

HAMBLETON DISTRICT COUNCIL

Report To: Cabinet
2 December 2014

Subject: SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY AND HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE RURAL AREAS – DRAFT INTERIM POLICY GUIDANCE NOTE

**All Wards outside North York Moors National Park
Portfolio Holder for Environmental and Planning Services: Councillor B Phillips**

1.0 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 An Interim Policy Guidance Note (Appendix 1) has been prepared for consultation purposes to guide the Council in considering planning applications for new housing development in and around smaller settlements of the District's Plan Area.
- 1.2 The need for this note has arisen from Members' and community aspirations for more flexibility with respect to housing development within the smaller settlements. It also responds to the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012, which provides a greater emphasis on social and community aspects of sustainability than had previously been the case within Planning Policy Statements. Some recent appeal decisions have also allowed development outside of defined Development Limits where these have contributed to the vitality of local communities and provided support for local services. Therefore the note brings the Council's approach in line with national policy and makes the Development Management decision making process clearer for applicants.
- 1.3 The note has been informed by a survey of Parish Councils which was undertaken in 2013 and updates the Settlement Hierarchy. A further consultation was undertaken in Summer 2014 to gain the views of Parishes on the future development of their villages and to ensure the 2013 survey data was correct. From this, a revised Settlement Hierarchy to update that within Core Policy CP4 has been produced, see Appendix 1.
- 1.4 It is envisaged that by allowing appropriate development within the smaller settlements and outside of defined Development Limits, adjacent and well related to the built form, that there will be an increase in windfall sites which will help boost housing supply (potentially in the order of nearly 400 more dwellings delivered in the next 5 years (see Appendix 1). As a consequence, more affordable housing will be delivered at the current rates set out within Core Policy CP9 (i.e. 40 or 50%).
- 1.5 This note is to be read in conjunction with the whole Development Framework and does not change adopted policy, rather it interprets this policy in the light of more recent national guidance. It covers the plan period up to 2026. However, it is the intention of the Council to prepare a new Local Plan which will supersede this note and it is therefore seen as an interim measure and will apply over the next few years only.
- 1.6 At a Member's workshop held on 29 October, Members raised issues concerning i) whether to include additional smaller settlements in the list, ii) whether to list examples of the cluster villages or allow flexibility for more widespread clusters and iii) whether to define small scale development by reference to a 5% guide or by criteria for assessing scale. These matters will be referred to in the consultation questionnaire and covering letter accompanying the note as options and views will be sought on them.

1.7 In order to give weight to the document, full consultation with stakeholders is necessary in addition to that recently carried out with Parish Councils. Approval is therefore sought to go out for consultation on this draft note. Responses will be reported back to Members and taken into account in the Council adopting a final Interim Policy Guidance Note.

2.0 LINK TO COUNCIL PRIORITIES:

2.1 The review of the Settlement Hierarchy and the introduction of an Interim Policy Guidance Note for new housing in the rural areas have several links to corporate priorities, for example it would help to meet the housing needs of all sections of local communities, help protect and provide local services and facilities, support sustainable economic growth and development and help to meet housing needs, including affordable housing.

3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT:

3.1 There are no significant risks arising from this report.

4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

4.1 The Policy Guidance will increase planning application submissions and pre-application advice receipts for the Council. Allowing more housing to be built will increase New Homes Bonus and Council Tax payments to the Council, as well as from the forthcoming Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 The Interim Policy cannot be given the same weight in planning decisions as up-to-date and adopted Local Plan policy or national policies but weight can be attached to it provided it is consistent with these.

6.0 EQUALITY/DIVERSITY ISSUES

6.1 There are no Equality/Diversity issues associated with this report.

7.0 RECOMMENDATION:

7.1 That Cabinet approves the Draft Interim Policy Guidance Note on the Settlement Hierarchy and Rural Housing Development for public consultation.

