far from the village centre. There is concern that there would be insufficient sight lines and concern that there will be traffic issues for cars and pedestrians when the shop relocates too.</p>	
S/073/002	<p>11 comments received in agreement with the recommendation not to allocate the site. Comments included the following matters. The Trans Pennine Ethylene Pipeline runs through the site. Access is inadequate both from Garbutts Lane and Levendale estate. Development would encroach into green space and the valuable Leven Valley environment. One additional comment was received from a local resident who stated the site could be suitable if an access from Levendale could be formed.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	Comments noted.
S/073/003	<p>The council received 12 comments in agreement with the recommendation not to allocate the site. Supporting the reasons outlined in the assessment. Other reasons included that the site was important in offering views to the open countryside and that development of this large site would significantly alter</p>	Comments noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>the character of both Hutton Rudby and Enterpen. There was one comment in support of frontage type development such as suitable infill development for 4-5 dwellings. The site is near to facilities. Two further comments supported the development due to access to village amenities. A Development that secured private open space for the long term benefit of the village community would be positive. The site also benefits from suitable access.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	
S/073/004	Reference not allocated to a site.	
S/073/005	<p>12 comments in agreement the site is not suitable for development. The majority of respondents indicated they agreed with the preferred options assessment. Some respondents provided some additional comment and the main points are summarised below.</p> <p>Traffic issues along Belbrough Lane which can be treacherous in wintry conditions. Visibility is also restricted due to overhanging trees and existing residents including on the Eden Park estate often have difficulties. Langbaugh Road itself can also be very busy particularly at school times.</p> <p>The site is rich in wildlife habitats, particularly within the ancient hedgerows and mature trees.</p> <p>The site is far from the village centre, therefore, further intensifying the use of the car.</p> <p>Development would form a large intrusion into the open countryside and would impact on views when approaching from Campion Lane and Garbutts Lane.</p> <p>One further comment states the site could come forward alongside site S/073/012 as there are not considered to be any specific constraints to development.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	Comments noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/073/006	<p>The council received 5 comments in support of the preferred options assessment which identified the site as suitable and 8 comments that objected to the preferred options assessment of the site.</p> <p>Comments were received that supported the allocation of the site because it would keep the village compact.</p> <p>Comments that did not support the allocation of the site provided the following comments:</p> <p>They indicated that development should be on small infill sites, not create new estates.</p> <p>Respondents indicated that the site is used for grazing of cattle and sheep. They noted that there are also numerous visiting wildlife habitats within the historic hedgerows and stated that removal of the trees and hedgerows would be inconsistent with the village design statement which seeks to retain existing landscape features where possible.</p> <p>A respondent indicated that the northern part of the site is liable to surface water flooding.</p> <p>Respondents indicated that the site has no direct access to the public highway at Garbutts Lane. They note that access could only be via Paddocks End. Access from S/073/001 is near a blind bend and close to existing entrances. The spur may increase traffic volume on the route.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over biodiversity, the Council has commissioned biodiversity screening of sites. This concludes that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment is required at planning stage.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, as noted in the initial site assessment, the Strategic Flood Risk assessment concludes that the development may be permitted on flood risk grounds. Further investigation may be required by the developer and the council should be consulted as to whether a Flood Risk Assessment may be required.</p> <p>In terms of access issues, the Highways Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p>
S/073/007 S/073/008	References not allocated to sites.	
S/073/009	<p>The council received 23 responses objecting to the preferred options assessment of the site. Four comments were received in support of the the preferred options assessment which identified the site as suitable.</p>	<p>The concerns raised are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of loss of agricultural land, it is not always possible to meet all housing need requirements on brownfield sites.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The responses in support of the site indicated that the site is in reasonable location with pedestrian access to key facilities. Respondents commented that there is no need for additional parking for the play area.</p> <p>Respondents in support indicated that limiting the scale of the site would reduce the visual impact. A key issue is retaining the open and rural feel of the village.</p> <p>Respondents in support of the site indicated that development would have a limited impact on congestion in the village as traffic would not need to go through the village when travelling north or south.</p> <p>They also indicated that development would provide additional security to the nearby children's play area.</p> <p>Comments that objected to development of the site are summarised below.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Respondents note that in previous years the area has flooded. There is also concern that near by properties will be at increased risk of flooding if the site is developed.</p> <p>Respondents question the need for additional housing in Hutton Rudby. Indicated that there have been between 12-20 properties on the market in the last year, and there is development in Stokesley and Yarm.</p> <p>Respondents objecting to development at this location stated that the junction at Station Road and Belborough Lane is very hazardous, due to poor sight lines and incline.</p> <p>Respondents suggested that development would obscure open views including Drumrauch Hall (a non designated heritage asset) and the Old Vicarage. It would also impact on Grade II listed Linden Grange and Gardenstone Farm.</p>	<p>In terms of flood risk, as noted in the initial site assessment, the strategic flood risk assessment does not identify any surface water issues on site and indicates that the site is in flood zone 1. However, the developer will be responsible for demonstrating how any surface water flooding issues will be managed in a sustainable manner without increasing flood risk to other areas.</p> <p>In terms of comments questioning the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Hutton Rudby is identified as a service village in the Council's settlement hierarchy and is therefore considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period. The Council is undertaking further work to determine what level of development is appropriate for different locations.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>Historic England will advise the Council on potential impacts on heritage assets.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Respondents indicated that new estates or ribbon development such as this would not be appropriate within the settlement. Respondents commented that there would be loss of significant views to the North York Moors National Park which are an important part of the wider character of Hutton Rudby. This is particularly valuable on the approach to the village from the A19 and A172. They suggest that the site makes a valuable contribution to the openness and rural setting of Hutton Rudby. Respondents note the Hutton Rudby Settlement Character assessment acknowledges the importance of the site.</p> <p>Site would be better utilised as a village green that can be enjoyed by the wider community.</p> <p>A planning application was previously withdrawn following the volume of objections, why is it being considered again?</p> <p>There is concern development of the site will impact on the enjoyment of the play area, walkers joggers and cyclists along station Lane.</p> <p>There is concern that development here will set the precedence for future development in this location.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over character and form, as noted in the initial site assessment, the design of the scheme would need to respond appropriately to the local setting and character.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions the site could be used as a village green, it is noted that there is already a recreational area adjacent to the site.</p> <p>In terms of questions as to why the site is being considered again following earlier withdrawal of a planning application, it is noted that the site has been considered and assessed as part of the site assessment process for the Local Plan. Further work will be undertaken to determine which sites are most appropriate for allocation the new Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact on the play area, the development should not prevent people from accessing or using the recreational area.</p> <p>In terms of concerns of development setting a precedence for further development at this location, as noted in the initial site assessment, a relatively small scale, carefully and sensitively designed development is only considered appropriate at this location.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/073/010	<p>The general consensus is that the site is not suitable for development. This is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>The reasons for objection to development on the site are similar to those points of objection raised for site S/073/09.</p> <p>There are a few respondents who consider the site would be suitable for development on the basis that it would not increase traffic through the village as it is in proximity to the A19. It is also considered that the site is close to village facilities and the play area.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.</p> <p>Points of objection are noted.</p>
S/073/011	<p>13 comments have been received objecting to the potential allocation of the site.</p> <p>Comments provided include:</p> <p>Development would be too large and would have serious implications for the character of the village and whether existing infrastructure could cope.</p> <p>Development would impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>There would be a significant loss of wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Sexhow Lane is very popular with walkers, horse riders and cyclists.</p> <p>The junction of Sexhow Lane and Enterpen can be very difficult due to the large amount of farm traffic, delivery lorries and car parking.</p> <p>Two local residents have commented that the northern portion of the site could be suitable for development.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable are welcome.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/073/012	<p>7 comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable for development. This is on the basis that the site is considered to be in a good location offering easy pedestrian access to the key village amenities.</p> <p>5 comments received objecting to the proposed allocation of the site.</p> <p>Comments provided include:</p> <p>Allocation of this site would be contrary to the Local Plan's vision which includes the protection and enhancement of the District's landscapes and special qualities and the experience of the landscape should be protected.</p> <p>Development would be a large intrusion into the open countryside.</p> <p>Development of the site would impact on the old field system as is shown on the 1856 OS map, such historic features should be preserved.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife including 11 species on the red list of endangered species.</p> <p>Historic hedges and trees should be retained.</p> <p>Parts of the site are subject to surface water flooding at times of heavy rainfall.</p> <p>Poor road access with risk of accidents on to Garbutts Lane.</p> <p>Comments received from a landowner who has recently acquired a parcel of land within the site, as a result the site is no longer available for development.</p>	<p>The concerns raised are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on the landscape, as noted in the initial site assessment, only part of the site has been considered suitable on the basis that a smaller scale development would reduce impact on character and form.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over biodiversity, the Council has commissioned biodiversity screening of sites. This concludes that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment is required at planning stage.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over surface water flooding, the developer would be required to demonstrate how this would be managed in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council.</p> <p>In terms of the comment from a landowner on availability of land, the Council will communicate further with landowners to check availability.</p>

Table 6.58 Rudby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/125/001	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.	Noted.
S/125/002	The consensus from the consultation responses is that the site is not suitable for development and this is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment. Of the 17 responses received, only two responses suggest the site could be developed. The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.	Support for conclusion of initial assessment is welcome.
S/125/003	The consensus from the consultation responses is that the site is not suitable for development and this is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment. Of the 15 responses received, only two responses suggest the site could be developed. The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.	Support for conclusion of initial assessment is welcome.
S/125/004	Site reference not allocated to a site.	N/A
S/125/005	The consensus from the consultation responses is that the site is not suitable for development and this is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment. Of the 15 responses received, only one response suggests part of the site could be developed.	Support for conclusion of initial assessment is welcome.

Table 6.59 Skutterskelfe

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/134/001	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site. The consensus from the consultation is that the site is unsuitable for development. This is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment.	Noted.

Table 6.60 Crathorne

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
S/033/001	<p>One respondent is in agreement with the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. The Parish Council consider that visually a new development may be an improvement to the farm buildings on site. The Parish Council also note that a new development could include a new car park for the adjacent pub.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.</p>	<p>The initial site assessment notes that sensitive design could reduce impact of new development on the site but concludes that overall there would be a potentially negative impact on form and character,</p> <p>The suggestion of a new car park for the pub to alleviate parking on the road is noted.</p>
S/033/002	<p>No responses from individuals. However, the site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.</p>	Noted.
S/033/003	<p>No responses from individuals. However, the site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.</p>	Noted.
S/033/004	<p>The Parish Council support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.</p>	Noted.
S/033/005	<p>There was responses from a resident, the Parish Council and Historic England all of which supported the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable for conversion.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.</p>	Noted.
S/033/006	<p>The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.</p> <p>No other responses.</p>	Noted.

