

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Submission
ALLOCATIONS DPD
SOUNDNESS SELF ASSESSMENT



FEBRUARY 2010

CONTACTS			
		Telephone	Email
Hambleton District Council	Graham Banks	01609 767097	Graham.Banks@hambleton.gov.uk
Programme Officer	Jayne Wall	01609 767090	Jayne.Wall@hambleton.gov.uk
Inspectors	Karen McCabe & Sian Worden		

HAMBLETON LDF ALLOCATIONS DPD

SOUNDNESS SELF ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Statement has been prepared by Hambleton District Council as an objective self-assessment of the soundness of the Hambleton LDF Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), which was submitted to the Secretary of State on 18th December 2009.
- 1.2 The purpose of production of this Statement is to assist the Allocations DPD Public Examination, the hearings for which are expected to commence on 12th May 2010.

The Public Examination into the Allocations DPD

- 1.3 Under the new planning system, the Public Examination of the individual development plan documents that will comprise the Local Development Framework has taken on a wider and significantly different role from the Public Local Inquiry under the previous development plan system. Although objections to the plan document will still be considered, as in the former system (and must be addressed by the Inspector), the primary purpose of the Public Examination is to consider two matters:
1. whether the Plan satisfies the requirements of the Act¹ and the Regulations² relating to the preparation of DPDs in terms of procedure;
 2. whether the Plan is “sound”.
- 1.4 Advice prepared by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS)³ suggests that Local Planning Authorities may find it useful to carry out an objective self-assessment process, to be used as part of their evidence. The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) has published a “Soundness Toolkit”⁴, to assist Authorities in undertaking an appropriate self-assessment of each emerging DPD. This Statement, which relates to the Submission Hambleton Allocations DPD, has been derived from the PAS Soundness Toolkit.

The Hambleton Local Development Framework (LDF)

- 1.5 The LDF for Hambleton as prepared by the Council, comprises a number of documents, including the Allocations DPD. Already produced and adopted,

¹ The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

² The Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 [NCD30] and Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and 2009 [NCD30A & NCD30B]

³ “Local Development Frameworks – Examining Development Plan Documents: Soundness Guidance” – the Planning Inspectorate, August 2008 [NCD33A] – para. 2.7.

⁴ Toolkit available from the PAS website: <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pageId=85629>

following Public Examination, are the *Core Strategy* (adopted on 3rd April 2007), the *Development Policies DPD* (adopted on 26th February 2008). The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted on 24th June 2008; the Sustainable Development SPD on 22nd September 2009 and the Domestic Extensions SPD on 22nd December 2009.

- 1.6 The *Core Strategy* sets out the LDF's long-term spatial vision, and the spatial objectives and strategic policies to deliver that vision. The *Development Policies DPD* provides interpretation, explanation and further detail to the Core Policies, and explains the practical means of implementing those Core Policies.
- 1.7 The *Submission Allocations DPD* identifies the site allocations that will help to deliver the LDF's Core Strategy. The Allocations DPD is concerned with the allocation of specific areas of land, to meet the development requirements of Hambleton for the plan period until 2021 (or longer, to 2026, in the case of housing). Provision is made for *housing*, for uses that generate *employment*, and for *community and other uses* (which include town centre uses, recreation and transport). A number of allocations are also made for *mixed* uses, incorporating more than one of these main categories. Closely related to the allocation of specific areas of land, and thus also covered within the Allocations DPD, is the definition of Development Limits around designated settlements.
- 1.8 All the main components of the LDF, including the Development Policies DPD and the Allocations DPD, must be in conformity with the Core Strategy – which they are intended to supplement and help deliver. The fact that the Core Strategy and the Development Policies DPD have both been found to be sound through Examination has important implications for the assessment of soundness of the Allocations DPD. To the extent that the Allocations DPD helps to deliver the intent of the other two DPDs, there is a sound context for the Allocations DPD in place. The assessment of soundness undertaken here thus very closely relates to the soundness assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy and the Development Policies DPD. An equivalent Soundness Self Assessment Statement was prepared by the Council for the Core Strategy in June 2006 [LCD55], and for the Development Policies DPD in March 2007 [LCD75], both available from the Council's website. This Statement, concerning the Allocations DPD, draws from both the other two Soundness Statements.

The Soundness Self Assessment Statement

- 1.9 **Section 2** of this Statement addresses **LEGAL COMPLIANCE** with the formal procedural requirements. It is organised by the stages of production of the Plan document, identifies the activities that are required by each relevant statutory provision, and states how the preparation of the Hambleton Allocations DPD has complied with these requirements. Cross-references are included to the specific documents relevant as the Submission Allocations DPD was produced [utilising the Core Documents referencing system in

square brackets], including where appropriate specific sections of documents. All these documents are available from the Council, and will be included in the Public Examination library of Core Documents. An Appendix to this Statement lists all the documents referenced here (representing a sub-set of the full Public Examination Core Document list).

- 1.10 One complication needs to be mentioned at this point, concerning legal compliance. During the preparation of the Allocations DPD, the Government issued the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and 2009 (amending the Regulations 2004), which provide certain changes to procedure effectively from September 2008 and April 2009 onwards. The most significant of these Amendment Regulations are those of 2008 and their simple implication (explained in their transition provisions, s. 3, paras. 4 – 7) is that the earlier consultation procedures undertaken by the Council in preparing the Allocations DPD need to be legally compliant with the 2004 Regulations, but the publication and subsequent submission stages need to be legally compliant with the 2008 and 2009 Amendment Regulations. The relevance of the differing Regulations, and the way in which the process of preparing the Allocations DPD has been compliant at each stage with the relevant Regulations, will be explained in Section 2 of this Statement.
- 1.11 **Section 3** of this Statement considers **SOUNDNESS**. It expresses the view of the Council that the Allocations DPD is “sound”, in the terms of the statutory provisions and guidance. In a nutshell, this means, as the PINS guide indicates, “well-founded”. Government Guidance⁵ indicates that soundness should be judged through tests relating to three broad aspects: considering whether the strategy is “justified”, “effective” and “consistent with national guidance”. Section 3 addresses each of these soundness tests in turn, to demonstrate the Council’s view of the soundness of the Allocations DPD.
- 1.12 This Statement is intended to provide a context for the Examination, by bringing together all the relevant components on which legal compliance and soundness should be judged, and effectively providing a comprehensive index to the Council’s evidence. It is likely that this Statement, together with all the evidence cross-referenced within it, will also be supplemented by further evidence Papers. These cannot as yet be determined, because their subject matter will respond to the requirements of the Inspectors, and in particular what matters, issues and questions they establish for investigation at the hearings.

⁵ Planning Policy Statement 12 – Creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning, CLG June 2008, para. 4.52 [NCD14A].

2. LEGAL COMPLIANCE

Stage 1: Inception

Legal Compliance of this stage, undertaken in 2004 – 2005, needs to be judged against the provisions of the Local Development Regulations 2004 [NCD30] (reflecting the transition arrangements set out in the Local Development Amendment Regulations 2008 [NCD30A] (s. 3, paras. 4 – 7)).

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Evidence provided
<p>Was the development plan document identified in the adopted local development scheme and was the timetable for its production recorded?</p>	<p>The Act s.15(2); s.19(1)</p>	<p>Work commenced on the Allocations DPD under the first LDS. The first LDS was approved in November 2004, and came into effect on 15th March 2005 [LCD16]. This first LDS advised that work had formally commenced on the Allocations DPD in September 2004 (with a pre-production stage before this). The first LDS was current at the time of consultation on the Issues & Options documents in November – December 2005. The document was listed as the “Allocations DPD” [LCD16 para. 5.14], and indicated that it would “show all the sites which have been specifically identified for development in order to meet the Council's vision and objectives or strategic policies of the Core Strategy”. In the first LDS, the Allocations DPD was anticipated to be submitted in August 2006.</p> <p>The second LDS (i.e. the first revision) [LCD17] came into effect on 21st April 2006, and the third LDS [LCD84] came into effect on 24th April 2007. This latter LDS was in effect at the time of the Preferred Options consultation: see Stage 3. A further revision (LDS4)[LCD109] came into effect on 6th March 2009, which indicated in para 5.16 that the DPD will show all the sites which have been specifically identified for development in order to meet the vision and objectives, spatial strategy or strategic policies of the Core Strategy. It also referred to setting out policies and proposals for the sites including detailed requirements for their development and how, when and by whom they will be implemented. Slippage in the timescale for preparation of the Allocations DPD occurred between all LDS drafts, with LDS4 indicating May 2009 as the anticipated date of submission. Clearly this has slipped further, with actual submission being in December 2009. This slippage has been a direct result both of the need to give priority to securing adoption of the Core Strategy (and the Development Policies DPD), but also because the volume and complexity of work proved much greater than originally anticipated. This included the volume of potential development sites which came forward for consideration during the consultation process and the need to ensure that the document was legally compliant by undertaking a second Proposed Submission publication stage in October-November 2009.</p>

<p>Was consideration given to how community engagement would be programmed into the preparation of the development plan document?</p>	<p>- The Act s.19(3) - Regulation 25 (2004)</p>	<p>Although the SCI was not adopted during the Issues and Options consultation in September/October 2005 (it was adopted on 28th March 2006 [LCD15]), the approach followed in consultation at each stage of the Allocations DPD followed the intentions of the SCI.</p> <p>The processes of consultation undertaken are described below under each of the main plan stages.</p>
<p>Was consideration given to the appropriate bodies to consult?</p>	<p>Regulation 2 (2004)</p>	<p>The relevant specific and general consultees, as defined in Regulation 2 (2004), were established for consultation, based closely on those consulted for the two previous adopted DPDs. A list of these consultees is provided at Appendix 8 in the Consultation Statement [LCD98A], and they are set out in the Report of Issues & Options Consultation on the Allocations DPD [LCD97], at Appendix 1.</p>
<p>Was baseline information collected and evidence gathered to keep the matters which affect the development of the area under review?</p>	<p>The Act, s.13</p>	<p>The evidence base on which the plan has been prepared is summarised under the “justified” test, research/fact finding section below. This shows that for the LDF as a whole, about 20 research and fact finding studies have been completed.</p>
<p>Was baseline information collected and evidence gathered to set the framework for the sustainability appraisal?</p>	<p>The Act s.19(5)</p>	<p>Scoping Reports for the Sustainability Appraisal were published in March 2005. Separate reports were prepared for each of the Core Strategy, Development Policies and Allocations DPDs: the Scoping Report for the Allocations DPD is referenced [LCD201]. These Reports reviewed existing plans, established an appraisal framework including objectives, characterised Hambleton and established key sustainability issues, and established baseline information on these. The Reports also drew on the work of an earlier Core Strategy Stage 1 Report, March 2004 [LCD9], which also considered emerging issues and options at that stage.</p>
<p>Were the statutory environment consultation bodies consulted for five weeks on the scope and level of detail of the environmental information to be included in the sustainability appraisal report?</p>	<p>Regulations 9 and 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No. 1633</p>	<p>Copies of the SA Scoping Report for the Allocations DPD [LCD201] were sent to the 4 statutory SA/SEA consultees on 11th March 2005, with a request for comments on the proposed scope and level of details of the information to be included in the final report, by 18th April 2005 (ie. just over 5 weeks later) [ASSA9].</p>

Stage 2: Plan preparation – frontloading phase

Legal Compliance of this stage, which relates to the Issues & Options consultation undertaken in November/December 2005, needs to be judged against the provisions of the Local Development Regulations 2004 [NCD30] (reflecting the transition arrangements set out in the Local Development Amendment Regulations 2008 [NCD30A] (s. 3, paras. 4 – 7)).