MICK JEWITT

Background papers: Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2007
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2012
Audit of Village Services, September 2014

Author ref: CLB

Contact: Clare-Louise Booth
Planning Policy & Conservation Officer
01609 767045

Draft Interim Policy Guidance Note

Settlement Hierarchy and Housing Development outside of Development Limits

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Interim Policy Guidance Note has arisen from Hambleton Council Members' and community aspirations for more flexibility with respect to development, particularly housing development, within smaller settlements of the District. Core Policy CP4 was written in accordance with national Planning Policy Statements (PPS), which at that time was more restrictive and focused upon sustainable travel than the later National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012), which now offers a more flexible approach with a greater emphasis on the community dimension of sustainable development, supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities.
- 1.2 In Summer 2013 a survey of Parish Councils was undertaken to update the Settlement Hierarchy. This was further informed through consultation in Summer 2014 when Parish Councils/Meetings were asked additional questions relating to the future development of their settlements. This work has contributed to this Interim Policy Guidance Note.
- 1.3 This Note is intended to demonstrate how Hambleton District Council will consider development in and around smaller settlements both within and outside the hierarchy to ensure it is sustainable economically, socially and environmentally, taking account of the greater emphasis on the vitality of rural communities introduced by the NPPF and some recent appeal decisions within the District, which have allowed developments outside of defined Development Limits. It therefore sets out how the Council will assess development proposals in those locations to ensure that its decisions have due regard to the Development Plan and national policy.
- 1.4 The Council has recently agreed to progress work on a new Local Plan for Hambleton. Whilst this is in preparation, the Interim Policy Guidance Note explains the Council's approach to new development outside of the defined Settlement Hierarchy to accord more closely with the NPPF.

2.0 The Local Development Framework (LDF)

- 2.1 Hambleton LDF Core Strategy - Spatial Principle 3 introduces a sustainable hierarchy of settlements with the aim of concentrating development in those settlements with the best range of local services, allowing people to carry out many of their daily tasks without the need for significant travel. The approach taken in the LDF is based on:
 - concentrating development in the Market Towns, which are defined as Service Centres;
 - supporting limited development in Service Villages and Secondary Villages where this supports a local need and contributes to the sustainability of the local community;
 - defining settlements beneath the level of Secondary Village as "Other Locations", being treated in policy terms in the same way as countryside due to their low level

of service provision where no development apart from in exceptional circumstances is acceptable.

- 2.2 Core Policy CP4 'Settlement Hierarchy' names the towns and villages defined in Spatial Principle 3, except for 'Other Areas'. Other Areas are those for which there are currently no defined development limits, consisting of smaller settlements with no or limited services and the open countryside. The policy also states that development or activities of a scale and nature appropriate to secure the sustainability of each settlement, as identified in Spatial Principle 3 and in the Core Strategy policies will be supported within the Development Limits of the settlements in the hierarchy table. The Development Limits in many cases are considered to be tightly defined, offering limited scope for development. Defined Development Limits of all settlements within the LDF Settlement Hierarchy can be found in the Allocations DPD Annex 5: Proposals Map document.

3.0 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012)

- 3.1 The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans and is also an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications. At the heart of this document is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which has three dimensions; economic, social and environmental, and for development to be sustainable it must encompass all three of these factors.
- 3.2 For decision-taking this means approving development proposals which accord with the development plan. However, where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF, or if specific NPPF policies indicate that development should be restricted.
- 3.3 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF states that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. However, local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.

4.0 Core Policy CP4 and NPPF

- 4.1 The NPPF introduces a number of sustainability considerations which impact upon how Core Policy CP4 should be applied. The NPPF requires local authorities to locate housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Core Policy CP4 does not allow for new housing development outside of the Settlement Hierarchy and therefore the approach needs to be adjusted in order to support the sustainability of rural communities. Core Policy CP4 does, however, contain clear exceptions for allowing new homes in the countryside in special circumstances, which remain applicable.
- 4.2 Therefore, this Note sets out the Councils' approach to housing development outside of Development Limits and within the villages which fall outside of the defined Settlement

Hierarchy. This Note also updates the Settlement Hierarchy in the table that accompanies LDF Core Policy CP4, based on the 2014 Audit of Village Services Review (see **Annex A**).

5.0 Development Limits

5.1 The approach to the consideration of development outside Development Limits should depend in the first instance on the nature or number of services within the village where the development is proposed. Service Villages and Secondary Villages are considered 'sustainable settlements'. Other Locations (Other Settlements) may also meet the sustainability requirements as the recent Audit of Village Services shows that some of these have a comparable level of service provision to some existing Secondary Villages. These Other Locations (Other Settlements) currently have no defined Development Limits and therefore development proposals will be assessed using the criteria within section 8 of this Note. The Audit of Village Services 2014 provides an up-to-date assessment of facilities, which will subsequently be kept under review through the Annual Monitoring Report.