Thirsk area

Table 6.61 Thirsk

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/152/002	<p>There are two responses to the consultation for this site. One supports the initial site assessment. The other suggests the site is suitable for development. This is on the basis that they believe the site relates well to the built area and that the site does have access. They also suggest the site has good access to services, public transport and amenities and is in an area of landscape which they believe is badly degraded. They suggest that development of the site would provide scope for important sound attenuation that would benefit neighbours and that there is opportunity for incorporating formal, managed public access facilities as part of the development.</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>The initial site assessment notes that the site is well related to the existing built form.</p> <p>In terms of comments on access, the Council has taken advice from the Local Highway Authority who have noted that the site does not benefit from access to the public highway.</p> <p>In terms of accessibility to services and amenities, the initial site assessment acknowledges that the site is in walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>In terms of comments on the landscape, the area is within the green infrastructure corridor.</p> <p>In terms of opportunities for sound attenuation for existing residents, the site is part of a landscape buffer between the existing housing and the A19.</p> <p>In terms of opportunities for creating formal open space, all new developments will be required to meet open space requirements set out in policy within the new Local Plan.</p>
T/152/004	<p>Over 30 individuals have responded to the consultation on this site. Consultees object to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which suggests part of the site is suitable for development. The general consensus from consultees is that the site is not suitable for development. This is a view shared by the Parish Council.</p> <p>The main reasons given by consultees objecting to development of the site are:</p>	<p>The Council notes the concerns raised by consultees in response to the consultation on this site.</p> <p>It should be noted that following queries about land ownership for site T/152/004, revised site boundaries were resubmitted and a new site reference ALT/T/152/013 was allocated to the site which was then reassessed and consulted on as part of the Alternative Sites consultation. Please see summary of comments raised and HDC officer response for ALT/T/152/013 in separate chapter of this document.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Flooding issues on the site and concern additional development would increase flood risk to existing properties;</p> <p>Unsuitability of the access to the site, including the view that Shire road is too narrow to accommodate increased traffic flow;</p> <p>Road safety issues due to increased traffic on to highway;</p> <p>Negative impact on the conservation area due to loss of important open space and visual impact of new properties on the landscape;</p> <p>Capacity of doctors surgery and local schools;</p> <p>Impact on biodiversity;</p> <p>Need to prioritise brownfield sites;</p> <p>Loss of green infrastructure and negative impact on well-being of population;</p> <p>Increased air pollution of additional traffic;</p> <p>Thirsk and Sowerby have already had enough house building in recent years;</p> <p>Historic England have commented and note that the development of this site would result in the loss of an open area part of which lies adjacent to and part of which lies within the Thirsk and Sowerby Conservation Area. Historic England advise that an assessment is required to establish the impact development would have on the</p>	<p>The comments that are raised by consultees in response to the Preferred Options consultation on T/152/004 are addressed below:</p> <p>The main concern raised by consultees is in relation to flooding issues on the site and the concerns that additional development would increase the flood risk to existing properties. The initial site assessment suggests that part of the site which is outside the Flood Zone could be suitable for development. The Council will need to seek further advice with regards to flooding issues on the site given the concerns raised, including reviewing relevant assessments from the site promoter. Please also see the section on ALT/T/152/013 within this document for a further update.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and road safety, the Local Highway Authority have advised that a site of this size would require a transport statement in support of any application. They also state that minor improvements might be required along Shire Road and that the site layout would need to be considered with T/152/010. The Council will seek further advise from the Local Highway Authority on this matter to inform further site assessment work.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on Conservation Area, Historic England have advised that further assessment work regarding this issue is required. The Council will need to carry out further assessment work in line with Historic England's advise.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on biodiversity, the Council has commissioned biodiversity screening of sites. This advises that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment and</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Conservation Area and that the outcome of the assessment will help determine if the site is suitable for allocation.</p> <p>The site promoter of alternative sites in Thirsk objects to development on the site due to issues around loss of amenity to neighbours and adverse impacts on the environment.</p> <p>The site promoter of T/152/004 has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>possible Ecological Impact Assessment would be required at planning application stage. This will identify any mitigation that is required.</p> <p>Concerns over impact on health and well being as a result of development on part of the green infrastructure corridor and concerns over increased air pollution are noted.</p> <p>In terms of comments suggesting the need to prioritise brownfield sites, it is not always possible to meet all development requirements on brownfield sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact on services and facilities, as part of the Local Plan preparation process, the Council is engaging with the Clinical Commissioning Group, health providers and the Local Education Authority. These bodies will advise the Council on capacity issues and this will inform decisions regarding the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions that Thirsk and Sowerby do not need any more development, it is noted that Thirsk and Sowerby are identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service centre. The settlement is therefore considered to have capacity to take some additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation such as landscaping would be considered.</p> <p>Advice from Historic England is noted.</p>
T/152/005	<p>An individual objects to development on the site due to concerns over capacity of Station road. They suggest focusing development at Sowerby Gateway.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of Station Road, the Local Highways Authority requires consideration of all potential</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>An individual comments on inaccuracies in the map.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>allocations along Station Road in terms of cumulative impact on key junctions within Thirsk and access arrangements.</p> <p>Comments regarding the maps are noted.</p> <p>In terms of comments on the site having a poor relationship to local services, it is noted that the site is in walking distance of the town centre and train station.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation such as landscaping would be considered.</p>
T/152/007	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation. No other comments received for this site.</p>	Noted.
T/152/008/E	<p>Responses related to concerns about the loss of this site for employment purposes and impact on Station Road traffic in addition to a suggestion that this site could facilitate a road link through to the Sowerby Gateway scheme.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment. They conclude that the site should be retained for employment use.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over impact on Station road, the Local Highway Authority advise that a transport assessment and travel plan will be required to support any planning application. They also state that the cumulative impact of all proposed allocations along Station Road will need to be considered on key junctions within Thirsk.</p> <p>Transport modelling work would be required to determine the need for a link road.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the loss of an employment site, at the time of responding to consultation comments, the site is being marketed for employment purposes, however, there has been a lack of interest and the owners at this stage are considering the possibility of developing the site for housing.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation such as landscaping would be considered.</p> <p>In terms of comments on the site having a poor relationship to local services, it is noted that the site is in walking distance of the town centre and train station.</p>
T/152/009	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>In terms of objections by the site promoter of alternative sites, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p>
T/152/010	<p>Concerns have been raised about the loss of important open space, impact on the conservation area, traffic implications, risk of flooding and capacity of local services and amenities, impact on biodiversity. The Parish Council object to development on the site.</p> <p>There is only one individual consultee supporting the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>The general consensus of consultees is that the site is not suitable for development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over traffic and access, in response to the proposal for development on this site as part of the Local Plan process, the Local Highway Authority has advised that the cumulative impact of the site would need to be considered with T/152/004. They state that the site has no direct access onto a public highway and that access to the highway will need to be through site T/152/004 (however, this is dependent on T/152/004 being identified for allocation).</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>In terms of concerns over impact on the conservation area, the initial site assessment concludes that the some development could still be acceptable.</p> <p>In terms of concern over risk of flooding, this is noted and the Council would need to seek further advice with regards to flooding issues on the site given the concerns raised, including reviewing relevant assessments from the site promoter.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on biodiversity, the Council has commissioned local biodiversity screening of the site which advises that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment and possible Ecological Impact Assessment would be required at planning application stage. This will identify any mitigation that is required.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of local services, as part of the Local Plan preparation process, the Council is engaging with the Clinical Commissioning Group, health providers and the Local Education Authority. These bodies will advise the Council on capacity issues and this will inform decisions regarding the suitability of sites.</p>
T/152/011	<p>There is an individual consultee objecting to development on the site due to impact of additional traffic on Station road.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The Environment Agency advise the need to ensure that any development manages surface water flooding issues and does not increase risk to other areas.</p>	<p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>The advice from the Environment Agency is noted.</p>
T/152/012	<p>The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
T/152/013	<p>An individual consultee objects to development on the site on the basis that it would represent a significant encroachment into the countryside.</p> <p>The Parish Council also objects to development on the site for the following reasons: lack of suitable access; loss of amenity open space; the site is in the flood plain which will increase flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>Highways England state that the site is anticipated to generate 105 two-way trips per hour, and is consequently of concern to Highways England.</p> <p>The site promoter of alternative sites in Thirsk objects to development on the site on the basis that they believe the site is an important green wedge.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>The Council notes objection to the development of the site.</p> <p>The Council will continue to have dialogue with Highways England regarding any further assessment work required.</p>

Table 6.62 Sowerby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/139/001	<p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p> <p>Historic England note that the site adjoins the boundary of the Thirsk and Sowerby Conservation Area and have advised that an assessment of the impact of any development on the Conservation Area is required. The outcome of the assessment should inform decisions on the suitability of the site.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>Advice from Historic England is noted.</p>
T/139/002	<p>There are two neighbouring land owners who state that part of their land has been included in the site boundary submitted for assessment. They state that the land that they own is not for sale for development.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p>	<p>Issues around land ownership are noted. It has been confirmed that not all of original site is available for development, which significantly reduces the size of the site. A revised site boundary has been submitted and re-assessed and consulted on as part of the Alternative Sites consultation. The new site reference is ALT/T/139/025. Please see separate section for this site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/139/003	<p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as unsuitable in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p>
T/139/004	<p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p> <p>Two other individuals have objected to development on the site due to concerns over traffic, specifically the capacity along Station Road, and loss of greenspace and views.</p> <p>Highways England note that if only the preferred part of development is brought forward then the site will not be of concern to Highways England given the low number of two-way trips. If the entire site is developed then the site will be of concern given an estimate of 210 two-way trips per hour.</p>	<p>Some of the points raised by the site promoter of other sites in Thirsk are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of loss of views, the Council notes that loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of green space, the initial site assessment identifies only part of the site as potentially suitable for development. The Council also notes that provision of open space within the</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>development will be a requirement as part of the design of any scheme at the planning application stage. The scheme will need to align with requirements of planning policy with regards to open space provision.</p> <p>Highways England advice is noted.</p>
T/139/005	<p>No comments requested as site already has planning permission as part of the Sowerby Gateway scheme.</p> <p>However the agent has put forward a proposal to reduce employment land by 4ha and to replace this with residential use. The agent states this is due to high levels of employment land available at nearby Dalton Airfield and elsewhere in the district.</p>	<p>Site already has planning permission as part of the Sowerby Gateway scheme.</p> <p>The Council notes that at this stage, the site promoter has not submitted evidence which demonstrates there is no demand for employment uses.</p>
T/139/006	<p>The site area falls below the minimum threshold for assessment as set out in the site assessment methodology. The site has not been assessed. Comments have not been requested.</p>	N/A
T/139/007	<p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p> <p>Historic England note that the site adjoins the boundary of the Thirsk and Sowerby Conservation Area and have advised that an assessment of the impact of any development on the Conservation Area is required. The outcome of the assessment should inform decisions on the suitability of the site.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as suitable for development in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>Advice from Historic England is noted.</p>
T/139/009	<p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as suitable for development in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p>
T/139/010	<p>An individual consultee has agreed with the initial site assessment.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as suitable for development in the initial site assessment alongside T/139/011.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/139/011	<p>An individual consultee has agreed with the initial site assessment.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p> <p>Historic England note that the site adjoins the boundary of the Thirsk and Sowerby Conservation Area and have advised that an assessment of the impact of any development on the Conservation Area is required. The outcome of the assessment should inform decisions on the suitability of the site.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as suitable for development in the initial site assessment alongside T/139/010.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>Advice from Historic England is noted.</p>
T/139/012	<p>There is only one consultation response that does not agree with the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. Reasons for supporting the site are not given.</p>	Noted.
T/139/013	<p>There is a response from an individual consultee who supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>Another comment also agrees with the conclusion of the initial site assessment. The reasons given include issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as unsuitable in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p>
T/139/014	<p>A comment agrees with the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. The reasons given include issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as unsuitable in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, this is noted.</p>
T/139/016	<p>A comment agrees with the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. The reasons given include issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as unsuitable in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, the site is within walking distance of the town centre.</p>
T/139/017	<p>There is a response from an individual consultee who supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable.</p>	<p>The site has been identified as unsuitable in the initial site assessment.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Another comment also agrees with the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. The reasons given include issues around additional traffic; loss of amenity to neighbours; poor relationship to local services and public transport and adverse impact on environment.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over additional traffic, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on matters relating to capacity of the highway.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on amenity of neighbours and impact on the environment, this is a matter that would be addressed at planning application stage. Potential for mitigation through the design of the scheme would need to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of concern over access to local services, this is noted in the initial site assessment.</p>