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Evidence provided
Were the specific consultation bodies that have an interest in the subject of the development plan document notified, and invited to make representations about its contents?	Regulation 25, 2004	<p>The consultation process is summarised in the Report of Issues & Options Consultation on the Allocations DPD [LCD 97]. As para. 2.1 of that Report explains, Appendix 1 (page 46) lists all consultees, which include all the <i>specific</i> consultees defined by Regulation 2(1), 2004 which were considered to have an interest in the subject of the DPD. The Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98] also identifies those consulted on Issues and Options under Regulation 25, 2004. The Consultation Report summarises the comments received. A summary of consultations undertaken at the Issues and Options stage is also presented in the Submission Allocations DPD Annex 2 [LCD199].</p> <p>Copies of the consultation letters concerned are referenced [ASSA10].</p>
Were the general consultation bodies that were considered to have an interest in the subject of the development plan document notified and invited them to make representations about its contents?	Regulation 25, 2004	<p>The consultation process is summarised in the Report of Issues & Options Consultation on the Allocations DPD [LCD97]. As para. 2.1 of that Report explains, Appendix 1 (page 46) lists all consultees, which include all the <i>general</i> consultees defined by Regulation 2(1), 2004 which were considered to have an interest in the subject of the DPD. The Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98A] also identifies those consulted on Issues and Options under Regulation 25, 2004. The Consultation Report summarises the comments received. A summary of consultations undertaken at the Issues and Options stage is also presented in the Submission Allocations DPD Annex 2 [LCD199].</p> <p>Copies of the consultation letters concerned are referenced [ASSA10].</p>
Were representations invited from people resident or carrying out business in your area about the content of the development plan document?	Regulation 25(3), 2008	<p>Although not strictly a requirement on the Issues & Options consultation, which was undertaken under the terms of Regulation 25 (2004) rather than Regulation 25 (2008), the Consultation Statement [LCD98] and the Report of Issues & Options Consultation on the Allocations DPD [LCD97], demonstrate that representations were canvassed widely from all sectors of the community and business about potential sites for development – and summarise the responses received.</p>
Were stakeholders responsible for	Regulation 25,	<p>Although not strictly a requirement on the Issues & Options consultation, which was undertaken under the terms of</p>

delivery of the strategy engaged?	2008	Regulation 25 (2004) rather than Regulation 25 (2008), the Consultation Statement [LCD98] and the Report of Issues & Options Consultation on the Allocations DPD [LCD97], demonstrate that representations were canvassed from the main delivery stakeholders, and confirm that responses were received (Appendix 2 page 49 of LCD97 and Appendix 2 of LCD 98).
Were representations made taken into account?	Regulation 28(1), 2004	<p>The bodies consulted are listed in the Report on Issues and Options Consultation (November - December 2005) [LCD97], Appendix 1, with those replying listed in Appendix 2. A summary of the points raised is given in Section 4 (page 5). The response to the points made, in terms of the way the Allocations DPD Preferred Options documents [LCD95] were developed, is given in Section 5 (page 24).</p> <p>A summary of the consultation process, and comments received, is also given in the Consultation Statement [LCD98] and in the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Annex 2 [LCD96].</p> <p>Since the evolution of the Allocations DPD Preferred Options as a response to the comments received is fundamental to the new “front-loaded” system, the Allocations Preferred Options documents [LCD95] also make reference to the main points raised in consultation on issues and options, within boxes headed “you told us that” set into the text (found at the start of each of the Service Centre and Service Village sections).</p>
Did consultation contribute to the development and Sustainability Appraisal of alternatives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Act s.19(5) - Regulations 12 and 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No. 1633. 	<p>Consultation on issues and options was undertaken based on the Issues and Options documents [LCD50] (a separate document for each of the Market towns and their hinterlands), during November/ December 2005.</p> <p>Readers were asked for views generally “about the suitability or otherwise of the option sites and any other possibilities as well” (para. 1.15). Detailed observations were sought on the information presented about the identified sites, with site specific schedules provided giving site details and comments on suitability, availability and accessibility. The Issues and Options canvassed were considered to relate to the following matters (and on which consequently views were also sought): the distribution of development within the settlement hierarchy, the ways allocations could be developed, the split between brownfield and greenfield sites, the phasing of allocations and the development limits on settlements (para. 1.17).</p> <p>Whilst formally described in the Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98], a more full description of the consultation responses is provided in the separate Report on Issues and Options Consultation (November/December 2005), published in August 2007 [LCD97].</p> <p>A full Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken as part of the production of the Core Strategy. The Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Preferred Options was published for</p>

		<p>consultation in June 2005 [LCD11], in parallel with consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options. That Appraisal took account of consultation responses received on the Sustainability Scoping Reports [LCD47 for the Core Strategy, LCD201 for the Allocations DPD] (March 2005), including amendments to the objectives as a result of stakeholder comments. The Sustainability Appraisal of Preferred Options evaluated the Core Strategy's Preferred Options against the Sustainability Objectives that had been developed, and provided a commentary on the preferred and rejected alternatives, which helped develop the final Core Strategy.</p> <p>A further Sustainability Appraisal report on the emerging Allocations DPD was not prepared at Allocations Issues and Options stage (following shortly after the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation in November 2005) – since the stage was primarily designed to bring forward sites for evaluation, and development of the Allocations approach flowed directly from the Core Strategy itself, and the matters were fully covered in the ongoing Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy. A full Sustainability Appraisal report of the Allocations Preferred Options stage [LCD115] (when work had progressed to comparing and selecting alternatives) was published in October 2007 (see Preferred Options stage, below).</p>
<p>Did the participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - follow the principles set out in your statement of community involvement - integrate involvement with the sustainable community strategy - take place proportionate to the scale of issues involved in the development plan document? 	<p>The Act s.19(3) Regulation 25, 2008</p>	<p>Consultation on issues and options was undertaken based on the Issues and Options documents [LCD50] during November/December 2005.</p> <p>The consultation process is summarised in the Report of Issues & Options Consultation on the Allocations DPD [LCD97], in the Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98], and also in the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Annex 2 [LCD96].</p> <p>The consultation approach adopted followed closely the principles in the process of being established in the Statement of Community Involvement, formally adopted a few months later, in March 2006 [LCD15], as the consultation process summaries indicate. The approach was designed to engage strategically with key partners and delivery agents at a District or sub area level, but locally with communities, Parish Councils and landowners, in terms of identifying specific areas and sites for potential development.</p> <p>The parallel preparation of the Core Strategy gave considerable emphasis to the linkage with and delivery of the first Hambleton Community Plan (2003) [LCD18], updated in June 2006 as the Community Plan for Hambleton 2006 – 2011 [LCD18A]), and the North Yorkshire Community Strategy [RCD10]. The Allocations DPD process enabled this to be taken further in terms of local aspects of these Community Plans.</p>
<p>Was a record kept</p>	<p>Regulation</p>	<p>Whilst formally described in the Allocations DPD Consultation</p>

<p>of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the individuals or bodies invited to make representations - how this was done - the main issues raised? 	<p>28(1), 2004</p>	<p>Statement [LCD98] , a more full description of those consulted and their responses is provided in the separate Report on Issues and Options Consultation (November/ December 2005), published in August 2007 [LCD97]. A summary is also presented in the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Annex 2 [LCD96].</p>
<p>Was a framework developed for monitoring the effects of the development plan document?</p>	<p>The Act section 35 Regulation 48 Reg 17 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No1363</p>	<p>At the time of the Issues and Options consultation, a monitoring framework was being advanced as part of the development of the Core Strategy Preferred Options. Subsequently, the Allocations DPD Preferred Options documents [LCD95] (Annex 5 for each document) presented, for comment, the evolving framework proposed to monitor the effects of the LDF, relating to the implementation of the Core Strategy, Development Policies DPD and the Allocations DPD, and containing suggested indicators and targets.</p>
<p>Were copies of documents used in consultation sent to the Government Office and Planning Inspectorate?</p>	<p>Not statutory, but will assist in identifying issues leading towards a sound development plan document</p>	<p>Copies of all consultation documents were sent to the GOYH during Issues and Options consultation stage. The letter requesting comments was dated 17th January 2007 [ASSA10]. No formal written response was received.</p>

Stage 3: Plan preparation – formulation phase

Legal Compliance of this stage, which relates to the Preferred Options consultation undertaken in October – November 2007, needs to be judged against the provisions of the Local Development Regulations 2004 [NCD30] (reflecting the transition arrangements set out in the Local Development Amendment Regulations 2008 [NCD30A] (s. 3, paras. 4 – 7)).

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Evidence provided
<p>Were reasonable alternatives prepared for evaluation during the preparation of the development plan document?</p>	<p>Regulation 12 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No. 1633</p>	<p>The District Council has throughout the process of preparing the Allocations DPD sought to identify the widest possible range of alternative sites, to evaluate against the principles of the emerging LDF strategy. This has been achieved both from the use of the Council’s own information, and through giving wide publicity (see Stage 2) to the scope for sites to be advanced by interested parties, including landowners and local communities (eg press release of 17th May 2004 – call for sites [ASSA10A]).</p> <p>The volume of sites generated through this process has been very considerable, and has grown throughout the successive stages of preparing the DPD. At the issues and options stage around 300 sites were identified for consideration in the published documents, and about a further 500 sites came forward through consultation responses – i.e. a total of some 800 sites identified for subsequent consideration.</p> <p>At that point, the process of focusing on all “reasonable” alternatives resulted in the discounting from detailed analysis of about 350 sites because these were in locations not supported by the Core Strategy. Around a further 60 sites were discounted because these were below the adopted minimum size threshold (of 0.3ha /10 dwellings capacity) for allocation. These are all listed in each of the separate sub area Preferred Options documents [LCD95] at Annex 6.</p> <p>At the Preferred Options stage, the remaining almost 400 sites were advanced for further consideration. Of these approximately 100 were identified as preferred sites, some being grouped together to form larger sites. The remaining sites were recommended not to be taken forward as allocations. At this point, taking account of emerging preferred development sites, views were also canvassed on proposed Development Limits – largely based on existing former District Wide Local Plan Policy L1 boundaries, amended to take account of preferred sites and to remove some minor anomalies (listed in each of the separate sub area Preferred Options documents [LCD95] at Annex 2).</p> <p>The principles adopted for site selection are described</p>

		<p>in Section 2 (supplemented by Annex 1) of each Preferred Options sub-area document [LCD95], and explained further below. A description of the Sustainability Appraisal approach, which helped to ensure that all reasonable options were identified and progressed for further consideration, is provided below.</p> <p>Whilst early work to prepare the Allocations DPD took account of existing knowledge of land availability, including the Urban Potential Study [LCD34], the latter stages, taking forward the Preferred Options documents to produce the Proposed Submission draft also took account of the Council's first Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), published in March 2008 [LCD102], and updated in November 2008 [LCD102A]. Given the volume of sites identified through the preceding Issues & Options and Preferred Options stages, the SHLAA did not in general seek to identify new sites but the information obtained helped to develop the details (including in particular the infrastructure and development requirements, and the phasing) of the proposals contained in the Submission plan.</p>
<p>Were alternatives assessed against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consistency with national policy? - general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy? - conformity with the Core Strategy DPD? 	<p>The Act, s.19(2), s. 24</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD has been prepared to be in conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82], and consistent with the Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94]. These documents were both found to be sound through Public Examination and provide a clear context for the Allocations DPD, in terms of establishing an approach which is consistent with national and regional guidance, and against which alternatives should be evaluated.</p> <p>The role of the Allocations DPD in relation to the Core Strategy is set out in the Local Development Scheme and the Preferred Options sub area documents [LCD95] para. 1.4 as providing the site details which will help to deliver the Core Strategy.</p> <p>In terms of the relationship between national, regional and Core Strategy policies, Section 2 of the Preferred Options documents [LCD95] explains the principles of site selection, indicating in para. 2.3 that the most important principles or objectives are (in summary) to reflect and deliver the Core Strategy; to reflect the principles of the Development Policies DPD; to reflect national and RSS guidance; and to reflect local views.</p> <p>The explanation of the objective relating to the national and regional guidance indicates that this includes the approach to building sustainable communities, the guidance on the selection of housing land in PPG3 (now PPS3), and the guidance contained in the RSS on the required sequence of search for development sites.</p>