5.2 For development outside of Development Limits to be considered sustainable it must relate well to the built form of the settlement. This should generally mean it directly adjoins the Development Limits where these exist or the core built form of settlements without Development Limits. However, it may not necessarily adjoin the Development Limits, especially where they have been very tightly defined and therefore a sensible decision must be taken as to whether the development is appropriate taking into consideration all other Core Strategy and Development Policies, particularly the criteria within Development Policy DP8 such as the scale, form, character and setting of each settlement.

6.0 Identifying Other Settlements

6.1 In line with NPPF paragraph 55, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Core Policy CP4 allows for new development in 'Other Locations' if it meets one of the exceptions criteria. For the purpose of this document such locations are referred to as 'Other Settlements'. This approach was very restrictive and based on the now superseded Planning Policy Statement PPS3 which followed a policy of restraint in a time of a rising property market. Therefore to align Core Policy CP4 more closely with the NPPF, new development will now be permitted in Other Settlements (subject to other elements of this guidance and other LDF policies) where it would support communities economically, socially and environmentally. For the purpose of this guidance, 'Other Settlements' are to be defined as follows:

"Settlements with an identifiable built form and settlement character and which have a recognisable sense of community". A list of those settlements can be found at **Annex A**, which reflects the categorisation of settlements within the former District Wide Local Plan, 1999.

6.2 Development in Other Settlements will only be acceptable if it can be demonstrated by its nature, scale and location to provide significant support to the services of the village or a village nearby. It is likely that such Other Settlements could form a cluster with a Service or Secondary Village.

6.3 Housing elsewhere will not be supported as this would result in isolated dwellings in the countryside, contrary to the NPPF concept of sustainability. This includes very small “settlements” with a dispersed loose knit form and where there are very few residential buildings and a lack of any sense of community, such as a cluster of farmsteads. Only development which meets the exceptions criteria of Core Policy CP4 will be acceptable in such locations.

7.0 Defining Cluster Villages

7.1 NPPF paragraph 55 states that “where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby”. Therefore, the concept of Cluster Villages will be used to identify those circumstances where villages have a long association and are linked economically and socially e.g. through the use of primary schools, shops and community facilities and can work together to promote more sustainable living. Such clusters are likely to normally consist of one principal settlement defined as either a Service Village or Secondary Village within the Settlement Hierarchy. Access to services within these sustainable settlements will determine whether or not a lower order settlement (Other Settlement) can be considered as part of a cluster, allowing development within that Other Settlement to support the services in a village nearby. A list of settlements is included at **Annex A**.

7.2 It is not the purpose of this guidance to provide a definitive list of those villages to be considered as Cluster Villages, this will be developed through application of the policy, however the following should be used to guide decision making.

“Cluster Villages should be comprised of nearby settlements, one of which should normally be a Service or Secondary Village, given the wider level of services available. If Other Settlements are to form a cluster, these must have a good collective level of shared service provision. Settlements should be linked to each other by convenient public transport, walking or cycling, where the combined settlements offer a range of services contributing to a sustainable community. This could include the sharing of facilities such as a school, post office, health facility or village shop. However it is unlikely to constitute a sustainable community if there are very few services or if there are significant distances (over 2km) or barriers between settlements (e.g. rivers with no crossing)”.

7.3 Examples of Cluster Villages include:

- Alne and Alne Station
- Borrowby and Knayton
- Burneston and Carthorpe
- Great Broughton and Kirkby in Cleveland
- Huby and Sutton on the Forest
- Hutton Rudby and Rudby
- Ingleby Arncliffe and Ingleby Cross
- Kirkby Fleetham and Great/Little Fencote

- Leeming and Leeming Bar
- Linton on Ouse and Newton on Ouse
- Morton on Swale and Ainderby Steeple with Thrintoft
- South Otterington and Newby Wiske

7.4 Consideration will be given to settlements on the edge of the Local Planning Authority area and their relationship to settlements in neighbouring Districts and the National Park.

8.0 Criteria for considering developments within the Settlement Hierarchy

8.1 Proposals which provide a natural infill within an existing settlement (e.g. the construction of a building or buildings on a vacant parcel of land located predominantly within the 'built form' of a settlement) that achieves the small scale, logical development of a settlements' form will be considered favourably, provided that there is consistency with other LDF policies.