Table 6.63 Carlton Miniott

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/025/001	<p>There is both support for and against the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable for development.</p> <p>However, where there is suggestion that the site may be suitable, consultees identify various issues that would need to be addressed to make any additional development possible.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised about impact of further development on local facilities such as the school and the highway network, notably there is concern over the capacity of Ripon Way. There is</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on local services such as the school, as part of the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council is working closely with key partners to identify capacity issues and required mitigation. Discussions with key partners such as health and education providers will inform decisions on the suitability of sites. In terms of schools, the Council is in dialogue with the Local Education Authority to identify capacity issues and advice from the Education Authority will inform decisions on which sites are most appropriate for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on the local highway, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on highway matters and the suitability of sites.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>also concern regarding the capacity of the sewerage and drainage systems. Concerns are raised regarding flood risk and loss of an area which is used for recreational purposes. Concerns are also raised about the impact development may have on the adjacent scrap yard. The scrap yard owners have stated that housing should not be built any closer to the scrap yard due to the noise and disruption caused by its operation.</p> <p>The need for additional housing in the area is also questioned given the existing housing development at near by Sowerby Gateway.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water will advise the Council of any capacity issues and any required mitigation. This will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns of flood risk, the initial site assessment acknowledges that part of the site is affected by surface water flooding. The developer will be required to demonstrate how this will be managed in a sustainable manner as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of a recreational area, the Council note that the area is privately owned and is not a formal recreational area. The developer will need to make provision for open space within the development in line with the requirements set out in Local Plan policy.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over conflict between residential areas and the scrap yard, impact on amenity of residents will need to be considered as part of the design of the scheme and mitigation measures such as landscaping incorporated. The developer will need to ensure the scheme meets the requirements set out in the policy on amenity within the Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on the environment, there is an opportunity to enhance the area through incorporating landscaping into the design of the scheme.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to services, the site is within walking distance of the school, village services and the town centre.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/025/002	<p>Most consultation responses are of the view that the site is not suitable for development. This is contrary to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as preferred providing adjacent sites come forward to create an access.</p> <p>Concerns have been made in regard to the unsuitability of the access both into the site and onto the A61. Other issues raised during the consultation were concerns about drainage and sewage capacity as well the impacts on the school. There is a view given that brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites. There is also concern that development of the site would represent a significant intrusion into the open countryside that does not relate well to the existing built form.</p> <p>The Parish Council does not support development on the site, largely due to concerns over accessibility.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Objection to development on the site within consultation responses is noted.</p> <p>The concerns that have been raised are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, the initial site assessment acknowledges that adjacent sites would need to come forward at the same time to provide an access. The Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on access and highway capacity matters.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on the school, the Council is in dialogue with the Local Education Authority to identify capacity issues and advice from the Education Authority will inform decisions on which sites are most appropriate for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water will advise the Council of any capacity issues and any required mitigation. This will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions that brownfield sites should be prioritised, the Council note that brownfield status is a consideration, but other factors may mean that a site is not suitable for development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on form and character, this is noted.</p> <p>In terms of loss of amenity for neighbours, amenity of residents will need to be considered as part of the design of the scheme and mitigation measures such as landscaping incorporated. The developer will need to ensure the scheme meets the requirements set out in the policy on amenity within the Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of impact on the environment, the developer will need to make provision for open space within the development in line with the</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>requirements set out in Local Plan policy. Through careful design of the scheme, there is an opportunity to minimise impact.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over a poor relationship with local services, the Council note that providing access is resolved, the site is within walking distance of the school, village services and town centre.</p>
T/025/003	<p>The Parish Council object to development on the site due to concerns over capacity of the local highway and concerns over the level of proposed development in Carlton Miniott.</p> <p>An individual consultee notes that the pub is being renovated and will re-open.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>The consultation responses object to housing development on the site. This is in line with the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable for housing. It notes the importance of retaining the community facility.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of amenity for neighbours and impact on the environment, if housing was developed on the site, providing it was of low scale and density, this would be unlikely to impact on amenity of neighbours or impact negatively on the environment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to services, by retaining the existing use, this will help to protect local services.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p>
T/025/004	<p>The Parish Council object to development on the site due to concerns over capacity of the local highway and concerns over the level of proposed development in Carlton Miniott.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>While support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome, the consultees raise a few points of concern which are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of amenity for neighbours and impact on the environment, if housing was developed on the site, providing it was of low scale and density, this would be unlikely to impact on amenity of neighbours or impact negatively on the environment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to services, by retaining the existing use, this will help to protect local services.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p>
T/025/005	<p>The Parish Council object to development on the site. Reasons for objection include the view that Carlton Miniott is linear in nature and therefore that any development would not be in keeping. There are concerns that the existing access is too narrow and concern this may impact on safety and amenity. The Parish Council also note that the site is currently an employment site and should be safeguarded for this purpose. Issues of contamination are noted. Also concerns were raised in relation to surface water flooding.</p>	<p>Objections to development on the site are noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on character and form, the initial site assessment notes that existing buildings on the site extend out to the rear.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access and capacity of the local highway, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of the view that employment use should be safeguarded, the Council note that in accordance with planning policy, the site will only be considered suitable for allocation for residential development if it can be robustly demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable or viable for this purpose.</p> <p>Issues of contamination are noted and will need to be considered and factored in by the developer when considering viability of the scheme.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Concern over flooding is also recognised in the initial site assessment. This matter will need to be reviewed further as part of the site assessment process. The developer will be required to demonstrate how this will be managed in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over amenity of neighbours, this will be considered as part of the design of the scheme including identifying an appropriate access. The developer will need to ensure the scheme meets the requirements set out in the policy on amenity within the Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to services, the site is in walking distance of village services, including the train station.</p> <p>In terms of impact on environment, through careful design of the scheme, there is an opportunity to minimise impact.</p>
T/025/006	<p>The Parish Council object to development on the site due to concerns over capacity of the local highway and concerns over the level of proposed development in Carlton Miniott.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>While support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome, the consultees raise a few points of concern which are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p> <p>Matters of amenity are considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>Views on poor connectivity are noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>In terms of concerns over impact on environment, the poor relationship of the site with the main built form of the settlement is noted in the initial site assessment.</p>
T/025/007	<p>The general consensus from individual consultees is that the site is not suitable for development. Concerns have been raised in relation to capacity of the sewage and drainage systems, impact on local facilities such as the school, access issues, road safety, impact on the character and form of the village, loss of wildlife habitats, loss of Grade 2 agricultural land and view that brownfield sites should be prioritised, impact on values of properties overlooking the proposed development site, impact on the B&B business and adverse impact on amenity of existing residents during construction.</p> <p>There is also a view that the area does not need any more housing and that the Sowerby Gateway scheme should be sufficient.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>Highways England state the site is likely to generate around 84 two-way trips, and although these</p>	<p>Objections to development on the site are noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway and road safety, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters. The degree of concern over access within the consultation responses is noted. Further work will need to be undertaken on highways and access.</p> <p>Concerns over impact on character and form of the settlement are noted.</p> <p>In terms of impact on the environment, the developer will need to make provision for open space within the development in line with the requirements set out in Local Plan policy. Through careful design of the scheme, there is an opportunity to minimise impact.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions that brownfield sites should be prioritised, the Council note that it is not always possible to meet all development requirements on brownfield sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on local services such as the school, as part of the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council is working closely with key partners to identify capacity issues and required mitigation. Discussions with key partners such as health and education providers will inform decisions on the suitability of sites. In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on the school, the Council is in dialogue with the Local Education Authority to identify capacity issues and advice from the Education Authority will inform decisions on which sites are most appropriate for allocation.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>are likely to be spread across SRN junctions, it is of interest to Highways England.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water will advise the Council of any capacity issues and any required mitigation. This will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of wildlife habitats, the Council has commissioned local biodiversity screening of sites and this concludes that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment would be required at planning stage.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to services, providing access is resolved, the site is in walking distance of village services, including the train station.</p> <p>Matters of amenity are considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>Impact on property values is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>Loss of private views is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>Highways England advice is noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p>
T/025/008	<p>The general consensus from individual consultees is that the site is not suitable for development. Concerns have been raised in relation to capacity of the sewage and drainage systems, impact on local facilities such as the school, poor access, road safety, loss of Grade 2</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>While support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome, the consultees raise a few points of concern which are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>agricultural land and view that brownfield sites should be prioritised.</p> <p>The need for additional housing in the local area is also questioned.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of suggestions that brownfield sites should be prioritised, the Council note that it is not always possible to meet all development requirements on brownfield sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on local services such as the school, as part of the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council is working closely with key partners to identify capacity issues and required mitigation. Discussions with key partners such as health and education providers will inform decisions on the suitability of sites. In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on the school, the Council is in dialogue with the Local Education Authority to identify capacity issues and advice from the Education Authority will inform decisions on which sites are most appropriate for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water will advise the Council of any capacity issues and any required mitigation. This will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>Matters of amenity are considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>Views on poor connectivity to local services are noted.</p> <p>In terms of impact on environment, the initial site assessment acknowledges that the site is poorly related to the existing built form.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p>
T/025/010	The general consensus from individual consultees is that the site is not suitable for	Objections to development on the site are noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>development. Concerns have been raised about the proximity of the railway line to potential residential development, impact on sewage and drainage infrastructure, surface water flooding issues, impact on local school, access and road safety issues, loss of employment use and whether the site will be viable due to possible contamination issues.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway and road safety, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on the school, the Council is in dialogue with the Local Education Authority to identify capacity issues and advice from the Education Authority will inform decisions on which sites are most appropriate for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water will advise the Council of any capacity issues and any required mitigation. This will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to services, providing access is resolved, the site is in walking distance of village services, including the train station.</p> <p>Matters of amenity are considered at planning application stage. There is an opportunity to minimise impact on amenity of residents through design of the scheme. A landscape buffer could reduce noise from the railway.</p> <p>In terms of impact on the environment, the developer will need to make provision for open space within the development in line with the requirements set out in Local Plan policy. Through careful design of the scheme, there is an opportunity to minimise impact.</p> <p>The initial site assessment identifies surface water flooding susceptibility in the south west part of the site. The developer would be required to demonstrate how any surface water flooding issues would be addressed and managed in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of an employment site, the site can only be considered for allocation if robust marketing can demonstrate that the site is no longer suitable or viable for this purpose.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>The developer would need to factor in possible contamination issues when considering the viability of the site for redevelopment.</p>
T/025/011	<p>The general consensus from individual consultees is that the site is not suitable for development. Concerns have been raised about impact of further development on local facilities such as the school and impact on the highways network. Concerns raised regarding flood risk, conflict with the scrap yard business and loss of an area which is used for recreational purposes. Concerns also raised about the impact development may have on the adjacent scrap yard, as it is a noisy enterprise. Impact on a heritage asset is also raised.</p> <p>The need for additional housing in the local area is also questioned.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Objections to development on the site are noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway and road safety, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on local services such as the school, as part of the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council is working closely with key partners to identify capacity issues and required mitigation. Discussions with key partners such as health and education providers will inform decisions on the suitability of sites. In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on the school, the Council is in dialogue with the Local Education Authority to identify capacity issues and advice from the Education Authority will inform decisions on which sites are most appropriate for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over flood risk, the developer would be required to demonstrate how any surface water flooding issues would be addressed and managed in a sustainable manner as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of a recreational area, the Council note that the area is privately owned and is not a formal recreational area. The developer will need to make provision for open space within the development in line with the requirements set out in Local Plan policy.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over conflict between residential areas and the scrap yard, impact on amenity of residents will need to be considered as part of the design of the scheme and mitigation measures such as landscaping incorporated. The developer will need to ensure the scheme meets the requirements set out in the policy on amenity within the Local Plan.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>In terms of concerns over impact on the environment, there is an opportunity to enhance the area through incorporating landscaping into the design of the scheme.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to services, the site is within walking distance of the school, village services and the town centre.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p> <p>Historic England will advise the Council on issues regarding impact on heritage assets.</p>
T/025/012	<p>The general consensus from individual consultees is that the site is not suitable for development. Concerns have been raised that there is no need for further development in the village, there is concern over access issues, loss of agricultural land, loss of wildlife, impact on sewage and drainage infrastructure, surface water flooding issues. There is concern that the school is at capacity and that there are more suitable brownfield sites. There is concern over the scale of proposed development if brought forward with adjacent sites and that the site is contrary to the linear form of the village. There is also concern that the site lies close to or under the flight path into the operational Topcliffe airfield giving rise to noise/safety concerns.</p>	<p>Objections to development on the site are noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway and road safety, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>Concern over impact on form and character is noted. The Council will need to give further consideration to this, particularly given that access may be dependent on adjacent sites coming forward.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over flood risk, the developer would be required to demonstrate how any surface water flooding issues would be addressed and managed in a sustainable manner as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on the environment, there is an opportunity to enhance the area through incorporating landscaping into the design of the scheme.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access to services, providing access can be resolved, the site is within walking distance of the school, village services and the town centre.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Matters of amenity are considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water will advise the Council of any capacity issues and any required mitigation. This will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional development on the school, the Council is in dialogue with the Local Education Authority to identify capacity issues and advice from the Education Authority will inform decisions on which sites are most appropriate for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of loss of wildlife habitat, the Council has commissioned local biodiversity screening of the site and this will recommend what ecological assessments are required.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p>
T/025/013	<p>Concerns have been raised about the scale of development taking place in the village and the impact this will have on the highways network.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>While support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome, the consultees raise a few points of concern which are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway and road safety, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on environment, the initial site assessment recognises that the site is prominent in views and would impact on form and character of the village.</p> <p>Matters of amenity are considered at planning application stage.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>Views on poor relationship to local services are noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p>
T/025/014	<p>Concerns have been raised about the scale of development taking place in the village and the impact this will have on the highways network.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>While support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome, the consultees raise a few points of concern which are addressed below:</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of the local highway and road safety, the Local Highway Authority advise the Council on such matters.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on environment, the initial site assessment recognises that the site is would impact on form and character of the village.</p> <p>Matters of amenity are considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>Views on poor relationship to local services are noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns which question the need for additional housing, the Council notes that Carlton Miniott is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a service village. The settlement is therefore considered to be a suitable location for development.</p>

Table 6.64 Topcliffe

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/163/001	<p>There is only one consultation response which does not support development on the site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.</p>	<p>Support for conclusions noted.</p>
T/163/002/E	<p>A comment District objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.</p> <p>Historic England note that the site is within 700 metres of a Scheduled Monument. They advise that an assessment of the impact of proposed development on the heritage asset is required and that the outcome of the assessment should inform decisions on the suitability of the site.</p> <p>Highways England state that the proposed site is a relatively large employment development, generating approximately 159 two way trips. As it is immediately adjacent to the A2167-A168 Topcliffe junction on the SRN, it is of concern to Highways England.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Comments of the site promoter of alternative sites are noted. However, as stated in the initial site assessment, the Employment Land Review (2016) identifies the area as being a key employment location and considers that the site has potential for consideration for long term allocation for specific local occupiers or single inward investment.</p> <p>Advice from Historic England is noted.</p> <p>The Council will maintain dialogue with Highways England and their advice will inform further site assessment work.</p>
T/163/003/E	<p>There is only one consultation response which does not support development on the site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.</p>	<p>The consultee supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/163/004/E	There is only one consultation response which does not support development on the site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.	The consultee supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable. Comments noted.