		<p>Further details of the implications of these principles are provided for each of the main land uses – housing, employment and other uses (town centre and community uses) in the remainder of Section 2, and in Annex 1.</p> <p>No observations were received from GOYH or the Regional Assembly (the Regional Planning Body) that indicated concerns about consistency or conformity in these respects. Indeed the Regional Assembly’s response (ASSA27, final para. of page 2, 20th November 2007) indicated in summary that “the DPD reflects the policy direction of current and draft RSS”.</p>
Was regard had to adjoining Regional Spatial Strategies?	The Act s.19(2) Regulation 15(1)(g)	<p>The implications of the LDF for the adjacent areas of the North East region (and in turn the implications of the emerging proposals for those areas on the Hambleton LDF) were considered in detail during both the preparation of the Core Strategy. Consultation responses from adjacent North East Authorities helped to determine the approach that was developed.</p> <p>Given that the Allocations DPD is intended to amplify and support the Core Strategy, the consideration of the adjoining RSS in formulating the latter meets the necessary requirements. Although the adjacent authorities in the North East region were consulted on the Allocations DPD at Preferred Options stage (and indeed concerning Issues and Options), only 2 comments were received (both from Middlesbrough BC). This is not surprising given the preceding dialogue on the Core Strategy, and the role of the Allocations DPD described above.</p>
Was regard had to: - the Sustainable Community Strategy of the authority or other authorities whose area comprises part of the area of the Council? - any other local development documents adopted by the Council?	The Act, s.19(2)	<p>The relationship between the Hambleton Community Plan [LCD18 and 18A] (and the North Yorkshire Community Strategy [RCD10]) and the LDF is a crucial one – the LDF providing the main means of giving spatial expression to both the Hambleton Community Plan and the County Community Strategy.</p> <p>This is explained fully in the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] (para. 1.7), and the context described in Adopted Core Strategy Annex 4: paras. 18-25 covering the implications of the Hambleton Community Plan, and paras. 26-27 covering the North Yorkshire Community Strategy. The Hambleton Community Plan and the North Yorkshire Community Strategy are both consistent and complementary. As the Core Strategy Consultation Statement [LCD8] indicates, the Hambleton Strategic Partnership (LSP) was consulted during the preparation of the Core Strategy, and indicated its support to the Core Strategy as a key means of delivering the Community Plan.</p> <p>In its role of providing further interpretative and implementation detail for the Core Strategy, the Allocations DPD has similar importance for the two</p>

		<p>Community Plans. As the Preferred Options sub area documents [LCD95] para. 1.16 indicates, the allocations considered “provide an opportunity to deliver the aspirations set out in the Community Plan, and in the Area Action Plans which have been prepared as part of the Community Plan and its process”. Consideration of relevant Community Plan objectives is therefore made in relation to relevant proposals, eg. in relation to many proposed town centre or community use site allocations. The breakdown of the plan area into sub areas in the Allocations document reflected the LSP Area Groups to aid integration. The Hambleton Strategic Partnership has been closely involved in the preparation of the Allocations DPD and gave support to the Proposed Submission document. (See letter dated 6 March 2009 from the LSP Chairman and minutes of relevant meetings [ASSA35]).</p> <p>An explanation of the link with the Core Strategy and the Development Policies DPD has been made above. The Allocations DPD is designed to be fully in conformity with the Core Strategy. The principles of site selection, and the matters determined which need to be taken into account in developing each site, are also designed to be consistent with the Development Policies DPD.</p>
<p>Was regard had to other matters and strategies relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - resources - the regional development agencies’ regional economic strategy - the local transport plan and transport facilities and services - waste strategies - hazardous substances and accidents? 	<p>The Act s.19(2) Regulation 15</p>	<p>The Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] indicates that the full range of issues identified was taken into account in developing the Core Strategy.</p> <p>General matters and issues within the context for preparing the LDF, including the overall resource context, are considered in the Adopted Core Strategy spatial portrait of Hambleton and issues to be addressed contained in LCD82 Chapter 2 (paras. 2.3-15). Annex 4 of that document provides a review of all the relevant strategies that form the context for the LDF. As well as the RSS and Community Plan, these include a wide range of other strategies, considered in paras. 28 - 35. The relationship with the Regional Economic Strategy [RCD2] is particularly important, and the implication described more fully in the box on page 90. The need to integrate land use and transport (eg. with the Local Transport Plan [RCD12]) is addressed particularly in relation to accessibility and the need to minimise travel (Policy CP2); support to the economy (Policy CP12) and to the regeneration of the market towns (Policy CP13).</p> <p>The Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94], was prepared within the context of the Core Strategy, and designed to provide further elaboration and implementation details. Thus whilst matters relating to infrastructure, hazardous substances, waste, climate</p>

		<p>change and other environmental issues are considered in general within the Core Strategy, they are addressed more fully within the Development Policies DPD.</p> <p>In its role of providing site allocations to help delivery of the Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD, the Allocations DPD sits within this context, and helps to provide further details. Individual site proposals take account of locational considerations relating to waste, hazardous substances, and the content of other strategies, eg. relating to economic strategy proposals or transport schemes contained in the LTP. Examples of schemes include the Bedale, Aiskew Leeming Bar relief road, the transport interchanges at the railway stations and the market town employment allocations.</p>
<p>Was regard had to the need to include policies on mitigating and adapting to climate change?</p>		<p>The overall approach of the Hambleton LDF, as reflected in the Adopted Core Strategy, Adopted Development Policies DPD and the Allocations DPD, seeks to assist in mitigating and adapting to climate change. For example the strategic approach seeks to minimise travel movements by non-car modes, and the selection of sites takes the necessary steps to minimise the risks of flooding.</p>
<p>Was the necessary sustainability appraisal of alternatives undertaken, including consultation on the sustainability appraisal report?</p>	<p>The Act s.19(5) Regulation 12 and 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No. 1633</p>	<p>A full Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken in parallel with the preparation of the Allocations DPD Preferred Options. This was prepared with the benefit of the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken throughout the development of the Core Strategy (the Core Strategy Final Sustainability Appraisal report [LCD12] was published in December 2005), and also the Sustainability Appraisal conducted of the Development Policies DPD (Final Report published August 2006 [LCD69]).</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal of the Allocations DPD (October 2007)[LCD116] was published at the Preferred Options stage, and provided a full assessment (Appendix 5) of the Preferred Options selected, and those options not selected. All consultees were notified of this document and comments were invited on it. Details are provided in the Consultation Statement [LCD98] at Section 4 on page 115.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal [LCD116] (para. 5.230, page 105) found that “the majority of predicted significant effects are positive. There are very few significant negative effects predicted to result from the development of the Preferred Option sites”. The Sustainability Appraisal commented that to a large extent this resulted from the adoption of a Core Strategy DPD which had already been subject to SA, and thus that development had been steered towards settlements in the District that are most likely to present</p>

		<p>opportunities for sustainable development. In addition, the SA commented that the site selection methodology described in Annex 1 of each sub-area plan [LCD95] was successful to the extent that it concentrated development within urban areas in the first instance, helping to reduce the need to travel to reach services and facilities and reducing the need to develop on greenfield sites which may be to the detriment of local countryside character. Two replies were received in response to the SA of Preferred Options sites consultation report - from English Heritage and Natural England and mitigation measures were identified (LCD 117A Appendix 4).</p> <p>At the time of the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal, a formal Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report was prepared [LCD116], which concluded (para. 4.4) that “any adverse effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites can be avoided or mitigated through the proper application of policy safeguards within and outside the planning process. The undertaking of further stages of the HRA process should therefore not be necessary”.</p>
<p>Were clear reasons set out for any preferences between alternatives?</p>	<p>Regulation 13(1)</p>	<p>The Allocations Preferred Options documents [LCD95] distinguish clearly between the preferred sites package, and the rejected alternative sites, for each settlement. The justification for advancing the preferred sites, as a strategy for each main settlement, and for individual sites, is clearly set out in the text. The rejected sites and their commentary is distinguished by their inclusion within shaded boxes and identified as rejected development options or sites. In each case there are full reasons identified for the rejection of the site or sites.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal of the Allocations DPD (October 2007) [LCD115] published at the Preferred Options stage, provided a full assessment (Appendix 5) of the Preferred Options selected, and those options not selected.</p>
<p>Was account taken of any representations made on the content of the development plan document and the sustainability appraisal?</p> <p>Was a record kept?</p>	<p>Regulations 27 (3) (2004)</p> <p>Regulation 13(4) of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98] describes the consultation undertaken on the Preferred Options under Regulation 26 (2004). Following Regulation 27 (2004), Section 3.1 describes who was consulted (listed in Appendix 8); Section 3.2 the methods employed; Section 3.3 summarises the main issues raised; and Section 3.4 explains how these comments were addressed in formulating the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD. Section 4.3 of the Consultation Statement covers the consideration of issues raised on the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Allocations DPD Preferred Options consultation is also summarised in the Submission Allocations DPD</p>

		<p>[LCD199] Annex 2 paras. 80 – 139.</p> <p>A full set of the responses to the Allocations DPD Preferred Options consultation is presented in an accessible form in the Preferred Options Consultation Responses Schedules [LCD99], details being organised on a standard schedule for each site. Original representations received are also available [LCD100].</p>
<p>Where sites were identified or areas for the application of policy in the development plan document, was sufficient illustrative material prepared to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enable the currently adopted proposals map to be amended? - inform the community about the location of proposals? 	<p>Regulations 9 and 14</p>	<p>OS plans at an appropriate scale locating potential allocation sites by settlement were included in the Issues and Options documents [LCD50], and also in the Preferred Options documents [LCD95]. In the latter case the location plans indicated diagrammatically and in colour whether the sites were preferred or rejected (and the proposed use). Proposed Development Limits were also shown for each relevant settlement in the Preferred Options documents [LCD95]. Maps for each settlement were also made available separately, and similarly were available for separate download from the Council's website.</p> <p>The Proposals Map has been produced as Annex 5 to the Allocations DPD, incorporating the proposed new allocations onto the existing Proposals Map, as amended, following adoption of the Development Policies DPD.</p>
<p>Were the participation arrangements compliant with the statement of community involvement?</p>	<p>The Act, s. 19(3) Regulation 26 (2004)</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98] describes the consultation undertaken on the Preferred Options under Regulation 26 (2004), demonstrating that the approach taken meets the statutory requirements. Allocations DPD Preferred Options consultation is also summarised in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 2 paras. 80 – 139. The approach followed in consultation at the Preferred Options stage follows the intentions of the SCI, adopted on 28th March 2006 [LCD15].</p>
<p>Was close contact maintained with the Government Office, and any emerging issues discussed that might affect the soundness of the development plan document?</p>		<p>Contact was maintained with GOYH during the preparation of the Allocations DPD, and no concerns were raised by them about the soundness of the emerging document. A copy of the covering letter dated 11th October 2007 to GOYH is referenced as [ASSA11], supplying the Preferred Options “pre-submission” proposals documents (their response, dated 22nd November 2007, provided no comments).</p>
<p>Were copies of the “pre-submission proposals</p>	<p>Regulation 26(a)(2004). Regulation 27 (2004) allows anyone to make</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD Preferred Options reports [LCD95] and Statement of Proposals Matters [ASSA2] were made available for inspection for the period 12th</p>