8.2 In instances where proposed development sites adjoin the built form of a settlement, the level of affordable housing requirement will remain in line with Core Policy CP9. The development will be assessed using the criteria of Development Policy DP8 (see **Annex B**), the criteria of which are addressed below.

8.3 **Scale** - Small scale development adjacent to the main built form of settlements will be supported where it does not exceed an approximate 5% cumulative increase on the number of dwellings built in the settlement overall as at 1 April 2014 (see **Annex C**). The period of growth runs to the end of the Plan Period (2026), however it is envisaged that a new Local Plan will be in place within the next 5 years. Any development resulting in an increase above 5% will need to be supported by clear evidence of how it will enhance the vitality of the local community by addressing impact upon local facilities such as schools, health, meeting spaces, public open space, village shops and pubs.

8.4 In calculating the scale of increase, account should be taken of any deliverable extant planning permissions or housing allocations in the settlement at the time of the application, plus any dwellings which have been completed since 01/04/2014 (Published SHLAA, October 2014). The distribution of such development could be from several individual building plots or a small self-contained site.

8.5 **Form and Character** - Proposals will be assessed for their impact on the form and character of a settlement. Consideration should be given to the built form of a settlement, its historical evolution and its logical future growth and how the proposal relates to this. Where proposals do not adjoin a settlement then wider consideration must be given to the special physical characteristics of the surrounding area as well as the settlement which sets it apart from its surroundings and contributes to its individuality (e.g. architecture, landscaping, setting, natural features, open space, types and styles of housing, number and size of roads and footpaths) and how the proposal addresses this. Small gaps between buildings should be retained where these provide glimpses to open countryside beyond and contribute to the character and appearance of the area.

8.6 **Protection of the Countryside** - Any detrimental impact on the character, appearance and environmental quality of the surrounding area should be avoided and development should

not compromise the open and rural character of the countryside. Environmental quality can be assessed by using a set of characteristics that relate to the natural and built environment (e.g. noise, air quality, landscape, water quality, density, design, diversity and distance to accessible services) and considering the potential effects which such characteristics may have on physical and mental wellbeing.

8.7 **Prevent outward spread** - Proposals which provide a natural infill within a settlement and which achieve the small scale, logical development of its form will be considered favourably, provided that there is consistency with other LDF policies. Similarly, proposals which provide a natural extension to the built form of a settlement and which relate well to the existing form and character of the settlement, the landscape and landform of the surrounding area and can be easily accessed from the settlement should be favourably considered, provided that there is consistency with other LDF policies. Development which results in ribbon development or has an irregular relationship with the built form will not be acceptable.

8.8 **Coalescence** - The coalescence of settlements, where two or more settlements are situated in close proximity of each other, should be avoided to protect their individual character and identity. Proposals should not reduce the level of physical separation between them in order to retain the distinct form and character of those settlements.

9.0 Rural Exception Sites

9.1 Core Policy CP9A allows for the development of small scale sites for 100% affordable housing outside but adjacent to the Development Limits of Service Villages (except Great Ayton as defined in CP9A) and Secondary Villages where there is a locally identified need. This approach is supported by the NPPF.

9.2 By allowing some development outside of the defined Development Limits or in Other Settlements, the delivery of affordable housing is envisaged to increase as a total number of housing growth. Nevertheless, Rural Exception Sites remain an important mechanism in the delivery of affordable housing in Hambleton.

9.3 Rural Exception Sites outside but not adjoining the built form of Service Villages and Secondary Villages will be supported if they:

- relate well to the built up area;
- have regard to natural boundaries such as hedgerows, tree groupings, water courses, topography and ditches;
- are of a small scale appropriate to the settlement's character and form;
- are well connected to the settlement, including a safe and convenient footpath connection or potential for a connection;
- are capable of being accommodated within the capacity of the existing/planned infrastructure network;
- do not lead to inappropriate ribbon development and/or the coalescence of settlements; and
- are of a design and quality equal to market housing to promote community cohesion

- 9.4 In Other Settlements the development of Rural Exception Sites will be supported where, in addition to the above criteria, they:
- have an identifiable built form and a recognisable sense of community identity;
 - meet an established local need that cannot be met within a nearby higher order settlement, in line with CP9A; and
 - relate well to the character of the settlement and to its built form.
- 9.5 The exception site must be the most suitable, available and deliverable. Where more than one site is put forward for development at the same time, consideration should be given to the need for development, the scale and how well the site relates to the built form. Rural Exception Sites will not be included within the 5% growth calculation.
- 9.6 The community should be engaged in the site selection process and their views will be an important consideration by the applicant in determining the preferred site. Further guidance is available in the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), 2015.
- 9.7 There may be some circumstances when the most suitable site may not necessarily be within the settlement with the identified need. This may be the case where there are identifiable clusters of settlements. In these cases development of a site in one village may assist to meet the need established in another village within the cluster.