Table 6.65 Bagby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/009/001	<p>The Parish Council supported the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. The concern was that the road is at narrowest point in the village, that the frontage is not wide enough to accommodate splays and that the width of development would be limited.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to issues around additional traffic, loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of comments raised by the site promoter of alternative sites, the Local Highway Authority advises the Council on highway matters and amenity issues are considered at planning application stage. In terms of impact on environment, the initial site assessment considers that the site is not prominent in views. In terms of connectivity, there are footpaths to the village centre. However, sustainability of location will be considered when making decisions on which sites are most suitable for allocation.</p>
T/009/002	<p>The Parish Council supported the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. The concern was that the road is at narrowest point in the village, that the frontage is not wide enough to accommodate splays and that the width of development would be limited.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to concern over loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of comments raised by the site promoter of alternative sites, amenity issues are considered at planning application stage. In terms of impact on environment, the initial site assessment considers that the site does not relate well to the built form. In terms of connectivity, there are footpaths to the village centre. However, sustainability of location will be considered when making decisions on which sites are most suitable for allocation.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/009/003	<p>Contrary to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable, the majority of councillors within the Parish Council were in support of development of the site. This view was also shared by an individual consultee. This was on the basis that the road is wide enough to accommodate a new access safely, that new development will be less visible as the site slopes down from the main road and that redevelopment of the site would have a positive impact on the amenity of local residents.</p> <p>However, there are other councillors within the Parish Council who do not consider the site suitable for development for reasons including impact on form and character of the village, concern over drainage and sewerage capacity in the village, impact on amenity of residents and impact on the listed building.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to concern over loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p>	<p>The points raised by the Parish Council and individual which are in support of development on the site are noted.</p> <p>In terms of access and visibility, the Council would need to seek further advice from the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>The Council notes that there is some opposition to development of the site by some parish councillors and there is also opposition from a site promoter of alternative sites.</p> <p>The Council considers that impact on form and character remains an issue as does the potential impact on amenity of residents.</p> <p>Poor connectivity of site is noted in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>If the site was to be considered further, Yorkshire Water would need to advise the Council on matters relating to sewerage capacity.</p>
T/009/004	<p>Contrary to the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as suitable, there are comments from an individual and from the Parish Council which object to development on the site. There are concerns that the site is of great value to the local community as it is abundant with wildlife. It is noted that the villages has no public transport and only has one local facility. There is concern that development of site would have a negative impact on adjacent properties and negative impact on the form of the</p>	<p>Objections to development on the site are noted.</p> <p>The Council notes that since the submission of the site for assessment for the Local Plan, the eastern part of the site has been granted planning permission for three dwellings, (16/01468/OUT) with provision of access to Bagby Lane.</p> <p>The existing planning permission has identified suitable access, however, the Local Highway Authority will advise as to whether the access is adequate for additional dwellings on this site.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>village. There is also concern about how sewage would be dealt with and there is also concern over the access.</p> <p>A comment objects to development on the site due to concern over loss of amenity to neighbours, poor relationship to local services and adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Issues of amenity will be considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>In terms of concerns relating to access to local services, sustainability of location will be considered when making decisions on which sites are most suitable for allocation.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over local wildlife, the Council has commissioned local biodiversity screening of sites and this recommends that a preliminary ecological assessment will be required at the planning application stage.</p> <p>If the site was to be considered further, Yorkshire Water would need to advise the Council on matters relating to sewerage capacity.</p> <p>There is potential to minimise the Impact on the environment through careful design of any scheme on the site.</p>
T/009/005	The only consultation response is from the Parish Council which supports development on the site.	The initial site assessment recognises the site is suitable for development but as it is within a Key Employment Location concludes that it is not necessary to identify the site for allocation.
T/009/006	<p>The Parish Council supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.

Table 6.66 Borrowoby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/017/001	No responses received to the consultation.	N/A

Table 6.67 Dalton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/037/001	<p>One comment of support has been received.</p> <p>A comment objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.</p>	Comments noted.
T/037/002	<p>A comment objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.</p>	Comment noted.
T/037/003	<p>A comment objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Comments noted.
T/037/004	<p>A comment supports of development on the site on the basis that an access can be achieved and that the site would represent a reasonable extension.</p> <p>A comment objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.</p>	<p>In terms of the individual consultees suggestion that the site is suitable. The Local Highway Authority has advised that there is no access to the public highway. The initial site assessment states that the site does not relate well to the existing settlement form.</p> <p>Objection is noted.</p>
T/037/005	<p>A comment objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.</p>	Comment noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/037/006	A comment objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.	Comment noted.
T/037/007	A comment to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.	Comment noted.
T/037/008	A comment objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.	Comment noted.
T/037/009	A comment objects to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements.	Comment noted.
T/037/010	A comment to development of this site on the basis that the site does not relate well to main residential settlement, proliferates commuting and takes trade from businesses and services in main settlements. Highways England do not identify any concerns.	Comments noted.

Table 6.68 Knayton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	Comments submitted by an individual consultee in support of development in Knayton generally but not in direct relation to any one site.	Noted.
T/088/001 T/088/002 T/088/003 T/088/004 T/088/005	No responses received to consultation.	N/A

Table 6.69 Pickhill

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/118/001	No comments requested as site has planning permission.	N/A
T/118/002	Outline planning permission for 4 dwellings has been granted for this site under reference 16/00808/OUT. No comments have been submitted in relation the site.	N/A
T/118/003	No comments have been submitted in relation to this site.	N/A
T/118/004	No comments submitted in relation to the site. Outline permission has been granted for the construction of 14 dwellings and one replacement dwelling on the site.	N/A

Table 6.70 Sandhutton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/126/001	No comments have been submitted in relation to this site.	N/A
T/126/002	Comments submitted in support of the wider site as it would allow houses to be well spaced out, of a high standard, and may even allow for some "Village Green" style layout, similar to the main village. Sandhutton Parish Council raised concerns that not all of the land is within the ownership of Church Farm. There have been long-standing concerns about the sewage infrastructure where the preferred site is located. There have been concerns, and these remain, on the standards of roads and footpath to the West of Sandhutton. There is concern the proposed development of 10 properties will impact on the environmental quality of the village. There is concern that the development will, if undertaken to the scale proposed, severely encroach on neighbouring properties in regard to privacy regarding line of sight. It is	<p>Yorkshire Water will advise on sewage infrastructure.</p> <p>Highways will advise on highways and access.</p> <p>Comments relating to impact on neighbouring properties and the environmental quality of the village are noted. The initial site assessment identifies only the front section as potentially suitable for development.</p> <p>Any ownership issues will be resolved as part of any further site assessment work.</p> <p>Sandhutton is identified as a secondary village in the council's settlement hierarchy and is therefore</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	noted that the village has very little service infrastructure other than a public house. Also questions have been raised about whether existing dwellings on the site will be demolished.	considered to have some capacity for additional development in the Local Plan period. The Council is undertaking further work to establish what levels of development are appropriate for different locations.
T/126/003	No comments were submitted in relation to this site.	No/A

Table 6.71 Sessay

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/129/001 T/129/002 T/129/003 T/129/004 T/129/005	No specific comments submitted in relation to these sites.	N/A
T/129/006	The site promoter has submitted information in support of the site.	Noted.

Table 6.72 South Kilvington

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/137/001	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.	No ted.
T/137/002	No comments were submitted in relation to this site.	N/A
T/137/003	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.	Noted.
T/137/004	The site promoter has submitted representation in support of the site.	Noted.

Table 6.73 South Otterington

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
T/138/001	Comment submitted in support of site assessment which concludes that the site is outside the village boundaries and it would mean part demolition of an existing dwelling to create an access for 2 additional dwellings also there is a site that is infill within the village.	Noted.
T/138/002	Comment supporting site assessment as this one is located on the edge of the village and there are infill sites available.	Noted.
T/138/003	Comments submitted raised concerns that building on the site would be to the detriment of the area's natural beauty and neighbouring residents personal and financial enjoyment of their properties. Comments that this land is significantly affected by flooding from the Wiske. Access to the site from the highway would cause traffic problems. The site is considered to be a valuable green space and too large compared with scale of the village.	Financial gain or loss of properties is not a material planning consideration. Flood risk is noted within the initial site assessment. Highways would advise on access. Concerns regarding impact on character and form are noted in the initial site assessment.
T/138/004	Concerns raised that the number of proposed houses would result in a concentration of housing that is not in keeping with the existing village and housing distribution and would be to the overall detriment of the community and existing residents. Access off the highway, A167, would cause significant traffic problems and hazard. The access to the site from the A167 is very narrow and bisected by a public right of way and any access road via this route would be unacceptably close to the adjacent properties. There are localised problems with surface water and flooding would be increased by development of this land.	In terms of concerns over additional development in the village, South Otterington is identified in Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. The Council is undertaking further work to determine what level of development is appropriate for different locations. Highways would advise on access and highways issues.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Conversely support for the site on the basis that the site is within the village boundaries and is an infill site, surrounded on all 4 sides by domestic dwellings.</p>	<p>The developer would be required to demonstrate how surface water flooding would be managed in a sustainable manner as part of the planning application process.</p>
T/138/005	<p>Comments submitted on the basis that development of the site would spoil the outlook for many residents and why squash a housing estate into such a small space. The site has access difficulties and is on a greenfield site. It will impact on the amenity for existing properties to other north of the development. Access to the site must be directly from A167 and not via Mayfield or Beechfield. The scale of the possible development is too large for a small village location , with minimal local facilities to support it, no shops and a very infrequent public transport link. Employment opportunities in the locality are also minimal making this a development one of transient residents.</p> <p>Further comment was that the site is appropriate as it is within the village boundaries and is an infill site, surrounded on all 4 sides by domestic dwellings.</p>	<p>Impact on amenity is considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>Highways would advise on access and highway issues.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over additional development in the village, South Otterington is identified in Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village and is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period. The Council is undertaking further work to determine what level of development is appropriate for different locations.</p>



Addressing issues raised

6.65 The initial response to issues raised is included above in the form of an officer response. Additional sites submitted during the Preferred Options consultation will be assessed and the results presented in the Alternative Sites consultation. The issues raised will be considered and addressed in the Publication version of the Local Plan.

7 Alternative Sites and Local Green Space Designation

- 7.1 The consultation on the alternative sites and greenspaces took place from Friday 21 April until 5pm on Friday 2 June 2017.
- 7.2 As part of the Preferred Options consultation, respondents were asked to consider if there were any more appropriate alternative development sites and to provide details where relevant. This resulted in the identification of 83 alternative development sites, including sites with revised boundaries. The Council undertook an initial assessment of the additional sites in accordance with the site assessment methodology. As part of the Preferred Options consultation, respondents also had the opportunity to submit alternative sites proposed for local green space designation. A total of 148 additional greenspaces were identified and these were independently assessed.
- 7.3 The Council published details of the additional development sites and local green space sites and the accompanying site assessments in April 2017 and the documents were subject to a 6 week consultation period. Details of the additional development sites were presented in the Alternative Sites Consultation document. Details of the additional local green spaces were presented separately in the Local Green Space Recommendations Report (August 2016). Respondents had the opportunity to state whether or not they agreed with the conclusion of the site assessment for each of the sites and provide reasons for their response.

Approach to consultation

- 7.4 The consultation documents were available to view at libraries across the district and at the Council's offices in Stokesley, Easingwold and Northallerton. All documents, including evidence documents and maps were available on the Council's website.