<p>documents” and a statement of the “proposals matters” made available for inspection?</p>	<p>representations and specifies a period of six weeks.</p> <p>The LPA must consider all representations received (see Regulation 27(3))(2004).</p>	<p>October until 23rd November 2007 (i.e. a period of 6 weeks) at the District Council offices at the Civic Centre, Northallerton, at area offices in Easingwold and Stokesley, and the libraries at Bedale, Easingwold, Great Ayton, Northallerton, Stokesley and Thirsk. A notice was given in two local newspapers on 12th October 2007 [ASSA1].</p> <p>The Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98] describes the consultation undertaken on the Preferred Options under Regulation 26 (2004). Following Regulation 27 (2004), Section 3.1 describes who was consulted (listed in Appendix 9); Section 3.2 the methods employed; Section 3.3 summarises the main issues raised; and Section 3.4 explains how these comments were addressed in formulating the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Preferred Options consultation is also summarised in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 2 paras. 80 – 139.</p>
<p>Were the pre-submission proposals documents published (preferred options report), proposals matters and a statement that the documents were available for inspection (at specified places and times) on the website?</p>	<p>Regulation 26(b)(2004)</p> <p>Regulation 24 (2004) gives definitions and Regulation 27 (2004) facilitates representations (see above)</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD Preferred Options reports [LCD95], the response form and questionnaire, and Statement of Proposals Matters [ASSA2] (which included a statement of where the documents were available for inspection, and indication of from where supporting documents could be obtained or inspected) were made available via the Council’s website (accessed via Local Development Framework) from 12th October 2007.</p>
<p>Were all the “DPD bodies” (i.e all those consulted at the Regulation 25 (2004) stage) sent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposals for the DPD? • supporting documents that are relevant to the body? • notice of proposals matters? • a statement that the documents are 	<p>Regulation 26 (c)(2004)</p> <p>Regulation 24 (2004) gives definitions and Regulation 27 (2004) facilitates representations (see above)</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98] identifies those consulted under Regulation 26 (2004) (Appendix 8), which included all those consulted under Regulation 25 (2004) (listed in Appendix 1).</p> <p>Copies of the standard covering letters dated 11th October 2007 referenced as [ASSA13], were sent to the consultees together with the Allocations DPD Preferred Options documents [LCD95] plus a Statement of the Proposals Matters [ASSA2] (which included a statement of where the documents were available for inspection, and indication of from where supporting documents could be obtained or inspected). In the case of the main consultees, the non-technical summary of the Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal [LCD11] was also supplied – otherwise its availability was indicated in the covering letters.</p>

<p>available for inspection (at specified places and times)?</p>		
<p>Was a notice advertised in a local paper concerning the proposals matters & where and when the pre-submission proposals documents could be inspected?</p>	<p>Regulation 26(d)(2004) Regulation 24 (2004) gives definitions and Regulation 27 (2004) facilitates representations (see above)</p>	<p>A notice was given in 2 local newspapers on 12th October 2007 [ASSA1], advising that the Allocations DPD Preferred Options reports [LCD95] and Statement of Proposals Matters [ASSA2] were available for inspection for the period 12th October until 23rd November 2007 at the District Council offices at the Civic Centre, Northallerton and area offices in Easingwold and Stokesley, and the libraries at Bedale, Easingwold, Great Ayton, Northallerton, Stokesley and Thirsk.</p>

Stage 4: Publication

Legal Compliance of the actions undertaken at this stage, which relates to the two periods 23rd January – 6th March and 2nd October – 13th November 2009, needs to be assessed against the provisions of the Local Development Amendment Regulations 2008 & 2009 [NCD30A&B].

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Evidence provided
Decision to publish	Regulation 25(5)(2008)	<p>As the Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98] indicates, the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD [LCD96] was prepared following full consideration of the responses received in consultation under Regulation 26 (2004), i.e. on the Preferred Options document.</p> <p>The Council considered that the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD provided an appropriate and sound component of the LDF, serving to help deliver the Core Strategy, with sufficient reasoned justification, in determining to publish the document for formal representations - Council approval on 16th December 2008, following Cabinet approval on 25th November 2008 [LCD114].</p> <p>A formal representation was however received following publication relating to legal compliance, which gave rise to the Council seeking legal advice. It resulted in the Council reconsidering all the representations received at the Preferred Options stage. A report was presented to Cabinet on 4 August 2009 and Council on 22 September 2009 (report and minutes – LCD214]. At this meeting the Council agreed to republish the Allocations DPD of January 2009, with a revised Consultation Statement (June 2009) [LCD98A] and Sustainability Appraisal (April 2009) [LCD117A].</p>
Has a Sustainability Appraisal report been prepared?	The Act s.19(5) Regulation 12 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal Report [LCD117] was published in November 2008, but was subsequently revised and republished in April 2009 [LCD117A]. This Report documents all stages of the Sustainability Appraisal, and provides the analysis of the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD [LCD96]. An updated formal Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report was also published in January 2009 [LCD118], which concluded (para. 4.4), as did the earlier draft, that “any adverse effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites can be avoided or mitigated through the proper application of policy safeguards within and outside the planning process. The undertaking of further stages of the HRA process should therefore not be necessary”.</p>
Has it been made clear where and within what period representations must be made?	Regulation 28(2) and (3)(2008)	<p>A Statement of the Representations Procedure was provided at both publication stages [ASSA5&6] indicating the period within which further representations could be made, and the address to which they must be sent, and indication of where and when the representations could be inspected.</p>

<p>Have copies of the following been made available for inspection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed submission documents? - the Statement of the Representations Procedure? 	<p>Regulation 27(a)(2008)</p>	<p>Copies of the Proposed Submission documents, namely the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD [LCD96], (including the Proposed Changes to the Proposals Map as an Annex); the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report [LCD117A]; the Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98]; and the 16 supporting relevant background study reports listed in the Statement of Representations and Document Availability, together with the Statement of Representations Procedure [ASSA5] were made available for inspection for the period 23rd January until 6th March 2009 (i.e. a period of 6 weeks) at the District Council offices at the Civic Centre, Northallerton and area offices in Easingwold and Stokesley, and the libraries at Bedale, Easingwold, Great Ayton, Northallerton, Stokesley and Thirsk.</p> <p>This was repeated for a second stage running for 6 weeks from 2nd October to 13th November 2009, with the same documents as Stage 1, except for a revised Consultation Statement (June 2009) [LCD98A] and revised Final Sustainability Appraisal report (April 2009) [LCD117A] together with a new Statement of Representations Procedure and Document Availability [ASSA6].</p>
<p>Have the following been published on the website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed submission documents? - the Statement of the Representations procedure? - Statement of Availability for Inspection 	<p>Regulation 27(b)(2008)</p>	<p>The Proposed Submission documents, the Statement of the Representations Procedure and Document Availability [ASSA5&6] (giving details of where documents could be inspected) were made available via the Council's website www.hambleton.gov.uk (accessed via Local Development Framework) on 23rd January 2009 and 2nd October 2009.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have each of the specific consultation bodies invited to make representations under Regulation 25(1) been sent: - a copy of each of the proposed submission documents? - the statement of the representations procedure? 	<p>Regulation 27(c)(2008)</p>	<p>All the specific consultation bodies consulted under Regulation 27 were sent on 22nd January 2009 (cover letter referenced ASSA16A) and 2nd October 2009 (cover letter referenced ASSA16B) copies of the Proposed Submission documents, namely the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD [LCD96], (including the Proposed Changes to the Proposals Map as an Annex); the Sustainability Appraisal Reports [LCD117&117A]; the Allocations DPD Consultation Statements [LCD98&98A]; and the 16 supporting relevant background study reports listed in the Statement of Document Availability, together with the Statements of Representations Procedure [ASSA5&6].</p>

<p>Have each of the general consultation bodies invited to make representations under Regulation 25(1) been sent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the statement of the representations procedure? <p>where and when the documents can be inspected?</p>	<p>Regulation 27(d)(2008)</p>	<p>All the general consultation bodies consulted under Regulation 27 were sent on 22nd January 2009 (cover letter referenced ASSA17A) and 2nd October 2009 (cover letter referenced ASSA17B) copies of the Statement of Representations Procedure and Document Availability [ASSA5&6] (giving details of where documents could be inspected). An indication was given that the material, including background documents, was also available on the Council's website.</p>
<p>Has notice been given by local advertisement setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the statement of the representations procedure? - where and when the documents can be inspected? 	<p>Regulation 27(e) (2008)</p>	<p>A notice was given in two local newspapers, York Evening Press and the Darlington & Stockton Times on 23rd January 2009 [ASSA3] and again on 2nd October 2009 [ASSA4] of the Statement of Representations Procedure and Document Availability [ASSA5&6] (giving details of where documents could be inspected).</p>
<p>Has the opinion of the regional planning body been sought on the general conformity of the development plan document with the Regional Spatial Strategy?</p>	<p>The Act section 24 Regulation 29 (2008)</p>	<p>The Regional Planning Body (the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly/ Local Government Yorkshire and Humber) were asked for their opinion at both first and second publication stages – copy of letter dated 22nd January 2009 referenced [ASSA15A] and 2nd October 2009 referenced [ASSA15B].</p> <p>Their responses indicating general conformity were given by letters dated 5th March 2009 and 10th November 2009 [ASSA28A&B] - with Addendum of 9th December 2009 (ASSA28C).</p>

Stage 5: Submission

Legal Compliance of the actions undertaken at this stage have been assessed against the provisions of the Local Development (Amendment) Regulations 2008 [NCD30A] and 2009 [NCD30B], except those aspects which relate to consultation (see preceding Stages 2 and 3), which are guided by the 2004 Regulations [NCD30]. During the examination this will provide the definitive record.