Service Villages

	LDF	2014 Review
Appleton Wiske		
Borrowby		
Brafferton & Helperby		
Brompton		
Carlton Miniott		
Crakehall		
East Cowton		
Great Ayton		
Great Broughton		
Huby		
Hustwaite		
Hutton Rudby		
Kirkby Fleetham		
Linton-on-Ouse		
Morton-on-Swale		
Shipton		
Snape		
Stillington		
Tollerton		
Topcliffe		
West Tanfield		

Secondary Villages

	LDF	2014 Review
Alne		
Bagby		
Burneston		
Crathorne		
Crayke		
Dalton		
East Harlsey		

KEY:

	Service Village
	Secondary Village

	Other Settlements
	National Park

Great Smeaton		
Ingleby Arncliffe		
Knayton		
Leeming		
Leeming Bar		
Pickhill		
Raskelf		
Sandhutton		
Scruton		
Sessay		
South Kilvington		
South Otterington		
Sutton-on-the-Forest		
Thornton Watlass		
Well		
West Rounton		

Other Settlements



	LDF	2014 Review
Ainderby Quernhow		
Ainderby Steeple		
Aldwark		
Alne Station		
Balk		
Brandsby		
Burrill		
Carlton Husthwaite		
Carthorpe		
Catton		
Clifton on Yore		
Cowesby		
Danby Wiske		
Deighton		
Easby		



KEY:

	Service Village
	Secondary Village

	Other Settlements
	National Park

East Rounton		
Ellerbeck		
Exelby		
Farlington		
Felixkirk		
Firby		
Flawith		
Gatenby		
Great Busby		
Great Fencote		
Great Langton		
Great Thirkleby		
Hackforth		
Holme		
Hornby		
Howe		
Hutton Sessay		
Kepwick		
Kilburn		
Kirby Wiske		
Kirkby-in-Cleveland		
Kirklington		
Langthorne		
Little Fencote		
Little Thirkleby		
Londonderry		
Low Worsall		
Maunby		
Middleton-on-Leven		
Myton-on-Swale		
Nether Silton		
Newby		
Newby Wiske		

KEY:		Service Village
		Secondary Village

	Other Settlements
	National Park

Newton-on-Ouse		
Nosterfield		
Oulston		
Over Dinsdale		
Over Silton		
Picton		
Potto		
Rudby		
Seamer		
Sinderby		
Skewsby		
Skipton-on-Swale		
Stearsby		
Streetlam		
Sutton Howgrave		
Sutton-under-Whitestonecliffe		
Tame Bridge		
Theakston		
Thimbleby		
Thirlby		
Thirn		
Tholthorpe		
Thormanby		
Thornborough		
Thornton-le-Beans		
Thornton-le-Moor		
Thornton-le-Street		
Thrintoft		
Upsall		
Welbury		
Yafforth		
Yearsley		

KEY:

	Service Village
	Secondary Village

	Other Settlements
	National Park

North York Moors National Park

	LDF	2014 Review
Boltby		
Carlton-in-Cleveland		
Coxwold		
Faceby		
Ingleby Greenhow		
Kildale		
Kirby Knowle		
Osmotherley		
Swainby		

KEY:

	Service Village
	Secondary Village

	Other Settlements
	National Park

Settlement Hierarchy 2014

Service Centres	Thirsk (with Sowerby)	Bedale (with Aiskew)	Easingwold	Stokesley
Northallerton (with Romanby)				
Service Villages				
Appleton Wiske Brompton East Cowton Morton on Swale	Borrowby Carlton Miniott Topcliffe	Crakehall Kirkby Fleetham Snape West Tanfield	Brafferton/Helperby Huby Hustwaite Linton on Ouse Shipton Stillington Tollerton	Great Ayton Great Broughton Hutton Rudby
Secondary Villages				
East Harlsey Great Smeaton Scruton West Rounton	Bagby Dalton Knayton Pickhill Sandhutton Sessay South Kilvington South Otterington	Burneston Leeming Leeming Bar Thornton Watlass Well	Alne Crayke Raskelf Sutton on the Forest	Crathorne Ingleby Arncliffe

DP8 Development Limits

DP8 Permission for development will be granted within the settlement Development Limits as defined on the Proposals Map, provided that it is consistent with other LDF policies.