The Response

- 7.5 Responses to the Local Green Space Recommendations Report (August 2016) have been considered by the independent consultant preparing the final report. The assessments have been updated as appropriate. The responses to local green space sites proposed as part of the Preferred Options consultation were also taken into account. Details of all local green space sites submitted and assessed through the Preferred Options consultation and the Alternative Sites consultation together with the final recommendations are available in the [Local Green Space Combined Recommendations Report \(2018\)](#).
- 7.6 A summary of the issues raised in comments for sites in the Alternative Development Sites consultation document and officer response is set out in the tables below.

Bedale area

Table 7.1 Bedale (Aiskew / Leeming Bar)

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/B/004/022	<p>One objection to the potential allocation by a local resident who stated the site is too large for a community that is already enlarged and lacks the necessary supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>An objection has also been received by a site promoter of a site elsewhere within Aiskew.</p> <p>A site promoter of adjacent sites ALT/B/004/030 and B/004/007 has commented they support the Council's assessment that the site will allow for the 'rounding-off' of the settlement and enable a more comprehensive development when taken together with other adjacent preferred housing sites.</p> <p>The Local Access Forum has identified this site as a specific example of one whereby travel plans should be used to incorporate enhanced cycle and walking provision.</p>	<p>The Council notes that Bedale (with Aiskew) is identified as a service centre in the Council's settlement hierarchy and is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>The comments made by the Local Access Forum are noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/B/004/023/E	<p>Eight comments were received from local residents in objection to the proposed allocation of this site. This is for a number of reasons including the following;</p> <p>Impact on neighbouring amenity including noise and light pollution, and overbearing and overshadowing of properties including loss of privacy;</p> <p>Brownfield land should be utilised for employment sites;</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land;</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitats;</p> <p>Highways concerns including lack of suitable access;</p> <p>Availability of other employment sites and no requirement for this site;</p> <p>More employment land would dominate the residential areas of Leeming Bar.</p> <p>The Environment Agency states that "The bedrock beneath sites ALT/B/004/031/E, ALT/B/004/033/E and ALT/B/004/023 comprises Sherwood Sandstone which is designated a Principal Aquifer. Principal aquifers provide significant amounts of water for people and can also sustain rivers and wetlands. It is important that groundwater is protected from pollution associated with the proposed employment uses. Development proposals should be supported by an appropriate risk assessment that assesses the potential risk to the quality of the underlying groundwater and groundwater receptors. The implementation of mitigation measures will be required to reduce unacceptable risks to any groundwater</p>	<p>In terms of impact on amenity of neighbouring residents, as noted in the initial site assessment, mitigation of noise and light pollution will need to be factored in to the design and layout of any extended premises through provision of a landscape buffer along the boundary with existing residents.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of agricultural land, whilst it is hoped brownfield sites can and will come forward for delivery, there is less certainty over their availability to do so. As the Plan needs to be deliverable in accordance with the NPPF, it is recognised that greenfield land may need to be utilised to meet the requirements for employment or housing.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on wildlife habitats, biodiversity screening that has been commissioned by the Council concludes that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment and an Ecological Impact Assessment would be required to support an application.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, the Local Highway Authority advises that although the site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway, the site is adjacent to the existing Vale of Mowbray site and therefore would be utilising the existing access onto Leases Lane. They note that access is therefore available through this existing junction onto Leases Lane.</p> <p>In terms of the comment suggesting there are alternative sites, this site has been identified as a preferred site at this stage. The Council will need to</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	to an acceptable level. Reference of this would need to be included in any policy text."	<p>undertake further work to decide which sites are identified as allocations in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the impact of additional employment land in Leeming Bar, the Council notes that as part of the application process, the design of any scheme would need to be carefully considered to minimise the impact on neighbouring residential areas.</p> <p>The Environment Agency comments and advise are noted.</p>
ALT/B/004/024	An objection has also been received.	Noted.
ALT/B/004/025	<p>One comment received from a local resident objecting to the proposal for the following reasons;</p> <p>Visual impact of development and impact on neighbouring properties;</p> <p>Impact on neighbouring amenity from noise, smell and light pollution;</p> <p>Availability of undeveloped plots elsewhere so there is no requirement for this site;</p> <p>Loss of greenfield land.</p>	<p>Planning permission for the construction of five houses was granted on this site on 31st March 2017.</p>
ALT/B/004/030	<p>One comment has been received from a local resident objecting to the potential allocation of the site. They state that there is a lack of supporting infrastructure in this part of Bedale.</p> <p>They also state that if access to the site is from Sandhill/ Back Lane, this would have significant impact on people who use this route for walking, running, cycling and dog walking. They note that there have also been motor accidents along Sandhill/ Back Lane in the past.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over access, in the initial site assessment the Local Highway Authority state that the developer would need to demonstrate that a safe and suitable access can be achieved. They state that works will be required on Back Lane to widen the carriageway. The Local Highway Authority conclude that this site cannot be viewed in isolation and a comprehensive development brief for the area needs to be produced. They state that this will enable cumulative impacts to be considered and for</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>The Local Access Forum also objects to the proposed allocation due to the impact on leisure users, highlighting that this is part of National Cycle Route 71.</p> <p>Another objection has also been received.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>arrangements to secure funding for strategic infrastructure improvements to be developed.</p> <p>In terms of concerns presented by the Local Access Forum, see the Local Highway Authority advice above.</p>
ALT/B/004/031/E	<p>Six comments have been received from local residents objecting to the potential allocation of the site. In summary, these comments include the following:</p> <p>Availability of other land and no need for additional allocations;</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land;</p> <p>Impact on neighbouring amenity including loss of privacy and noise/light pollution;</p> <p>Out of character with nearby residential properties;</p> <p>Loss of walking routes - There are some public footpaths in the proximity of this site. It is likely they could be retained and integrated in to a development or redirected in agreement with the relevant authority.</p> <p>Too much development in Leeming Bar;</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitats;</p> <p>Impact on highway network.</p> <p>Environment Agency - "The bedrock beneath sites ALT/B/004/031/E, ALT/B/004/033/E and ALT/B/004/023 comprises Sherwood Sandstone which is designated a Principal Aquifer. Principal aquifers provide significant amounts of water for people and can</p>	<p>In terms of the comment suggesting there are alternative sites, this site has been identified as a preferred site at this stage. The Council will need to undertake further work to decide which sites are identified as allocations in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of agricultural land, whilst it is hoped brownfield sites can and will come forward for development, there is less certainty over their availability.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on neighbouring residents, the Council notes that a key consideration at application stage will be the design of any scheme. This will include ensuring development does not impact adversely on amenity of neighbouring residents. Design should also minimise impact on surrounding area.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion that there is too much development proposed in Leeming Bar, the Council notes that Leeming Bar is identified as a secondary village and is therefore considered to have some capacity to take additional development in the Local Plan period. Further work is to be</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>also sustain rivers and wetlands. It is important that groundwater is protected from pollution associated with the proposed employment uses. Development proposals should be supported by an appropriate risk assessment that assesses the potential risk to the quality of the underlying groundwater and groundwater receptors. The implementation of mitigation measures will be required to reduce unacceptable risks to any groundwater to an acceptable level. Reference of this would need to be included in any policy text."</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>undertaken by the Council to establish what level of development is appropriate for each settlement.</p> <p>In terms of concern over loss of wildlife habitats, biodiversity screening that has been commissioned by the Council concludes that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment and an Ecological Impact Assessment would be required to support an application.</p> <p>In terms of concern over impact on highway, as stated in the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority noted that a safe and suitable access could be formed on to Low Street. As has been confirmed by Highways England, the cumulative impact of development on Junction 51 of the A1(M) needs to be assessed. This assessment work will inform decisions on suitability of sites.</p> <p>The Environment Agency comment and advise is noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/B/004/033/E	<p>Approximately 50 comments were received from local residents in objection to the proposed allocation of this site. This is for a number of reasons including the following;</p> <p>Availability of other employment sites and no requirement for this site;</p> <p>More employment land would dominate the residential areas of Leeming Bar;</p> <p>Increased traffic and unsuitable access;</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land;</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitats;</p> <p>Loss of views towards Hambleton Hills;</p> <p>Impact on amenity of neighbouring residents including air borne pollutants, light and noise pollution and overbearing, overshadowing and loss of privacy;</p> <p>Drainage and sewerage concerns;</p> <p>Potential hazardous material in close proximity to residential properties;</p> <p>Loss of trees / vegetation;</p> <p>Impact on local businesses such as the nearby caravan park;</p> <p>Impact on historic assets, specifically site close to Deer Street and may be of archaeological interest;</p> <p>Increase in littering as has already been evident from existing employment sites.</p> <p>One comment in support from a resident stating the proposed allocation would be good for the area.</p> <p>Environment Agency - "The bedrock beneath sites ALT/B/004/031/E, ALT/B/004/033/E and ALT/B/004/023 comprises Sherwood Sandstone which is designated a Principal Aquifer. Principal aquifers provide significant</p>	<p>In terms of the comment suggesting there are alternative sites, this site has been identified as a preferred site at this stage. The Council will need to undertake further work to decide which sites are identified as allocations in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on neighbouring residents, the Council notes that a key consideration at application stage will be the design of any scheme. This will include ensuring development does not impact adversely on amenity of neighbouring residents through for example the use of landscaping. Design should also minimise impact on surrounding area.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over traffic and access, the Local Highway Authority will advise the Council on this. Highways England also state that the site would require a full assessment in terms of impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) including A1(M) junction 51. The outcome of additional assessment work will inform decisions on the suitability of sites.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of agricultural land, whilst it is hoped brownfield sites can and will come forward for delivery, there is less certainty over their availability to do so. As the Plan needs to be deliverable in accordance with the NPPF, it is recognised that greenfield land may need to be utilised to meet the requirements for employment or housing.</p> <p>In terms of concern over loss of wildlife habitats, biodiversity screening that has been commissioned by the Council</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>amounts of water for people and can also sustain rivers and wetlands. It is important that groundwater is protected from pollution associated with the proposed employment uses. Development proposals should be supported by an appropriate risk assessment that assesses the potential risk to the quality of the underlying groundwater and groundwater receptors. The implementation of mitigation measures will be required to reduce unacceptable risks to any groundwater to an acceptable level. Reference of this would need to be included in any policy text."</p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council has commented on the proposed allocation stating "In principle we support the recommendation to make this a preferred employment site. This is consistent with the LEPs priority for Successful and Distinctive Places which recognises that in a largely rural geography it will be important to maximise and deliver the limited number of sites where there is strong market demand for new high value business space."</p> <p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust - "ALT/B/004/033/E - The site contains hedgerows, permanent grassland and drains pass through the site these will need to be assessed for their wildlife value. To mitigate for loss of habitat it will be essential to develop good green infrastructure. There will be potential for good green infrastructure to be designed within the site making it more attractive to businesses and enhancing wildlife."</p>	<p>concludes that a Preliminary Ecological Assessment and an Ecological Impact Assessment would be required to support an application.</p> <p>In terms of concern over loss of views to Hambleton Hills, this is noted.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over drainage and sewerage capacity, as noted in the initial site assessment, as the site is over 1 ha, a flood risk assessment would be required even though the site is within Flood Zone 1. Yorkshire Water will advise the Council on sewerage capacity and any necessary works as part of further site assessment work which will be required.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over hazardous materials, industry of this nature would not be considered near residential areas.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of trees and vegetation, there will be opportunity to retain some vegetation as part of the design of the scheme. Vegetation and associated landscaping could assist in screening parts of the development.</p> <p>In terms of impact on nearby caravan park, the Council notes that a key consideration at application stage will be the design of any scheme. This will include ensuring development does not impact adversely on amenity of neighbouring residents through for example the use of landscaping. Parts of the sites' boundary is well-vegetated and the retention of this vegetation could assist in screening of the development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns on historic assets, the archaeologist at North Yorkshire County Council states "this is a very</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>large greenfield site with archaeological potential particularly for later prehistoric and Romano-British settlement. Any development proposal would require an archaeological assessment in line with the advice given in the NPPF (para 128)."</p> <p>In terms of concerns of increased littering, concerns of this nature should be brought to the attention of the relevant authority.</p> <p>The Environment Agency comment and advise is noted.</p> <p>Support from North Yorkshire County Council at this stage in the assessment process is noted.</p> <p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust comments and advice is noted.</p>
ALT/B/011/025	<p>Two comments have been received regarding this site.</p> <p>One comment suggests the assessment is incorrect in that the site does benefit from a good access the full length of the western boundary of the site. The concultee states that the site does have footpath links in to Bedale rather than the poor connectivity previously stated and they state that the field has never flooded.</p> <p>The other comment is in objection to the potential allocation of the site. This is due to the landscape impact on this approach in to Bedale and the capacity of the highway.</p> <p>The site promoter of alternative sites in Bedale supports the recommendation for this site.</p>	<p>In terms of the comment relating to access and footpaths, as noted in the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority state that limited frontage onto Masham Road and proximity of surrounding access points onto Masham Road would prove difficult to enable an access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public highway. Developer to demonstrate that a safe and suitable access point could be achieved.</p> <p>In terms of footpaths, extension of pedestrian links to the settlement from the site would be required as well as extending the existing footway / street lighting to serve the site.</p> <p>In terms of the comment relating to flooding, the initial site assessment is based on surface water flooding data that the Environment Agency shares</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>with the Council. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The comment relating to landscape impact is identified in the initial site assessment.</p>
ALT/B/011/026	<p>One comment was received relating to concerns regarding the allocation of the site, this is due to the potential loss of trees that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The consultee suggests that the loss of these trees would also have knock-on effects in terms of surface water run-off, and the loss of screening which, coupled with the topography of the location, could lead to overlooking in to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The Local Access Forum commented on the site querying whether this site may be better used for recreational space which would better serve the community rather than adding to dense in-fill development.</p> <p>A comment supports the initial recommendation on this site.</p> <p>The site promoter of ALT/B/011/026 has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of the comment relating to trees protected by Tree Preservation Order, the initial site assessment identifies the presence of several groups of trees protected by Tree Preservation Order within the site boundary. The conclusion of the initial site assessment states that these trees would need to be protected.</p> <p>In terms of the Local Access Forum comment, the site has been assessed according to the proposed use set out in the submission to the Council. The land is privately owned and so is not available for recreational use.</p>
ALT/B/011/027	<p>This site is the same site boundary as ALT/B/011/026.</p> <p>See comments for ALT/B/011/026.</p>	See comments for ALT/B/011/026.
ALT/B/011/028	One comment has been received from a local resident objecting to the potential allocation of the site. This is due to the elevated position of the site	In terms of the comment relating to prominence of the site, this issue is identified in the initial site assessment.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>which the consultee suggests makes any development increasingly prominent and also causes overlooking concerns for neighbouring properties. The consultee also has concerns over highways impact due to the site's location near a sharp bend and proximity to school causing safety concerns. There is also concern over loss of wildlife.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of highway concerns, as mentioned in the initial site assessment, the Local Highway Authority has identified an access on to Masham Road but states that the developer would need to demonstrate that a safe and suitable access can be achieved.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over loss of wildlife, biodiversity screening has identified the need for a preliminary ecological assessment at planning application stage.</p>
ALT/B/011/029	<p>One comment has been received from a local resident objecting to the potential allocation of the site. The consultee suggests that the site is a significant area of open countryside and also states that Firby Lane is unable to cope with any additional traffic generated.</p> <p>A comment supports the initial recommendation on this site.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>In terms of the concern over impact on countryside, the issue of the proposed scale of the site and impact on form and character of the landscape is identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over capacity of Firby Road, the Local Highway Authority advises the Council on such matters.</p>