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Evidence provided
<p>Is the DPD ready for submission?</p> <p>Are there any major issues revealed by the representations on publication?</p> <p>Are all the relevant documents in place?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act s. 20(2)(b) 2. The Act s.20(1) 3. Regulation 30(1)(2008) 	<p>A review of all the issues revealed by the representations received on publication (see Stage 4) was undertaken before making the decision to proceed to submission to determine whether there were any very significant legal compliance issues or issues that go to the heart of the soundness of the plan.</p> <p>Having considered the representations, the Council remains convinced that the content of the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD is sound, and it has therefore been determined to submit the document as the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] to the Secretary of State for Examination.</p> <p>In addition to the Submission Allocations DPD (which also contains the Proposed Changes to the Proposals Map as an Annex), the District Council has assembled and submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report [LCD117A]; - the Statement of Community Involvement [LCD15]; - the Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98], which contains a full review of the consultation undertaken under the Regulation 25 (2004) consultation (Issues & Options) and the Regulation 26 (2004) consultation (Preferred Options), covering who was consulted, the methods used, and summarising the points raised; - the Statement of Representations [LCD200] (as required under Regulation 30(e), 2008)(numbers & summarises representations received to the published document); - copies of the representations made to the published document [LCD122]; - other supporting documents comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hambleton LDF Background Studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car Parking Study (Jan 2002); Validation Study (Feb 2003) & Strategy (Apr 2004) • Housing Needs Survey (Nov 2004) • Spatial Report of the Community Plan (Nov 2004) • Town Centres Study (Dec 2004)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic Development Study (Jun 2005) • Village Services (Jun 2005) • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Jan 2006 & Supplement Jan 2009) • Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (Aug 2006) • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (Nov 2008) • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (Mar 2008) • Housing Market Demand Study (Jul 2008) • Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (Dec 2008) • Viability Studies of Housing Sites (Jan 2009) • Northallerton Allocations and Traffic Model (Nov 2006) • Northallerton Northern Link Road Deliverability (Oct 2008 & Erratum Jan 2009) • Northallerton Strategic Option Testing (Dec 2008) <p>Hambleton LDF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD (Apr 2007) • Development Policies DPD (Feb 2008) • Allocations DPD - Issues & Options (Nov 2005); Preferred Options (Oct 2007) and Proposed Submission (Jan 2009) • Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Jun 2008) • Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Sep 2009) • Annual Monitoring Report (Dec 2008 & Dec 2009) • Local Development Scheme No. 4 (Mar 2009) <p>Hambleton District-Wide Local Plan (Saved Policy L1) (Jan 1999)</p> <p>Community Plan for Hambleton 2006-2011</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report of Allocations DPD (Jan 2009)</p> <p>A more detailed review of the Issues and Options Consultation is also available in the Report on Issues and Options Consultation (November - December 2005), published in August 2007. [LCD97]. The Submission Allocations DPD [LCD96] Annex 2 also provides a summary of consultation throughout the preparation of the Development Policies DPD (i.e. at both Regulation 25 (2004) and Regulation 26 (2004) stages).</p>
Has the development plan document been	The Act, s. 19(1)	Work commenced on the Allocations DPD under the first LDS. The first LDS was approved in November 2004, and came into effect on 15 th March 2005 [LCD16]. This first LDS advised

<p>prepared in accordance with the local development scheme?</p> <p>Does the development plan document's listing and description in the local development scheme match the document?</p> <p>Have the timescales set out in the local development scheme been met?</p>		<p>that work had formally commenced on the Allocations DPD in September 2004 (with a pre-production stage before this). The first LDS was current at the time of consultation on the Issues & Options documents in November/December 2005. The document was listed as the "Allocations DPD" [LCD16 para. 5.14], and indicated that it would "show all the sites which have been specifically identified for development in order to meet the Council's vision and objectives or strategic policies of the Core Strategy". In the first LDS, the Allocations DPD was anticipated to be submitted in August 2006.</p> <p>The second LDS (i.e. the first revision) [LCD17] came into effect on 21st April 2006, and the third LDS [LCD84] came into effect on 24th April 2007. This latter LDS was in effect at the time of the Preferred Options consultation: see Stage 3. A further revision (LDS4) came into effect on 6th March 2009, this indicates in para 5.16 that the DPD will show all the sites which have been specifically identified for development in order to meet the vision and objectives, spatial strategy or strategic policies of the Core Strategy. It will also set out policies and proposals for the sites including detailed requirements for their development and how, when and by whom they will be implemented. Slippage in the timescale for preparation of the Allocations DPD occurred between all LDS drafts, with LDS3 indicating May 2008 as the anticipated date of submission. Clearly this has slipped further, with the equivalent final publication date of May 2009 followed by submission in July 2009. This slippage has been a direct result of the need to give priority to securing adoption of the Core Strategy (and the Development Policies DPD), the much greater than originally anticipated, including the volume of potential development sites which came forward for consideration during the consultation process, and the need to ensure that the DPD complied with legal requirements.</p>
<p>Has the development plan document had regard to any Sustainable Community Strategy for its area (i.e. a county and district)?</p>	<p>The Act section 19(2)</p>	<p>The relationship between the Hambleton Community Plan (and the North Yorkshire Community Strategy) and the LDF is a crucial one – the LDF providing the main means of giving spatial expression of both the Hambleton Community Plan and the County Community Strategy.</p> <p>This is explained fully in the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] (para. 1.7), and the context described in Adopted Core Strategy Annex 4: paras. 18-25 covering the implications of the Hambleton Community Plan, and paras. 26-27 covering the North Yorkshire Community Strategy. The Hambleton Community Plan and the North Yorkshire Community Strategy are both consistent and complementary. As the Core Strategy Consultation Statement [LCD8] indicates, the Hambleton Strategic Partnership was consulted during the preparation of the Core Strategy, and indicated its support to the Core Strategy as a key means of delivering the Community Plan.</p> <p>In its role of providing further interpretative and implementation detail for the Core Strategy, the Allocations</p>

		<p>DPD has similar importance for the two Community Plans. As the Submission Allocations document [LCD199] para. 1.11 indicates, the allocations “provide an opportunity to deliver the aspirations set out in the Community Plan, and in the Area Action Plans which have been prepared as part of the Community Plan and its process. Similarly they will provide an opportunity to assist in the achievement of the Local Area Agreement (LAA) developed to deliver the Community Plan”. Identification of relevant Community Plan objectives is therefore made in relation to relevant proposals, eg. concerning many proposed town centre or community use site allocations.</p> <p>Hambleton is identified as a best practice example in the ODPM study “Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their future”, December 2005 [NCD32], which includes the following in relation to Hambleton:</p> <p>Since the introduction of Community Strategies in 2000, the Community Planning Team within the Council has been an integral part of the wider service dealing with spatial planning. This resulted in close collaboration in the production of the Community Strategy and the LDF. The LDF Core Strategy document demonstrated this as its themes closely correlate with those in the Community Strategy. The consultation on the LDF informed the review of the Community Strategy.</p> <p>In this respect, and whilst the reference relates to the Core Strategy, the Allocations DPD clearly sits within the same context and with the same intent.</p> <p>The first Hambleton Community Plan [LCD18] was published in 2003, before the commencement of preparation of the LDF. Subsequently, the Hambleton Strategic Partnership commissioned an analysis of the spatial implications of the Community Plan (and its sub area strategies), to inform and influence the preparation of the LDF [LCD19]. The report was fully taken into account in formulating the Core Strategy and the Allocations DPD. The Community Plan has now been reviewed, and the revised Community Plan for Hambleton published in June 2006 [LCD18A], expresses full recognition of the role that the LDF will play in providing the spatial expression of the Strategy.</p>
<p>Is the development plan document in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (where one exists)?</p> <p>Has the Council carried out consultation as described in the statement of</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act s19(3) 2. Regulation 32(1)(c) (2008) 	<p>The Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98] describes the consultation undertaken on the Issues & Options documents under Regulation 25 (2004) and Preferred Options under Regulation 26 (2004), demonstrating that the approach taken meets both the statutory requirements and the approach described in the Statement of Community Involvement, adopted on 28th March 2006 [LCD15].</p> <p>The Allocations DPD Issues & Options and Preferred Options consultation is also summarised in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 2 paras. 80 – 139. The approach followed in consultation at the Preferred Options stage follows the intentions of the SCI.</p>

community involvement?		
<p>Has the development plan document been subject to sustainability appraisal?</p> <p>Has the Council provided a final report of the findings of the appraisal?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act section 19(5) 2. Regulation 32(1)(a) (2008) 	<p>The nature and conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken throughout the preparation of the Allocations DPD have been explained under Stage 3.</p> <p>The Final Sustainability Appraisal Report [LCD117A] was published in April 2009. This Report documents all stages of the Sustainability Appraisal, and provides the analysis of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199].</p>
<p>Is the development plan document to be submitted consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>The Act section 20(2) and Schedule 8</p>	<p>This Allocations DPD has been prepared to be in conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82], and consistent with the Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94]. These documents, both found to be sound through Public Examination, provide a clear context for the Allocations DPD, in terms of establishing an approach that is consistent with national guidance.</p> <p>The relationship between the Allocations DPD and the Core Strategy (and Development Policies DPD) is established in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] para. 1.5 – 6. The Allocations DPD provides the site details that will help to deliver the Core Strategy.</p> <p>In terms of the relationship with national policies, Section 2 of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] explains the principles of site selection, indicating in para. 2.3 that the most important principles or objectives are (in summary) to reflect and deliver the Core Strategy; to reflect the principles of the Development Policies DPD; to reflect national and RSS guidance; and to reflect local views.</p> <p>The explanation of the objective relating to national guidance indicates that this includes the approach to building sustainable communities, and the guidance on the selection of housing land in PPG3 (now PPS3).</p> <p>Further details of the implications of these principles are provided for each of the main land uses – housing, employment and other uses (town centre and community uses) in the remainder of Section 2, and in Annex 3.</p> <p>No observations were received from GOYH expressing concern about consistency or conformity with national policies until publication stage. At first and second publication stages they raised concerns about the affordable housing policies being deliverable and flexible in the context of PPG3 and queried the evidence base on housing economic viability. At second publication stage, In November 2009 they also raised concern about the proposed allocation of a Motorway Service Area at Leeming Bar not fulfilling the criteria in PPS12 in terms of not necessarily being the most appropriate site.</p>

<p>Does the development plan document contain any policies or proposals that are not in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy?</p> <p>If yes, is there local justification?</p> <p>Has the Council got confirmation from the regional planning body about the general conformity of the plan with the Regional Spatial Strategy?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act s 24(1)(a); 24(2) and 24(4) 2. Regulation 29 	<p>There are no proposals contained in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] that are believed not to be in conformity with the approved RSS [RCD5A].</p> <p>This Allocations DPD has been prepared to be in conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82], and consistent with the Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94]. These documents, both found to be sound through Public Examination, provide a clear context for the Allocations DPD, in terms of establishing an approach that is in conformity with regional guidance.</p> <p>The relationship between the Allocations DPD and the Core Strategy (and Development Policies DPD) is established in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] paras. 1.5 – 6. The Allocations DPD provides the site details that will help to deliver the Core Strategy.</p> <p>In terms of the relationship between regional policies and the Allocations DPD, Section 2 of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] explains the principles of site selection, indicating in para. 2.3 that the most important principles or objectives are (in summary) to reflect and deliver the Core Strategy; to reflect the principles of the Development Policies DPD; to reflect national and RSS guidance; and to reflect local views.</p> <p>The explanation of the objective relating to regional guidance indicates that this includes the guidance contained in the RSS on the required sequence of search for development sites.</p> <p>Further details of the implications of these principles are provided for each of the main land uses – housing, employment and other uses (town centre and community uses) in the remainder of Section 2, and in Annex 3.</p> <p>No observations were received from the regional planning body which indicated concerns about conformity in these respects.</p> <p>A request was made for the regional planning body to indicate general conformity of the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD with the approved RSS (letters dated 22nd January 2009 and 2nd October 2009 [ASSA15A&B]). The Assembly replied by letters dated 5th March 2009 [ASSA28] and 10th November 2009 and 9th December 2009 [ASSA28B&C] (as Local Government Yorkshire and Humber - LGYH) indicating that in their opinion “the Allocations DPD is in general conformity with the Yorkshire and Humber Plan, the Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026 (May 2008)” and “Under new Regulation 29 (2008), this opinion is issued when the local authority publishes the DPD for comment prior to submission to the Secretary of State.” They said there were no issues of conformity but some matters of alignment that needed to be addressed. They found the DPD clear in setting out the role of the RSS in providing a strategic context for the local policies and welcomed the fact that the need for general conformity was addressed in para 1.11 and that references were made to</p>
--	--	--