Development Limits are defined for each settlement in the hierarchy identified in Core Policy CP4, in order to achieve the following:

- i. to relate development opportunities to the scale and appropriate distribution of housing (and other developments) proposed to be met by the sustainable hierarchy of settlements during the LDF period;**
- ii. to ensure that new development is sympathetic in scale and location to the form and character of settlements;**
- iii. to protect the countryside;**
- iv. to prevent the outward spread of development from settlements;**
- v. to prevent the coalescence of neighbouring settlements.**

The location of the Development Limit around each settlement will ensure that development within the Limit will:

- a. be a natural infill to or extension of the settlement compatible with its position within the settlement hierarchy (defined in Core Policy CP4), and its size, character, location and setting, or otherwise be an intensification/ redevelopment of an existing use;**
- b. not lead to the coalescence of distinct and separate communities;**
- c. not have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and environmental quality of the adjacent countryside, or otherwise conflict with the environmental policies of the LDF;**
- d. meet the development needs of the area, and can be accommodated within the capacity of existing infrastructure and facilities.**

Justification (DP8)

- 3.8.1 Development Limits are identified for each settlement identified in the hierarchy (Principal Service Centres, Service Centres, Service Villages and Secondary Villages) established by Policy CP4.
- 3.8.2 Policy CP4 identifies the names of settlements in the hierarchy – Policy DP8 establishes the principles that are used in defining the limits to development of each settlement, or effectively its boundary. Within Development Limits, proposals for development will be accepted, provided that they reflect the other Policies of the LDF, particularly concerning the appropriate locations for development, and in terms of design, reflect the requirements concerning amenity (Policies CP1 and DP1), and design (Policies CP17 and DP32).
- 3.8.3 Development Limits have a number of objectives, which are set out fully in the Policy, and which will direct the designation of the boundaries themselves. The approach adopted in the preceding District Wide Local Plan was to identify specific boundaries on the Proposals Map. This approach is retained in the LDF, but the boundaries concerned are being reviewed: the proposed Development Limits will be advanced through revisions to the Proposals Map, and will be published for comment as part of the progression of the Allocations DPD. Until the Allocations DPD is formally adopted, the Development Limits established by Policy L1 in the District Wide Local Plan will continue to apply to those settlements in the hierarchy identified in Policy CP4.
- 3.8.4 In reviewing the boundaries, and taking account of the objectives set out above, the Development Limits will be defined in precise locational terms to guide the appropriate shape and form of each designated settlement, based on the principles set out in the Policy. Should monitoring of the LDF indicate that further review of Development Limits is required, this will be conducted as part of a formal review of the Allocations DPD, based on the purposes and principles set out in Policy DP8.



Implementation (DP8)

- 3.8.5 The main agent for the implementation of this Policy will be the District Council, through its role as Local Planning Authority in bringing forward the definition of the Development Limits through the Allocations DPD, in consultation with local communities and the Parish Councils. In relation to development proposals within the Development Limits it will involve developers (advancing specific development proposals), and the District Council in its role as Local Planning Authority, determining planning applications, in consultation with Town and Parish Councils.