Table 7.2 Thornton Watlass

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/B/160/004	One comment received agrees with the Council's assessment and recommendation on the site.	Noted.



Table 7.3 West Tanfield

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/B/170/013	Comments are in agreement with the Council's recommendation in the initial site assessment.	Noted.

Easingwold area

Table 7.4 Easingwold

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/E/041/046	<p>The majority of consultation responses support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as suitable for development.</p> <p>There is some opposition to development on the site on the basis that the site floods in heavy rainfall which they state is a problem on the adjacent site which has planning permission for 175 dwellings (17/00519/REM).</p> <p>There is also concern that Stillington road is too narrow for both sites to have access on to it, particularly given the existing access to a new housing development on the opposite side of the road. There is a view that a roundabout will not solve the problem. Congestion at the junction of Long street and York road is identified as an issue with the view that the development will add to the problem.</p> <p>There is concern that local infrastructure is over stretched such as water, drainage and gas supplies and that school provision and employment opportunity is limited. The sewerage system is noted as being subject to overflow at times of heavy rainfall.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over flooding of the site, developers will be required to evidence how surface water flooding issues will be addressed and managed as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>In terms of comments suggesting the local infrastructure is over stretched, through the new Local Plan, the capacity of infrastructure will be reviewed and carefully planned for to ensure adequate provision to support allocations for new housing development.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to overflow from sewers and capacity issues in the sewerage network, Yorkshire Water advise that any further development in the market town of Easingwold should not come forward until work has been undertaken to investigate and where necessary provide for additional capacity in the water and wastewater infrastructure serving the town. Any identified improvement works would not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. For any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to access and capacity of the highway, transport modelling work has been commissioned by the Council and</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		<p>this will indicate any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development in this location.</p>
<p>ALT/E/041/047</p>	<p>There is no support for allocation of housing on this site within the consultation responses. This is on the basis that the view is that the site is low lying and regularly floods and there is also the view the site is disconnected from the town centre.</p> <p>Another response presents the view that all the new housing development already permitted in the town combined with development being proposed in the Preferred Options document will add to the problems with flooding, not just rainfall but with sewage. They state that the sewers overflow regularly in times of heavy rainfall.</p> <p>One consultee suggests that with careful design and raising ground/access levels the site would be suitable for a comprehensive medical centre.</p>	<p>In terms of objections based on the site being disconnected from the settlement, the initial site assessment recognises this and states that the site does not relate well to the existing built form or character.</p> <p>Issues of surface water flooding and flooding in general is also covered in the initial site assessment. Updated GIS mapping layers show the majority of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.</p> <p>In terms of reports that sewers overflowing in times of heavy rainfall it is noted that there is already a problem in certain parts of the town, the district council has made Yorkshire Water aware of concerns put forward through the consultation. In terms of Yorkshire Water's comments on proposals for additional housing in the Preferred Options document, Yorkshire Water states that additional housing sites should not come forward until infrastructure requirements have been properly assessed. They state any identified improvement works will not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. They state that for any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/E/041/048	<p>The majority of consultation responses are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment, however, in many of the cases of support, there are requirements that consultee views would expect to be considered or accommodated within the development if it was to become a housing development.</p> <p>One consultee highlights how essential it will be to ensure there is no development within 50 feet of trees with a Tree Preservation Order which are within the site and suggests a lower density may be more appropriate. One view was that the site has good road links and pavements and they suggest existing brownfield sites such as this site should be preferred over greenfield sites.</p> <p>There was a suggestion to include affordable housing while another consultee asked if affordable housing would be required on this site.</p> <p>Another view was that the exit from the site is narrow and the road is restricted by traffic calming measures and that an additional 46 households would impact on the highway and safety of pedestrians. They suggest a proper junction would be necessary. Another view presented was that Oulston Road is already seriously congested and a danger not only for vehicles but to pedestrians in particular at the junction with Uppleby. It is suggested that the roads in this area are not designed or built for this volume of traffic.</p>	<p>In terms of comments relating to Tree Preservation Orders, retention of trees under such protection and provision of buffers will be a requirement of any development permitted on this site.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to type and tenure of new housing, height of buildings and open space within any development, the scheme will be required to deliver in accordance with policies on type and tenure and policies on design as set out in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around access, the Local Highway Authority identifies the existing access on to Copperclay Walk as the access point. In terms of concerns over capacity of the highway, and specifically the junction at Uppleby, the Local Highway Authority will advise on this and the transport modelling work that the Council has commissioned may also assist in determining the suitability of development on this site.</p> <p>In terms of concerns around the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water states that additional housing sites should not come forward through the new Local Plan until infrastructure requirements have been properly assessed. They state any identified improvement works will not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. They state that for any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p>



Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>It is also noted by a consultee that the current three (redundant) hospital buildings on the site are low and with rooflines which are kept long and low. The site is on quite a slope and this keeps the existing buildings low and reasonably out of sight from CopperClay Walk. They suggest that it will be important to maintain a similar low roof level of development in any new development.</p> <p>There is a suggestion that green space and planting is necessary to improve what they consider to be a bland appearance on the south side of CopperClay Walk.</p> <p>There was a question in the consultation responses as to whether there is adequate capacity in the sewerage system, There was also concern about the capacity of services in the town such as schools, doctors and dentists etc. One view was that housing should not be considered for this site, until and unless an alternative site for a new medical centre is determined.</p> <p>Natural England have provided comment in response to the Preferred Options consultation stating that this site lies within 2km of the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the west of Easingwold. Natural England advise that the district council consults the Howardian Hills AONB Team regarding impacts on the special qualities and setting of the AONB and whether Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is necessary in order to rule out such impacts. The AONB Team have responded, stating that they</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of services in the town, through the new Local Plan, the capacity of infrastructure will be reviewed and carefully planned for to ensure adequate provision to support allocations for new housing development.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>have not identified anything that was deemed to be of significance in relation to the impact on the setting of the AONB.</p>	
<p>ALT/E/041/055</p>	<p>A general consensus emerging from consultation responses is that there is not support for development on this site. Reasons given are largely around the proposed scale of development not being appropriate for the settlement and concern over impact on character of the place, including the Conservation Area and prominence of development on approach to the settlement along Raskelf road. There is a view that access onto Thirsk Road would cause traffic chaos at peak times near to the Primary School and there is concern of safety of pedestrians. There is also concern of additional traffic generated by the new development on road junctions in the town.</p> <p>There is particular concern that local infrastructure and services will not be able to support this level of development and there are objections on the basis that there is concern that the sewerage system does not have capacity to deal with the additional dwellings. There is mention of the sewers overflowing into existing properties and roads.</p> <p>One view presented was in relation to the impact new pavements next to the site would have on the hedgerows, suggesting that due to limited space on roadside verges, hedgerows may be at risk.</p> <p>By contrast, there were a couple of consultees that suggested the site has good access onto a main road and is within an area of existing housing.</p>	<p>In terms of concerns relating to scale of development and impact on character and views, these issues are identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of comments relating to access and capacity of the highway, transport modelling work has been commissioned by the Council and this will indicate any issues and inform decisions on suitability of development in this location.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of services in the town, through the new Local Plan, the capacity of infrastructure will be reviewed and carefully planned for to ensure adequate provision to support allocations for new housing development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of the sewerage system, Yorkshire Water states that additional housing sites should not come forward through the new Local Plan until infrastructure requirements have been properly assessed. They state any identified improvement works will not be undertaken by Yorkshire Water until some point after 2020. They state that for any developments coming forward in advance of this work, Yorkshire Water advise that the developer will be required to fund any investigative and actual works.</p> <p>Where there is some support for development on the site on the basis that there is access to a main road, the</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>It was also suggested that a large site of this nature could incorporate green spaces. Another view was that perhaps development of a smaller part of the site would be sensible.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>overriding issue is that the scale of development would have a negative impact on form and character of the settlement.</p> <p>In terms of a suggestion that development on a smaller part of the site may be suitable, refer to the site assessment for E/041/045.</p>