		<p>RSS and the regional policy context throughout the document. Overall, they found the DPD reflected the policy direction of RSS and in particular they supported the scale and distribution of new development proposed by the DPD, which is supportive of the settlement hierarchy, set out in the Core Strategy and RSS.</p>
<p>Does the development plan document comply with the 2004 Regulations (as amended)?</p> <p>Specifically, has the council published the prescribed documents, and made them available at their principal offices and their website?</p> <p>Has the Council placed local advertisements?</p> <p>Has the Council notified the development plan document bodies?</p> <p>Does the development plan document contain a list of superseded saved policies?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act s.20(2), 20(3) and 20(5)(b) 2. Regulations 13(1), 13(2), 13(5) and 30(1)(2008) 	<p>The content and preparation of the Allocations DPD complies with the 2004 Regulations, as amended (where relevant in the context of the timing of preparation) by the 2008 and 2009 Regulations.</p> <p>The Council has published the following prescribed documents, and also made them available on the Council's website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Submission Allocations DPD (containing the submission Proposals Map) [LCD199] - the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report [LCD117A]; - the Statement of Community Involvement [LCD15] - the Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98], which contains a full review of the consultation undertaken under the Regulation 25 (2004) consultation (issues and options) and the Regulation 26 (2004) consultation (Preferred Options), covering who was consulted, the methods used, and summarising the points raised; - the Statement of Representations [LCD200] (as required under Regulation 30(1)(e), 2008), which numbers and summarises representations received to the published document; - copies of the representations made to the published document [LCD119,119A&120]; - other supporting documents comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hambleton LDF Background Studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car Parking Study (Jan 2002); Validation Study (Feb 2003) & Strategy (Apr 2004) • Housing Needs Survey (Nov 2004) • Spatial Report of the Community Plan (Nov 2004) • Town Centres Study (Dec 2004) • Economic Development Study (Jun 2005) • Village Services (Jun 2005) • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Jan 2006 & Supplement Jan 2009) • Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (Aug 2006) • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (Nov 2008) • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (Mar 2008) • Housing Market Demand Study (Jul 2008)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (Dec 2008) • Viability Studies of Housing Sites (Jan 2009) • Northallerton Allocations and Traffic Model (Nov 2006) • Northallerton Northern Link Road Deliverability (Oct 2008 & Erratum Jan 2009) • Northallerton Strategic Option Testing (Dec 2008) <p>Hambleton LDF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD (Apr 2007) • Development Policies DPD (Feb 2008) • Allocations DPD - Issues & Options (Nov 2005); Preferred Options (Oct 2007) and Proposed Submission (Jan 2009) • Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Jun 2008) • Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Sep 2009) • Annual Monitoring Report (Dec 2008 & Dec 2009) • Local Development Scheme No. 4 (Mar 2009) <p>Hambleton District-Wide Local Plan (Saved Policy L1) (Jan 1999)</p> <p>Community Plan for Hambleton 2006-2011</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report of Allocations DPD (Jan 2009)</p> <p>A notice was given in two local newspapers (Darlington & Stockton Times and York Evening Press) on 18th December 2009 [ASSA7] of the title of the DPD, its subject matter and area covered, the fact that it, and all the prescribed documents listed above are available for inspection, and details of where documents can be inspected)</p> <p>The Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] indicates in para. 1.3 and Annex 1 which policies in the preceding Hambleton District Wide Local Plan [LCD1] are proposed to be replaced by Policies in the Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>Are there any policies applying to sites or areas by reference to an Ordnance Survey map or to amend an adopted proposals map?</p> <p>If yes, have you prepared a submission</p>	<p>Regulations 13(4) 14 and 30(1)(b)(2008)</p>	<p>The Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] contains Annex 5: Proposals Map. This illustrates geographically (on a set of Ordnance Survey maps) the existing LDF Proposals Map content, i.e. incorporating the policies in the Adopted Development Policies DPD. It shows the proposed site allocations and revised Development Limits contained in the Submission Allocations DPD.</p>

proposals map?		
If the development plan document is not a core strategy, is it in conformity with the core strategy?	Regulation 13(6)	<p>The Submission Allocations DPD has been prepared to be in conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82].</p> <p>The relationship between the Allocations DPD and the Core Strategy (and Development Policies DPD) is established in the Local Development Scheme and the Submission Allocations document [LCD199] paras. 1.5 – 6. The Allocations DPD provides the site details that will help to deliver the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Section 2 of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] explains (para. 2.3) that the most important principles or objectives driving the allocation of land include to reflect and deliver the strategy set out in the Adopted Core Strategy. The Core Strategy itself conforms with national and regional guidance, and sets the scale and distribution of development designed to meet the District's needs.</p> <p>Further details of the implications of these principles are provided for each of the main land uses – housing, employment and other uses (town centre and community uses) in the remainder of Section 2.</p>
<p>Has a statement been prepared setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under Regulation 25 - how they were invited - a summary of the main issues raised - how the representations have been taken into account? 	<p>The Act s. 20(3)</p> <p>Regulation 28(c) and (d)2004</p> <p>Regulation 30(1)(d) 2008</p>	<p>As consultation was undertaken at Issues and Options and Preferred Options stages under the 2004 Regulations, a Consultation Statement has been prepared consistent with Regulations 28(c) and (d) (2004)[LCD98]. This describes the consultation undertaken on the Issues and Options documents under Regulation 25 (2004), and on the Preferred Options under Regulation 26 (2004). Following Regulation 27 (2004), Section 3.1 describes who was consulted under Regulation 26 (2004) (listed in Appendix 9); Section 3.2 the methods employed; Section 3.3 summarises the main issues raised; and Section 3.4 explains how these comments were addressed in formulating the Submission Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>Has a statement been prepared giving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the number of representations made under Regulation 28(2) ? - a summary of the main issues raised <p>OR</p>	<p>The Act s. 20(3)</p> <p>Regulation 30(1)(e)(2008)</p>	<p>The Statement of Representations [LCD200] (as required under Regulation 30(1)(e), (2008), numbers and summarises representations received to the published document.</p>

- that no representations were made?		
Have all the representations made under Regulation 28 been collected together?	The Act s.20(3) Regulation 30(1)(f)(2008)	Copies of the Representations [LCD119,119A&120] have been collected together and submitted.
Have the relevant supporting documents been assembled?	1. The Act s.20(3) 2. Regulation 30(1)(g) (2008)	<p>The following supporting documents have been assembled:</p> <p>Hambleton LDF Background Studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car Parking Study (Jan 2002); Validation Study (Feb 2003) & Strategy (Apr 2004) • Housing Needs Survey (Nov 2004) • Spatial Report of the Community Plan (Nov 2004) • Town Centres Study (Dec 2004) • Economic Development Study (Jun 2005) • Village Services (Jun 2005) • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Jan 2006 & Supplement Jan 2009) • Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (Aug 2006) • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (Nov 2008) • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (Mar 2008) • Housing Market Demand Study (Jul 2008) • Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (Dec 2008) • Viability Studies of Housing Sites (Jan 2009) • Northallerton Allocations and Traffic Model (Nov 2006) • Northallerton Northern Link Road Deliverability (Oct 2008 & Erratum Jan 2009) • Northallerton Strategic Option Testing (Dec 2008) <p>Hambleton LDF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD (Apr 2007) • Development Policies DPD (Feb 2008) • Allocations DPD - Issues & Options (Nov 2005); Preferred Options (Oct 2007) and Proposed Submission (Jan 2009) • Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Jun 2008) • Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Sep 2009) • Annual Monitoring Report (Dec 2008 & Dec 2009) • Local Development Scheme No. 4 (Mar 2009)

		<p>Hambleton District-Wide Local Plan (Saved Policy L1) (Jan 1999)</p> <p>Community Plan for Hambleton 2006-2011</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report of Allocations DPD (Jan 2009)</p>
Has the Council approved the development plan document for submission?	The Act s.20	The Council finally gave consideration to the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD on 22 nd September 2009, and resolved both to publish the document for formal representations and, provided no representations were received raising significant new legal compliance or soundness issues, that the plan should subsequently be submitted to the Government. [LCD214]
<p>Has the Secretary of State (the Planning Inspectorate) been sent a paper copy of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the development plan document? - the submission proposals map (unless there are no site allocation policies)? - the documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1)? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act s20(1) and 20(3) 2. Regulations 30(1) and 30(2)(a) (2008) 	<p>The Secretary of State (i.e. PINS) was sent paper copies of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Submission Allocations DPD, which includes the submission proposals map - the documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1), namely <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report [LCD117A]; - the Statement of Community Involvement [LCD15] - the Allocations DPD Consultation Statement [LCD98], which contains a full review of the consultation undertaken under the Regulation 25 (2004) consultation (issues and options) and the Regulation 26 (2004) consultation (Preferred Options), covering who was consulted, the methods used, and summarising the points raised; - the Statement of Representations [LCD200] (as required under Regulation 30(1)(e), 2008), which numbers and summarises representations received to the published document; - copies of the representations made to the published document [LCD119,119A&120]; - other supporting documents comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hambleton LDF Background Studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car Parking Study (Jan 2002); Validation Study (Feb 2003) & Strategy (Apr 2004) • Housing Needs Survey (Nov 2004) • Spatial Report of the Community Plan (Nov 2004) • Town Centres Study (Dec 2004) • Economic Development Study (Jun 2005) • Village Services (Jun 2005) • Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Jan 2006 & Supplement Jan 2009) • Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (Aug 2006)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (Nov 2008) • Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (Mar 2008) • Housing Market Demand Study (Jul 2008) • Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (Dec 2008) • Viability Studies of Housing Sites (Jan 2009) • Northallerton Allocations and Traffic Model (Nov 2006) • Northallerton Northern Link Road Deliverability (Oct 2008 & Erratum Jan 2009) • Northallerton Strategic Option Testing (Dec 2008) <p>Hambleton LDF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD (Apr 2007) • Development Policies DPD (Feb 2008) • Allocations DPD - Issues & Options (Nov 2005); Preferred Options (Oct 2007) and Proposed Submission (Jan 2009) • Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Jun 2008) • Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Sep 2009) • Annual Monitoring Report (Dec 2008 & Dec 2009) • Local Development Scheme No. 4 (Mar 2009) <p>Hambleton District-Wide Local Plan (Saved Policy L1) (Jan 1999)</p> <p>Community Plan for Hambleton 2006-2011</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report of Allocations DPD (Jan 2009)</p> <p>Cover letter referenced [ASSA18]</p>
<p>Has the Secretary of State (the Planning Inspectorate) been sent an electronic copy of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development plan document? - submission proposals map (unless there are no site allocation policies)? - documents 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act s20(1) and 20(3) 2. Regulations 30(1) and 30(2)(b) (2008) 	<p>Electronic copies of all the documents listed under the preceding question were sent to PINS on a DVD. Cover email of 18th December 2009 referenced [ASSA19].</p>

prescribed in Regulation 30(1)?		
<p>Have the following been made available at the same places where the proposed submission documents were to be seen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the development plan document? - the documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1)? 	Regulation 30(3)(a)(2008)	The required documents (as listed above) were made available on 18 th December 2009 in the same places as the proposed submission documents, namely at the District Council offices at the Civic Centre, Northallerton and area offices in Easingwold and Stokesley, and the libraries at Bedale, Easingwold, Great Ayton, Northallerton, Stokesley and Thirsk.
<p>On the Council website, have the following been published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development plan document - submission proposals map - sustainability appraisal report - Regulation 30(1)(d) statement - Regulation 30(1)(e) statement - supporting documents (where practicable) - representations made under Regulation 28 (where practicable) - statement as to where and when the development plan document and the documents are available? 	Regulation 30(3)(b)(2008)	The listed documents were all made accessible from the Council's website www.hambleton.gov.uk on 18 th December 2009.
Have each specific consultation body invited to make representations	Regulation 30(3)(c)(2008)	All the specific consultation bodies consulted under Regulation 25 (2004) and Regulation 26 (2004) were sent copies of the listed documents on 18 th December 2009. Copy of cover letter referenced [ASSA21].