ANNEX C

Settlement	Dwelling Numbers	5% Growth	Allocation		Permissions at 2014-04-01	Actual based on 5% Growth
Ainderby Quernhow	22	1			1	0
Ainderby Steeple	85	4			2	2
Aldwark	61	3				3
Alne	191	10			1	9
Alne Station	48	2				2
Appleton Wiske	190	10				10
Bagby	185	9			3	6
Balk	15	1				1
Borrowby	149	7				7
Brafferton & Helperby	319	16			1	15
Brandsby	37	2			1	1
Brompton	907	45	NH3	20	11	14
Burneston	122	6			7	0
Burrill	28	1				1
Carlton Husthwaite	70	4				4
Carlton Miniott	379	19	TH5	36	40	0
Carthorpe	84	4			1	3
Catton	31	2				2
Clifton on Yore	10	1				1
Cowesby (Part NYMNP)	25	1				1
Crakehall	241	12	BH7	15	1	0
Crathorne	56	3				3
Crayke	125	6			3	3
Dalton	223	11	TH4	30	41	0
Danby Wiske	58	3				3
Deighton	23	1			1	0
Easby	18	1			1	0
East Cowton	230	12	NH4	48	1	0
East Harlsey	95	5				5
East Rounton	17	1				1
Ellerbeck	14	1				1
Exelby	76	4				4
Farlington	33	2				2
Felixkirk	28	1				1
Firby	12	1				1
Flawith	28	1				1
Gatenby	10	1				1
Great Ayton	2168	108	SH4	60	15	33
Great Broughton	388	19	SH3	20	3	0
Great Busby	13	1				1
Great Fencote	31	2				2
Great Langton	43	2			2	0
Great Smeaton	102	5			3	2
Great Thirkleby	36	2				2
Hackforth	61	3			10	0

Settlement	Dwelling Numbers	5% Growth	Allocation		Permissions at 2014-04-01	Actual based on 5% Growth
Holme	19	1				1
Hornby	48	2			2	0
Howe	9	0				0
Huby	398	20			2	18
Husthwaite	155	8	EH5	20	1	0
Hutton Rudby	701	35	SH5	30	9	0
Hutton Sessay	30	2				2
Ingleby Arncliffe	121	6				6
Kepwick (Part NYMNP)	15	1			1	0
Kilburn (Part NYMNP)	86	4				4
Kirby Wiske	33	2				2
Kirkby Fleetham	118	6			3	3
Kirkby-in-Cleveland	89	4				4
Kirklington	84	4				4
Knayton	102	5				5
Langthorne	22	1				1
Leeming	211	11				11
Leeming Bar	365	18	BE1, BH9 & BM4	65		0
Linton-on-Ouse	247	12			20	0
Little Fencote	21	1				1
Little Thirkleby	21	1				1
Londonderry	44	2				2
Low Worsall	83	4			1	3
Maunby	46	2			1	1
Middleton-on-Leven	17	1				1
Morton-on-Swale	242	13	NH5	42	9	0
Myton-on-Swale	49	2				2
Nether Silton (Part NYMNP)	25	1				1
Newby	77	4			1	3
Newby Wiske	62	3				3
Newton-on-Ouse	222	11				11
Nosterfield	48	2				2
Oulston	35	2				2
Over Dinsdale	20	1				1
Over Silton	24	1				1
Pickhill	136	7			3	4
Picton	37	2				2
Potto	77	4				4
Raskelf	159	8			4	4
Rudby	125	6				6
Sandhutton	94	5			1	4
Scruton	154	8			1	7
Seamer	122	6			3	3
Sessay	100	5			1	4
Shipton	255	13	EH4	10	2	1

Settlement	Dwelling Numbers	5% Growth	Allocation		Permissions at 2014-04-01	Actual based on 5% Growth
Sinderby	56	3				3
Skewsby	32	2				2
Skipton-on-Swale	26	1			2	0
Snape	143	7	BH8	20	1	0
South Kilvington	103	5				5
South Otterington	112	6				6
Stearsby	11	1				1
Stillington	334	17	EH6	30	5	0
Streetlam	11	1				1
Sutton Howgrave	30	2			1	1
Sutton-on-the-Forest	215	11			2	9
Sutton-under-Whitstonecliffe	95	5				5
Tame Bridge	61	3				3
Theakston	13	1				1
Thimbleby	15	1				1
Thirlby	43	2				2
Thirn	29	1			1	0
Tholthorpe	87	4				4
Thormanby	41	2				2
Thornborough	48	2				2
Thornton Watlass	82	4				4
Thornton-le-Beans	81	4				4
Thornton-le-Moor	119	6			1	5
Thornton-le-Street	27	1				1
Thrintoft	49	2			1	1
Tollerton	361	18			2	16
Topcliffe	215	11			2	9
Upsall	14	1				1
Welbury	70	4				4
Well	83	4			3	1
West Rounton	52	3			1	2
West Tanfield	130	7	BM3	40		0
Yafforth	52	3			1	2
Yearsley	30	2				2