Table 7.5 Husthwaite

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/E/071/003	<p>Within the consultation responses received for this site, there is an overwhelming objection to development of the site and support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable for development.</p> <p>A message coming through the consultation responses is that there is concern that the village infrastructure and services cannot support additional housing with specific reference to impact on sewers.</p> <p>There are also strong views that additional traffic on to the Nookin would result in congestion on the road and could be hazardous and there is concern that there is not sufficient capacity in the highways infrastructure in the village and surrounding access roads. Access is specifically noted as a problem with reference to proximity to a 3-way road junction, narrow highway which is on a bend and limited visibility. The issue of roads in the</p>	<p>In terms of concerns over the capacity of infrastructure and services, Husthwaite is identified as a service village in the Council's settlement hierarchy and it is therefore considered that the village can sustain some growth. However, the village already has an allocation with outline planning permission for 20 dwellings. In terms of concerns over impact on sewers, Yorkshire Water have not flagged up any notable issues at this stage.</p> <p>In terms of highway concerns, the Local Highway Authority has not objected to the proposal at this stage but set out requirements that a developer would be required to address if the site was allocated.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on character of the village, these issues are picked up in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>In terms of concerns of flooding, Hambleton District Council Drainage Engineer has been made aware of these concerns and states that the developer</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>village being of disrepair and narrow with existing parking problems is raised.</p> <p>Another key message from consultation responses is that there is concern that development of the site and at this scale would have a negative impact on the character of the village and conservation area, particularly given that part of the site is in the conservation area. Impact on listed buildings is also identified as an issue.</p> <p>It is noted in most responses that the site is very waterlogged in places from the springs on Beacon Bank and that additional housing could cause flooding to existing properties. The issue of water running on to the roads and freezing in winter is noted within responses and it is noted that this is a hazard for vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>Reduction in property values of adjacent housing as a result of the development is identified as an issue by an individual.</p> <p>There is a concern that the site may not deliver affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>Loss of green space is identified as an issue which is deemed to be key to the character of the village and of amenity use for village residents such as walking and there is concern that the development would affect the rural character of the public right of way on the southern edge of the site.</p> <p>There is concern over impact on bats in the outbuildings on the site.</p>	<p>will have to manage the surface water from the new development and the existing surface water on-site, this will include ensuring it does not flood elsewhere (including existing development or the public highway).</p> <p>In terms of concerns over property value, loss of property value is not something that is taken into account when identifying sites for allocation or when determining planning applications.</p> <p>In terms of concerns regarding provision of affordable housing, any new developments will be required to deliver schemes which meet the policy requirements for house type, mix and tenure as set out in the Local Plan.</p> <p>In terms of loss of green space as a result of any development on this site, this is identified as resulting in a negative impact on the character of the village and conservation area in the initial site assessment. It should be noted there will be policies within the new Local Plan which aim to ensure that both the route and amenity value of existing public rights of way are protected and that opportunities for enhancement to the network are sought when considering proposals for new development.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over impact on bats, it should be noted that bat survey reports and mitigation plans are required for any development projects that could affect protected species, as part of getting planning permission.</p> <p>In terms of concerns of overlooking, it should be noted that there will be planning policies in place in the new Local Plan which are there to ensure that</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>There is concern that due to part of the site being on higher ground there will be an issue of overlooking to existing properties and gardens.</p> <p>There is concern over noise and disruption caused by the construction phase.</p> <p>It was noted in a couple of consultation responses that the site boundary on the western part of the site as depicted in the Preferred Options document was inaccurate.</p> <p>An individual suggests that development on land to the east of this site (off Prospects Cottages) which is an existing allocation in the Local Development Framework (LDF) should be explored first. However, they believe there has been no developer interest.</p> <p>Natural England has further commented through the consultation stating that it is noted that ALT/E/071/003 lies within 150m of the Howardian Hills AONB. Natural England advise that the council consults the Howardian Hills AONB Team regarding impacts on the special qualities and setting of the AONB and whether landscape and visual impact assessment is necessary in order to rule out such impacts.</p> <p>An individual is critical of the way in which the consultation on sites has been publicised, stating that all residents in the village should have been consulted.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>developments do not unacceptably affect the amenity of residents or occupants. This also addressed through policies on design.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the construction phase, it is noted that conditions would be attached to any planning permission which developers must adhere to, in the interests of highway safety and the general amenity of the area.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over the site boundary, this is acknowledged and the site boundary has been amended and corrected.</p> <p>In terms of comments around developing the land to the east of the site first, the Council can confirm that there is an existing allocation (EH5) which has outline planning permission for 20 dwellings (ref: 14/02294/OUT). The permission was granted in October 2015. The district council understands the site is being marketed in Autumn 2017. This site was identified as coming forward for delivery in the second phase of the LDF (2016-2021).</p> <p>In terms of Natural England's comments, the Council has contacted the AONB Team who have subsequently advised that as the AONB is 'over the brow of the hill' when viewed from within Husthwaite, and as this site is within the built-up area of the village, there would not be any impact on the setting of the AONB.</p> <p>In terms of criticism of the consultation, the consultation on sites was published on the Council's website and local newspapers. Parish Councils were informed of the consultation and all those</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
		registered on the Local Plan consultation database were notified by letter or email.

Table 7.6 Linton on Ouse

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/E/093/003	Over and above Highways England which do not identify any issues, there is only one consultation response to ALT/E/093/003 which supports the conclusions of the initial site assessment. The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.

Table 7.7 Raskelf

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/E/122/003	There is a consultation response from Historic England which does not identify any issues. The site promoter has submitted this site as part of the Preferred Options consultation as an alternative to other sites in Raskelf.	Noted.

Table 7.8 Shipton by Beningbrough

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/E/131/018	The site promoter has made representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
ALT/E/131/019	A comment supports the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable.	Noted.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/E/131/020	No consultation comments have been submitted for this site.	N/A

Table 7.9 Tollerton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/E/162/013	<p>There is a response from the Parish Council which objects to further housing development in the village.</p> <p>Highways England do not identify any issues.</p> <p>There are four further consultee responses from individuals which identify concerns over access on to Alne road and issues around lack of pavements to the bus stop. There is also concern that services and infrastructure in the village is already over stretched and that additional housing is not needed. Concern over impact of additional traffic on the lanes within the village such as Back Lane for pedestrians is also noted.</p>	<p>In terms of comments on impact of additional development on services and infrastructure, Tollerton is identified within the Council's settlement hierarchy as a secondary village which is therefore deemed as having some capacity to take additional development over the Local Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of concerns over access, the Council is advised by the Local Highway Authority on suitability of access and capacity of the local road network. This will inform decisions as to whether a site is deemed suitable for development.</p>

Northallerton area

Table 7.10 Northallerton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/N/110/043	<p>There is one response from an individual in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which recommends the rolling forward of the existing LDF allocation for recreation and community uses.</p> <p>Historic England support the intention to continue the existing LDF Policy of identifying this area as a Town Park. They state that this area includes part of a Scheduled Monument (a motte and bailey castle and Bishop's Palace) and state that the use of this area as open space will help to safeguard its setting.</p>	Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.

Table 7.11 Romanby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/N/123/017	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p> <p>One other comment in relation to this site which asks whether any survey has been done to establish whether the site has any biodiversity value.</p>	As part of further site assessment work, the Council is commissioning local biodiversity screening of sites.
ALT/N/123/030	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p> <p>Highways England advise that there would be potential need for individual assessment of the impact of this proposed development on the strategic highway network. Could have cumulative impacts on A1(M) junction 51 and A19 at Ellerbeck and Jeater Houses.</p>	The Council will liaise further with Highways England in respect of any further assessment work that is required.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/N/123/031	<p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p> <p>Highways England state that small sites would not be an issue from the perspective of Highways England in isolation, though they would need to be considered in terms of the cumulative impact of development traffic with other site allocations. Potential cumulative impacts at the A1(M) Junction 51 at Leeming Bar and A19 junctions at Ellerbeck and Jeater Houses.</p>	The Council will liaise further with Highways England in respect of any further assessment work that is required.

Table 7.12 Brompton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/N/020/005	No comments received through the consultation for this site.	N/A
ALT/N/020/006	No comments received through the consultation for this site.	N/A
ALT/N/020/007	<p>One comment received from an individual stating that the site has poor connectivity to local cycling routes and that the traffic speed is such that cycling could be hazardous.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>As noted in the initial site assessment, the site boundary as submitted does not identify access to the public highway.</p> <p>The issue of there being no cycle route in proximity to the site is noted in the initial site assessment.</p>

Table 7.13 East Cowton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/N/042/009	East Cowton Parish Council agree with the assessment and recommendation for this site. One additional respondent also agreed with the recommendation and stated there is poor public footpath connectivity to the site.	Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment from the Parish Council and additional consultee is welcome.

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Representation made by the site promoter is noted.
ALT/N/042/010	<p>East Cowton Parish Council have commented to state they agree with the Council's assessment and recommendation of this site whilst confirming the site has previously been approved for development a number of years ago.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment from the Parish Council is welcome. However, Council records do not show existing planning permission on this site.

Table 7.14 Great Smeaton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/N/061/001	<p>One comment received relating to the accessibility of the site.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	Noted.

Stokesley area

Table 7.15 Stokesley

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/S/142/031	<p>The site promoter of an alternative site has submitted representation which opposes development on this site.</p> <p>Highways England refer to sites in Stokesley, Great Broughton & Great Ayton and state that individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p>	Noted

Table 7.16 Great Ayton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/S/058/016	<p>Most respondents disagreed with the conclusion of the initial site assessment, identifying a range of issues:</p> <p>Unacceptable impact on the conservation area, listed buildings and their settings and the historic environment;</p> <p>concerns about the safety of the proposed pedestrian access;</p> <p>unsatisfactory road access and impact on traffic and road safety;</p> <p>sewerage capacity and surface water/ drainage problems;</p> <p>access to services;</p> <p>impact on residents in the area;</p> <p>other proposed sites being preferable;</p> <p>impact on visual and landscape setting;</p> <p>impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>Natural England advise consulting the North York Moors National Park Authority with regards to the impact of sites in and around Great Ayton on the national park.</p> <p>Historic England advise that a heritage impact assessment is necessary.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>Natural England comments noted. The Council has consulted with the North York Moors National Park Authority.</p> <p>Historic England advice is noted. The Council is commissioning a heritage impact assessment of sites.</p> <p>Highways England comments are noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>Highways England state that in terms of sites in Stokesley, Great Broughton & Great Ayton, individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p>	
ALT/S/058/017	<p>Most respondents support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable, this includes a response from the Parish Council.</p> <p>Three respondents do not agree with the site assessment and suggest the site is not suitable for development. One respondent states there is too much development on Newton road. They state that the traffic is already too high and on street parking causes blockages. They note that the current foul drainage system is already inadequate and it will not cope with additional input. Another respondent objects due to road issues. The other respondent believes that the issues identified in the conclusion of the initial site assessment should have led to a conclusion that the site is unsuitable for development.</p> <p>Historic England state that as the Consultation document notes, this site lies within Cleveland Lodge Park and Gardens - a non-designated heritage asset which forms part of the setting of the Grade II Listed Cleveland Lodge. Historic England state that there needs to be an assessment of what contribution this currently-undeveloped area makes to the setting of this Listed Building and what effect the loss of this site and its subsequent development might have upon it. This assessment should inform decisions on the suitability of the site.</p> <p>Natural England notes that these sites lie between 600m and 1.4km from the North York Moors National Park. They advise that the Council consults the North York Moors National Park Authority regarding impacts on the special qualities</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified part of the site as suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The objections to further development on the site are noted. However, the conclusion of the initial site assessment does state that part of the site is allocated (2010) for sheltered housing and high quality design and landscaping are identified as requirements within the existing allocation. It notes that any further development of the site would require careful consideration of the landscape setting, siting, scale and massing of development and the use of materials.</p> <p>Historic England advice is noted. The Council is commissioning a heritage impact assessment of sites.</p> <p>Natural England comments noted. The Council has consulted with the North York Moors National Park Authority.</p> <p>Highways England comments are noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>and setting of the National Park and whether Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is necessary in order to rule out such impacts.</p> <p>Highways England state that in terms of sites in Stokesley, Great Broughton & Great Ayton, individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	
ALT/S/058/018	<p>Two respondents suggest that development of the site would be possible, suggesting it makes sense to develop the site if the adjacent site is preferred.</p> <p>The remaining respondents support the conclusion of the initial site assessment, this includes the response from the Parish Council.</p> <p>Natural England notes that these sites lie between 600m and 1.4km from the North York Moors National Park. They advise that the Council consults the North York Moors National Park National Park Authority regarding impacts on the special qualities and setting of the National Park and whether Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is necessary in order to rule out such impacts.</p> <p>Highways England state that in terms of sites in Stokesley, Great Broughton & Great Ayton, individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>Reasons as to why the site is unsuitable for development as proposed are identified in the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Natural England comments noted. The Council has consulted with the North York Moors National Park Authority.</p> <p>Highways England comments are noted.</p>
ALT/S/058/019	<p>Two respondents do not agree with the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable. One of the respondents suggests that a small development on this site including the conversion of existing outbuildings</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>would be acceptable. They note that if homes for elderly or disabled could be considered for this site then it may improve the independence for some as it is within easy reach of all the village has to offer. They note that the farm shop has now closed. The other respondent states that the site is already developed in part. They note that now that the farm is unoccupied and the farm shop business is no longer operating the site is not used. They suggest that suitable, limited, development for housing is now a good option for the site. They note that if not developed, the farm buildings will fall into disrepair and become an eyesore.</p> <p>The remaining respondents support the conclusion of the initial site assessment, this includes the response from the Parish Council.</p> <p>Natural England notes that these sites lie between 600m and 1.4km from the North York Moors National Park. They advise that the Council consults the North York Moors National Park National Park Authority regarding impacts on the special qualities and setting of the National Park and whether Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is necessary in order to rule out such impacts.</p> <p>Highways England state that in terms of sites in Stokesley, Great Broughton & Great Ayton, individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>Suggestions of small scale development and / or conversion are noted and already identified in the conclusion of the initial site assessment.</p> <p>Natural England comments noted. The Council has consulted with the North York Moors National Park Authority.</p> <p>Highways England comments are noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/S/058/038	<p>Most respondents support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable. 2 respondents believe the site would be suitable on the basis that it provides better access to Middlesbrough and avoids taking traffic through the village.</p> <p>Natural England notes that these sites lie between 600m and 1.4km from the North York Moors National Park. They advise that the Council consults the North York Moors National Park Authority regarding impacts on the special qualities and setting of the National Park and whether Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is necessary in order to rule out such impacts.</p> <p>Highways England state that in terms of sites in Stokesley, Great Broughton & Great Ayton, individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional information in support of the site.</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>The comments relating to access and location are noted.</p> <p>Natural England comments are noted. The Council has consulted with the North York Moors National Park Authority.</p> <p>Highways England comments are noted.</p>