<p>under Regulation 25(1), been sent the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development plan document - submission proposals map - sustainability appraisal report - adopted statement of community involvement - Regulation 30(1)(d) statement - Regulation 30(1)(e) statement - supporting documents you consider relevant to each body - statement as to where and when the development plan document and the documents are available? 		
<p>Have each general consultation body invited to make representations under Regulation 25(1), been sent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - notification that the documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1) are available for inspection? - where and when they can be inspected? 	<p>Regulation 30(3)(d)(2008)</p>	<p>All the general consultation bodies consulted under Regulation 25 (2004) and Regulation 26 (2004) were notified on 18th December 2009 that the documents were available for inspection, together with details of where and when they could be inspected. Copy of cover letter referenced [ASSA22].</p>
<p>Has notice by local advertisement been given setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the title of the development plan 	<p>Regulation 30(3)(e)(2008)</p>	<p>A public notice appeared in two local newspapers, the York Evening Press and the Darlington & Stockton Times on 18th December 2009 [ASSA7] of the title of the DPD, its subject matter and area covered, the fact that it, and all the prescribed documents listed above are available for inspection, and details of where documents could be inspected..</p>

<p>document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the subject and area covered by the development plan document? - notification that the documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1) are available for inspection? - where and when they can be inspected? 		
<p>Has notice been given to persons who have requested to be notified that submission has taken place?</p>	<p>Regulation 30(3)(f)(2008)</p>	<p>All those who responded at the two Proposed Submission publication stages, were notified on 18th December 2009; copy letter referenced as [ASSA20]. There were no other specific requests received for notification of submission.</p>
<p>If an examination is being held, at least six weeks before its opening has the Programme Officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - published the time and place of the examination and the name of the person appointed to carry out the examination on the Council website? - notified those who have made representations on the published development plan document which have not been withdrawn of these details? - advertised these details? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act s. 20 2. Regulation 34 	<p>The Programme Officer, in consultation with the Inspectors, prepared and arranged the publication of a notice of the examination and pre-hearing meeting time and place, together with the names of the Inspectors.</p> <p>This was posted on the Council website on 3rd February 2010 and displayed in the Council's offices. A copy of the relevant webpage is provided [ASSA23]. The Programme Officer sent letters to all who made representations on the submitted Development Plan Document on 1st and 9th February 2010 [ASSA24].</p> <p>A notice was given of these details in two local newspapers (Darlington & Stockton Times and York Evening Press) on 5th February 2010 [ASSA8B].</p>

3. SOUNDNESS

Key question	Evidence provided
JUSTIFIED	
Participation	
<p>Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?</p>	<p>The process of engagement at Issues & Options and Preferred Options was described under Stages 2 and 3 above. The Consultation Statement [LCD98] provides an overall summary. More details are also provided in the Report of Issues & Options Consultation on the Allocations DPD [LCD97]. A summary is also provided in the Submission Allocations DPD Annex 2 [LCD199].</p> <p>The Consultation Report [LCD98 (at para2.1)] provides details of the approach to consultation taken at each stage, in terms of the bodies consulted, and the means of engagement with wider communities. These included distribution of consultation documents to the contacts mailing list, press advertisement, features in the Council’s free newspaper, holding of public local meetings, and a touring mobile exhibition. Details of the numbers engaged through these means are also provided in the Consultation Report, showing, as stated in para 2.1.2 [LCD98], that over 230 individuals and organisations on the Council’s consultation database were originally consulted, although a further 839 responses were received from individuals (mostly) and organisations, originally not consulted but who, nevertheless, wanted to engage in the Allocations process.</p> <p>The Council has throughout the preparation of the Allocations DPD sought to achieve full and early engagement, consistent with the concept of “front-loading”. It is almost inevitable however, in producing a DPD concerned with individual sites, that the scale of involvement, measured in terms of the site details advanced, increased through the successive stages of plan preparation and engagement. At the Issues & Options stage, the Council canvassed views on some 300 sites, based on its own knowledge and with the benefit of previous community and landowner views. Through the Issues & Options consultation, around a further 500 sites were promoted, resulting in the Preferred Options stage evaluating some 800 sites. This represents a very substantial number of sites for an authority the size of Hambleton (and a considerable quantity of information to assess) – and is one measure that demonstrates the extent to which the process has led to effective engagement.</p>
Research/ fact finding	
<p>Is the content of the development plan document justified by the evidence? What is the source of the evidence? How up to date and convincing is it?</p>	<p>Is the content justified by the evidence?</p> <p>A substantial evidence base underpins the preparation of the Allocations DPD, which is described below. This evidence has been used at each stage to inform the development of alternatives, fuel the debate about the selection of the preferred package of proposals – and in particular the specific sites identified for allocation and to assess matters raised by interested parties during consultation.</p> <p>All the evidence sources have been made widely available throughout plan preparation, including through the Council’s website. However, and more</p>

importantly, the information has been integrated into the successive consultation documents. Thus at each stage a wide range of technical and other information has been presented concerning each community or location, and about each specific site which was appraised for potential allocation.

This information, and its application to help determine the appropriate sites for inclusion, or rejection from the DPD, has been available and thus open to challenge throughout the DPD preparation. The selection of the preferred as opposed to the rejected alternatives, described below, has been based on evidence explicitly presented. Public responses during this process have provided a means to challenge and refine this information, and its interpretation.

What is the source of the evidence?

The solid evidence base from which the specific components of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] are derived comprises three main elements:

- i. specific studies prepared to address issues covered in the LDF;
- ii. the evidence provided by comments received from consultation responses;
- iii. the information and guidance provided by the Sustainability Appraisal.

Each of these is now considered in turn.

i. the following **studies** are those that have been the most relevant in supporting preparation of the Allocations DPD (and are listed in Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] para. 1.12.):

- Village Services & Town Council & Parish Council Consultation Report [LCD32];
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (and update) [LCD26 and LCD 26A];
- Town Centres [LCD29] and Car Parking Studies [LCD30, 30A & 30B];
- Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study [LCD65];
- Economic Development Study [LCD33];
- Spatial Report of the Hambleton Community Plan and Area Group Action Plans [LCD19];
- Housing Needs Survey [LCD27] and Housing Market Demand Study [LCD103];
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) [LCD101];
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) [LCD102 and LCD102A];
- Northallerton Allocations and Traffic Model [LCD105];
- Northallerton Northern Link Road Deliverability Report [LCD106];
- Northallerton Strategic Option Testing [LCD108];
- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment [LCD104];

- Viability Studies of Housing Sites [LCD107].

The development of the package of sites based on the evidence provided by these studies is explained within the Allocations DPD:

- the *Village Services Study* [LCD32] provides an important basis for the selection of Service Villages and Secondary Villages identified within the hierarchy of settlements defined in the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] (Spatial Principle 3 (paras. 3.4 – 5) and Core Policy CP4 (paras. 4.1.9 –12)). The Allocations DPD identifies specific sites for development which reflect this strategic approach and takes account of the local availability and location of facilities;
- the *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment* [LCD26 and LCD26A] provides background material for the determination of the LDF's strategy for the location and phasing of housing, but has been of particular relevance in considering the allocation and phasing of particular sites in developing the Allocations DPD. The first Assessment (January 2006) [LCD26] was updated in January 2009 [LCD26A];
- the *Town Centres Study* [LCD29] and *Car Parking Studies* [LCD30, 30A&B] provide the context for the LDF's approach to retail and town centre development, as defined in the Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD – and more specific guidance relating to local circumstances, needs and opportunities addressed in the Allocations DPD;
- the *Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study* [LCD65] provided the information base for the approach adopted in the adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94] (Policy DP37) concerning quantity, quality and accessibility of types of open space, and standards based on a local assessment of need – and assists the Allocations DPD in considering needs and opportunities for specific sites;
- the *Economic Development Study* [LCD33] provides the main context for determining the appropriate scale and distribution of employment land (Core Policy CP10) and employment priorities – and provides a local context for the development of employment land proposals in the Allocations DPD;
- the *Spatial Report of the Hambleton Community Plan and Area Group Action Plans* [LCD19] has helped provide the important link between the Community Plan and the approach and priorities of the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82], Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94], and in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] including the choice of specific allocations;
- the *Housing Needs Study* [LCD27], the *Housing Market Demand Study* [LCD103] and the *Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)* [LCD101] provide the main basis for the approach adopted in relation to the type, size and tenure of housing in the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] (Policy CP8) and the Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94] (Policies DP13 and DP14); and are proposed in current (and future updated) form to provide the basis for considering proposals for sites identified within the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199];
- the *Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)* [LCD102] was published in March 2008, after Preferred Options consultation, and updated in November 2008 [LCD102A]. Whilst this did not in general seek to identify new sites, the information obtained helped to develop the details (including in particular the infrastructure and development requirements, and the phasing) of

the proposals contained in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199];

- the *Proposed Submission Allocations Viability Studies* [LCD107] advised on the economic viability of a selection of sites proposed in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] across the District including major sites in each town, so as to ensure housing delivery;
- the *Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment* [LCD104] was commissioned to undertake landscape visual assessments of the proposed development options around the 5 market towns.
- the *Northallerton Allocations and Traffic Model* [LCD105]; *Northallerton Northern Link Road Deliverability Report* [LCD106] and *Strategic Options Testing Report* [LCD108]: these studies were specifically commissioned to address development issues concerned with the North Northallerton Area proposals contained in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199].

ii. **views expressed** during the progression of the Plan represent another key element of the evidence base on which the Allocations DPD is based, reflecting the general consensus reached around the Preferred Options. This is recorded in the Consultation Statement [LCD98]. Section 3.4 (page 40) summarises the main comments received to the preferred options and alternatives discounted. On the basis of the general support received to the preferred approach, but taking account of comments received, the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD document [LCD96] was prepared.

The Consultation Statement [LCD98] Section 3.4 summarises the response to comments made on the Preferred Options documents [LCD95], and the changes made in preparing the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD [LCD96]. A full set of the responses to the Allocations DPD Preferred Options consultation is presented in an accessible form in the Preferred Options Consultation Responses Schedule [LCD99], details being organised on a standard schedule for each site. These comments were taken into account in formulating the Submission Allocations DPD individual site proposals.

iii. the final main component in the evidence base supporting the contents of the submitted Allocations DPD is provided by **the Sustainability Appraisal**. The Final Sustainability Appraisal Report (April 2009) [LCD117A], assessed the Proposed Submission Allocations DPD [LCD96] and concluded in paras. 7.10 – 14 that the majority of predicted significant effects are positive. It comments that this largely “results from the adoption of a Core Strategy DPD which has already been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and is based on sound spatial principles and sets the framework for the Allocations DPD”. In particular it notes that development has therefore been steered towards settlements in the District that are most likely to present opportunities for sustainable development – with over half of new housing development proposed to take place in the Principal Service Centres of Northallerton and Thirsk.

The Final Sustainability Appraisal [LCD117A] also concludes that the site selection methodology used was successful “to the extent that it concentrates development within urban areas in the first instance (on brownfield sites), helping to reduce the need to travel to reach services and facilities and reducing the need to develop on greenfield sites which may be to the detriment of local countryside character”. It considers that the Council has also been largely successful in avoiding new development in areas that are susceptible to flooding – a key local issue for the District and a global issue in the context of adaptation to the effects of climate change.