Table 7.17 Great Broughton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/S/057/015	<p>Three comments support the conclusions of the site which identified the site as not suitable and one neutral from Highways England.</p> <p>There was concern that the site is outside development limits.</p> <p>There was concern that development would not relate well to the existing form of the settlement. It is noted that whilst the site is used for caravans, these are small and limited height. They note that development is located to the rear of a pub and pub car</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as not suitable is welcome.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits. the Council should consider sites outside development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>Amenity issues would be addressed at planning application stage.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>park which has the potential to cause disturbance to residents.</p> <p>Highways England state that individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p> <p>There is concern that there is not sufficient access to the site.</p>	<p>The Council notes the advice of Highways England.</p>
ALT/S/057/016	<p>One comment supports of the findings of the assessment from the Parish Council.</p> <p>There is concern that the site is outside development limits.</p> <p>Highways England: Individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits. the Council should consider sites outside development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>The Council notes the advice of Highways England.</p>
ALT/S/057/023	<p>Two respondents agreed with the preferred options assessment not to identify the site as a preferred site.</p> <p>The parish council stated a further objection that the site was outside the settlements development limits.</p> <p>Highways England indicated that Individually these sites are of little concern to Highways England, though cumulatively their impacts should be assessed on the A174 junctions with Stokesley Road and the A171.</p>	<p>General support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding development limits. the Council should consider sites outside development limits, where this is necessary to meet development requirements.</p> <p>The Council notes the advice of Highways England.</p>

Table 7.18 Ingleby Arncliffe

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/S/075/001	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Group have made a number of comments covering the following aspects. The view given is:</p> <p>That there is no impact on National Park;</p> <p>That access is not an issue;</p> <p>That footpath connections are not an issue;</p> <p>The site would form a natural extension to the settlement;</p> <p>That development limits are restricting new development opportunities;</p> <p>That the field has never been flooded.</p> <p>Highways England have indicated that an impact assessment would be required at A19 to the North and South as the site (s) are in close proximity to the strategic road network. Cumulative assessment would be required in terms of the impact on the A19</p>	<p>The North York Moors National Park Authority advise the Council on potential impacts on the National Park</p> <p>Highways advise the Council on access and highways issues.</p> <p>As stated in the initial site assessment, the site is disconnected from the main settlement.</p> <p>Development opportunities are dependent on land owners putting land forward for assessment as part of the new Local Plan process.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, the Council initial site assessment is informed by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Highways England advice is noted.</p>
ALT/S/075/002	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Group have made a number of comments covering the following aspects. The view given is:</p> <p>That the Public Right of Way does not run through the site.</p> <p>That views from the highway are not relevant to the site assessment.</p> <p>That a smaller section of the site would be appropriate.</p> <p>That development limits are restricting new development opportunities.</p> <p>Natural England advise that a Habitats Regulation Assessment is required.</p> <p>Highways England have indicated that the site(s) are located in close proximity to the Strategic Road Network. Cumulative</p>	<p>GIS data shows that a public right of way does run through part of the site. A bridleway runs to the south west of the site.</p> <p>Assessment of whether the site is prominent in views towards the settlement is part of the assessment criteria.</p> <p>The view that a small section of the site would be appropriate is noted.</p> <p>Development opportunities are dependent on land owners putting land forward for assessment as part of the new Local Plan process.</p> <p>Natural England advise is noted.</p> <p>Highways England advice is noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	assessment would be required in terms of the impact on the A19 junctions to the north and south of Ingleby Arncliffe.	
ALT/S/075/003	Site reference not allocated to a site.	N/A
ALT/S/075/004	<p>The neighbourhood plan group have indicated support for development at this location.</p> <p>Natural England advise that a Habitats Regulation Assessment is required.</p> <p>Highways England have indicated that an impact assessment would be required at A19 to the North and South, the site (s) are in close proximity to the strategic road network. Cumulative assessment would be required in terms of the impact on the A19.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Natural England advice is noted.</p> <p>Highways England advice is noted.</p>

Table 7.19 Hutton Rudby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/S/073/013	<p>9 individual comments in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as not suitable.</p> <p>Three comments suggest development of this brownfield site would be suitable for a small scale development and that brownfield should be considered before greenfield sites.</p>	<p>General support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.</p> <p>In terms of suggestions the site could be suitable, this is noted. Conversion could be considered through a planning application. However, the site is not deemed suitable for allocation in the new Local Plan.</p>

Thirsk area

Table 7.20 Thirsk and Sowerby

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/T/152/013	<p>The responses received are in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable. A number of responses were received to the consultation highlighting concerns over flooding and poor highways access. Photographic evidence has been submitted to show recent flooding of the gardens of existing properties.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>Please note, this site was initially submitted and assessed as site T/152/013 and consulted on at Preferred Options stage. Following clarification of land ownership and receipt of a revised site boundary, site reference ALT/T/152/013 was allocated and the site was reassessed and consulted on as part of the Alternative Sites consultation.</p>
ALT/T/152/019	<p>The Parish Council support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies part of the site as suitable for development. Concerns have been raised by an individual consultee that access to the site would be via Stoneybrough Lane.</p> <p>The site promoter of an alternative site in Thirsk objects to development on site ALT/T/152/019.</p> <p>Other consultees provide advice as below:</p> <p>Historic England state that the loss of this open area and its subsequent development could harm the setting of the Grade II Listed Pasture Farmhouse which is situated 180 metres to the north of this site. They state that an impact assessment is required to ascertain the impact of development on the setting of the listed building. The outcome of the assessment will need to inform decisions on the suitability of the site.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust notes the importance of retaining natural features such as hedgerows and other vegetation.</p>	<p>Historic England's advice is noted.</p> <p>The advice of the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is noted. The Council also note that biodiversity screening of the site has been commissioned by the Council. This identifies that Ecological Impact Assessment and Preliminary Ecological Assessment required at planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council will maintain dialogue with Highways England with regards to assessment work required.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	Highways England note that an assessment will be required with regards to the cumulative impact on the A168 / A170 / A19 junction and the A19 / A168 / A61 junction.	
ALT/T/152/020	<p>The Parish Council support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identified the site as unsuitable for development.</p> <p>Highways England note that an assessment will be required with regards to the cumulative impact on the A168 / A170 / A19 junction.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.</p> <p>Highways England comments are noted.</p>
ALT/T/139/018	<p>The Parish Council support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>Highways England state that new access would be required directly from A168 / A170 / A19 junction. A full assessment of the impact on the junction would be required as well as satisfying Highways England that the new access does not present any safety issues. Highways England state their preference is for access from the local road network.</p>	<p>Support from the Parish Council for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.</p> <p>Highways England advice is noted.</p>
ALT/T/139/019/E	<p>The Parish Council support the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>Highways England state that new access would be required directly from A168 / A170 / A19 junction. A full assessment of the impact on the junction would be required as well as satisfying Highways England that the new access does not present any safety issues. Highways England state their preference is for access from the local road network.</p>	<p>Support from the Parish Council for the conclusion of the initial site assessment is welcome.</p> <p>Highways England advice is noted.</p>
ALT/T/139/020	<p>The site promoter of an alternative site in Sowerby is objecting to development on the site.</p> <p>Historic England note that the site adjoins the boundary of the Thirsk and Sowerby Conservation Area and have advised that an</p>	<p>Advice from Historic England is noted.</p>

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
	<p>assessment of the impact of any development on the Conservation Area is required. The outcome of the assessment should inform decisions on the suitability of the site.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	
ALT/T/139/021	<p>There are only two consultation responses.</p> <p>Highways England advice that impact assessment would be required for A19 / Topcliffe Road junction and A168 / A170 / A19 junction.</p> <p>The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.</p>	<p>Site currently has planning permission for B1, B2 and B8 uses, forming part of the Sowerby Gateway scheme.</p> <p>Highways England advice is noted.</p>
ALT/T/139/025	<p>An individual consultee has provided a response in support of the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable.</p> <p>The site promoter of an alternative site in Sowerby is objecting to development on the site. They also support conclusions of the initial site assessment.</p>	<p>Support for the conclusion of the initial site assessment which identifies the site as unsuitable is welcome.</p>

Table 7.21 Carlton Miniott

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/T/025/015	<p>Concerns have been raised about surface water flooding issues.</p>	<p>In the initial site assessment, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment states the site is entirely within Flood Zone 1, with minimal or no risk from surface water flooding.</p> <p>However, the site is identified as unsuitable in the initial site assessment for other reasons.</p>

Table 7.22 Dalton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/T/037/011	The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
ALT/T/037/012	The site promoter has submitted additional representation in support of the site as part of the consultation.	Noted.
ALT/T/037/013	Highways England do not identify any concerns.	Noted.
ALT/T/037/014	Highways England do not identify any concerns.	Noted.
ALT/T/037/015	Highways England do not identify any concerns.	Noted.

Table 7.23 Sandhutton

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/T/126/004	No comments were submitted in relation to this site.	N/A

Table 7.24 Sessay

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/T/129/007	Historic England comment that the barn and attached horse engine house at the centre of this site are Grade II Listed. The loss of the open areas and the existing farm buildings and their subsequent development could affect elements which contribute to the significance of this building.	Historic England comments noted.



Table 7.25 South Kilvington

Site reference	Summary of comments	HDC officer response
ALT/T/137/005	There is objection on the basis that it would completely change the rural nature of the valley along the cod beck towards Thirsk and would result in merging of the two settlements.	Careful consideration to the access, layout, scale, massing, density and design could mitigate against the impact ensuring that the resultant scheme respects the local form and character.
ALT/T/137/006	Support for the sympathetic development with retention of the old farm buildings to meet local needs.	Noted.
ALT/T/137/007	Comment supporting that the site is not allocated.	Noted.



Addressing issues raised

- 7.7** The initial response to issues raised in response to the consultation on alternative sites is included above in the form of an officer response. The issues raised will be considered and the sites that are selected for allocation included in the Publication version of the Local Plan.

8 Publication of the Local Plan

Introduction

- 8.1 Following completion of the public participation stages, the Council has prepared the plan for formal publication under Regulation 19. At this stage the plan is considered ready for examination.
- 8.2 Once published there is a period for people to comment on the plan. Comments can only be made in relation to issues of soundness and legal compliance and are known as 'representations'. The period for representations must be at least six weeks, but can be longer. As it is a formal period there can be no extensions of time or exceptions made for any reason. When the plan is published, guidance will be provided to help people make representations that can be accepted.
- 8.3 The draft Final Sustainability Appraisal and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published alongside the Publication Plan for people to comment on.

Soundness

- 8.4 Local plans are 'sound' if they are:
 - **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
 - **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
 - **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
 - **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework.

Legal compliance

- 8.5 Local plans are legally compliant if:
 - they have been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme, in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the Regulations;
 - they have been subject to sustainability appraisal/ strategic environmental assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment;
 - there is evidence demonstrating cooperation with statutory bodies (the Duty to Cooperate) and is accompanied by a Statement of Common Ground; and
 - they have been produced in accordance with all other applicable laws and statutory requirements.

Submission

- 8.6** Following consideration of all representations received the Council can propose limited amendments, known as minor modifications to the published document. The Council will then formally submit the document (under Regulation 22) to the Secretary of State and the Planning Inspectorate for examination.
- 8.7** The Local Plan will be accompanied by a schedule of any changes proposed, the representations received at Publication Stage and a summary of the main issues raised, along with the all the supporting evidence documents.
- 8.8** The timetable for hearing sessions and the progress of the examination is determined by the inspector appointed by the Planning Inspectorate.



For further information contact:

Planning Policy
Hambleton District Council, Civic Centre,
Stone Cross, Northallerton DL6 2UU

T: 01609 779977

E: planningpolicy@hambleton.gov.uk

hambleton.gov.uk/localplan



This information is available in alternative formats and languages