The Sustainability Appraisal also comments favourably on the proposals for community infrastructure such as footpaths and cycle ways, improvements to transport interchanges, new and expanded schools and recreation land which it considers should help towards improved quality of life in the District.

Concluding that the individual site appraisals are generally positive, the Sustainability Appraisal nonetheless offers advice on outstanding issues that need to be considered in taking forward and reviewing the Allocations DPD (but which do not suggest the need for changes in the Submission document).

How up-to-date and convincing is the evidence?

Since commencement of work on the Hambleton LDF in 2004, a substantial body of evidence has been collected, and where critical, kept up-to-date with more recent surveys (eg. in the case of Housing Needs and the preparation of the SHLAA). In relation to the main studies undertaken to support the preparation of the LDF:

- the *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)* [LCD26 and LCD26A], was prepared in accordance with advice in the original PPS 25 (Annex E5). It was prepared "in house" in January 2006 in consultation with the Environment Agency. [LCD26]. It was updated in January 2009 [LCD26A]. The SFRA has been used by the Council to ensure that preferred site selection followed the risk based approach and satisfied the sequential test of site selection;
- the *Town Centres Study* (December 2004) [LCD29] was prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, Storeys:ssp and NEMS market research. It included (see para. 1.3 [LCD29]) an assessment of the five main town centres in Hambleton, and provided guidance on the hierarchy of market towns, and the role and function of each; the quantitative and qualitative need for additional floorspace in each town; the capacity of each town to accommodate new development; and the appropriate strategy for town centres in the District (including a review of existing Local Plan policies). This approach responded to guidance in PPS6 (draft at that time) advising local authorities to adopt a pro-active plan-led approach to planning for town centres;
- the *Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study* (August 2006) [LCD65] was prepared by PMP Consultants, and provided a full audit of facilities, established local needs and aspirations, and recommended standards of provision, in line with the guidance provided in PPG17 [NCD20], and directly following the step by step process suggested in the PPG17 Companion Guide [NCD53];
- the *Housing Needs Study* [LCD27] (November 2004) was prepared by David Cumberland Housing Regeneration Ltd, a specialist consultancy with considerable experience in analysis of local housing needs. The approach adopted reflected the key elements of the ODPM Housing Needs Assessment Guidance, and the ODPM Housing Market Assessment Manual (see [LCD27] para 1.2). It was supplemented and updated in relation to the wider market housing by the *Housing Market Demand Study* [LCD103] and *SHMA* [LCD101] in accordance with CLG SHMA Practice Guidance Version 2 (August 2007) and PPS3 (November 2006).
- the *SHLAA* [LCD102 (March 2008) and LCD102A (November 2008)] was prepared in-house, following CLG Guidance published in July 2007. It included establishment of a Housing Market Partnership, comprising house builders, a Registered Social Landlord, local property agents and a local community

	<p>representative;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the <i>Economic Development Study</i> (June 2005) [LCD33] was prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, and Storeys:ssp. This provided an analysis of Hambleton's economy, using commercial and other research, and also provided an analysis of the supply and take-up of employment land as of August 2004, leading to estimates of future demand and guidance on appropriate levels for which provision should be made. The approach adopted reflected established methodologies, and took account of research commissioned by the ODPM ("Planning for Economic Development", May 2004) (see [LCD33] para. 4.7)); - the <i>North Northallerton Studies</i> [LCD105, LCD106 & LCD108] were prepared over recent years by Jacobs Consultancy and involved developing a Traffic Model to test the major proposals for Northallerton and advising on delivery. Further work has been ongoing up to present, commissioned by the District and County Councils; - the <i>Proposed Submission Allocations Viability Studies</i> (January 2009)[LCD107] of housing sites was undertaken by JR Stroughair who previously worked for a national house builder and advised on land valuations and the economic viability of housing site developments in Yorkshire. He appraised a selection of sites proposed in the Submission Allocations DPD using standard house builder assessment methodology; - the <i>Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment</i> (December 2008) [LCD104] was prepared by Landcare. Through their professional judgements on landscape visual assessments of the proposed development options around the 5 market towns, this study determines the extent of visual impact. <p>The Allocations DPD Sustainability Appraisal was prepared by Land Use Consultants, a firm with considerable national experience in the preparation of such studies, and contributors to the development of national guidance on the process. The methodology followed in undertaking the Appraisal is described in the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report (April 2009) [LCD117A], Section 3 (page 31), and clearly followed the national guidance identified in that section, namely "Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents", ODPM November 2005 [NCD34]. It is also relevant to note that evidence considered and accepted by the Inspector at the Core Strategy Examination [LCD77 para. 3.2] demonstrated that the objectives comprising the Sustainability Framework are consistent with those established in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy.</p> <p>The response received from GOYH at Preferred Options stage [ASSA25] and on the Proposed Submission Development Policies DPD [ASSA26A, B & C] did not raise any observations suggesting that the background studies had not followed Government guidance or best practice in their preparation. No response at all was received during consultation on Issues and Options. Similarly, no concerns were raised by either Yorkshire Forward (the Regional Development Agency) or the Regional Assembly/Local Government Yorkshire and Humber (for example in relation to the preparation of the SHLAA or the Economic Development Study).</p>
<p>What assumptions had to be made in preparing the development plan document?</p> <p>Are the</p>	<p>The main assumptions and background context on which the LDF as a whole is based are set out in the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] Section 2, which provides a "portrait" of the District in paras. 2.3-14, and identifies the issues to be addressed (para. 2.15). Much of this background material is derived from the comprehensive body of information collated through the Community Plan process, but also draws on survey material from other sources, such as the Regional Economic Strategy [RCD2], and from the other strategies listed in the</p>

<p>assumptions reasonable and justified?</p>	<p>Adopted Core Strategy [LCD98] Annex 4 paras. 33 - 35. The Allocations DPD, in its role of supporting and elaborating the Core Strategy, is also based upon these assumptions.</p> <p>The Final Sustainability Appraisal Report on the Allocations DPD (April 2009) [LCD117A] sets out the comprehensive background information sources on which the Sustainability Appraisal (for the Core Strategy, Development Policies DPD and Allocations DPD) have been based – paras. 4.6 – 8 identify the baseline data and indicators, and paras. 4.9 - 51 provide a detailed characterisation of Hambleton and its sustainability issues.</p>
<p>Alternatives</p>	
<p>Can it be shown that the Council's chosen approach is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives? Have realistic alternatives been considered and is there a clear audit trail showing how and why the preferred strategy/approach was arrived at? Where a balance had to be struck in taking decisions between competing alternatives is it clear how and why these decisions were made?</p>	<p>The Council's approach has been to seek to secure consideration of the widest possible range of alternative sites – i.e. to ensure, in terms of the SA/SEA requirements and LDF guidance, that “all reasonable alternatives” have been considered.</p> <p>Evaluation of these sites has sought to establish the most appropriate package of sites, which meet the strategic requirements and approach set by national, regional and LDF (Adopted Core Strategy and Adopted Development Policies DPD) policies – and which are the most appropriate locally. In doing so, the full evidence base, comprising background studies, public comments and the Sustainability Appraisal, as described above, has been utilised.</p> <p>The approach taken by the Council has also sought to follow the principles of front-loading, and to seek throughout to establish agreement that the emerging package of sites was better than the alternatives. The debate on sites at the Preferred Options stage placed considerable emphasis on reaching agreement that sites should be rejected, as well as achieving support for those being promoted.</p> <p>Further details of these principles are now provided.</p> <p>Establishing all reasonable alternatives</p> <p>The District Council has throughout the process of preparing the Allocations DPD sought to identify the widest possible range of alternative sites, to evaluate against the principles of the emerging LDF strategy. This has been achieved both from the use of the Council's own information, and through giving wide publicity (see the description of Stage 2) to the scope for sites to be advanced by interested parties, including landowners and local communities.</p> <p>A summary of the consultation process, and comments received, is given in the Consultation Statement [LCD98] and in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 2. This explains the engagement undertaken at the Issues & Options stage, and the information published, to seek to identify appropriate sites, and obtain sufficient information about those sites. It also explains the progression to the Preferred Options stage, and the way in which earlier information was taken into account in developing the widest possible view of potential sites for inclusion. Since the evolution of the Allocations DPD Preferred Options as a response to the comments received is fundamental to the new “front-loaded” system, the Allocations Preferred Options documents [LCD95] also made reference to the main points raised in consultation on Issues & Options, within boxes headed “you told us that” set into the text (found at the start of each of the Service Centre and Service Village sections).</p> <p>The volume of sites generated through these processes has been very</p>

considerable, and has grown throughout the successive stages of preparing the DPD. At the Issues & Options stage around 300 sites were identified for consideration in the published documents, and about a further 500 sites came forward through consultation responses – i.e. a total of some 800 sites identified for subsequent consideration.

At that point, the process of focusing on all “reasonable” alternatives resulted in the discounting from detailed analysis of nearly 300 sites, because these were in locations not supported by the Core Strategy, and around a further 60 sites because these were below the minimum size threshold adopted of 0.3ha/10 dwellings. These are all listed in each of the separate sub area Preferred Options documents [LCD95] at Annex 6. Thus at the Preferred Options stage, the remaining almost 400 sites were advanced for further consideration. Of these, approximately 100 were identified as preferred sites, some being grouped to form larger sites. The remaining sites identified were recommended not to be taken forward as allocations.

Whilst early work to prepare the Allocations DPD took account of existing knowledge of land availability, including the Urban Potential Study Review in 2004 [LCD34], the latter stages, taking forward the Preferred Options document to produce the proposed submission draft, also took account of the Council’s first Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), published in March 2008 [LCD102]. The information obtained through the SHLAA confirmed the range of site options and helped to develop the details (including in particular the infrastructure and development requirements, and the phasing) of the proposals contained in the Submission Allocations DPD.

Identifying the appropriate sites for allocation

The principles adopted for site selection were described in Section 2 (supplemented by Annex 1) of each Preferred Options sub-area document [LCD95] – and thus made explicit and open to discussion. No significant adverse comments were received to this approach, and these principles, retained as the basis for selecting sites, are therefore set out in Section 2 of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199], supplemented in this case by details in Annex 3. The description in the Submission Allocations DPD Section 2 establishes the most important principles or objectives driving the allocation of land, relating to strategic considerations at the national, regional and local levels. For the main categories of housing and employment, this is followed by more detailed analysis, concerning the scale, timing and distribution of development, and the definition of the detailed criteria used in judging housing acceptability and sustainability. The iterative approach taken to take all these factors into account and derive the appropriate package of sites for inclusion in the LDF is explained in Annex 3. A description of the Sustainability Appraisal approach, which helped to ensure that all reasonable options were identified and progressed for further consideration, is also provided below.

Reaching agreement on the preferred package of sites – and balancing alternatives

The Allocations Preferred Options documents [LCD95] differ markedly from the traditional draft plans produced for consultation under the former development plans system (i.e. before the LDF system). Whilst these Preferred Options reports indicated clearly the preferred site package, with full reasons provided to allow for debate, they also placed considerable emphasis on showing in addition the other sites concerned which are intended to be rejected, and giving the reasons for their rejection – and thus allowing for full public debate on this

	<p>reasoning.</p> <p>The location plans for each main settlement thus typically showed both the preferred package and the rejected sites. The text clearly distinguished between the preferred sites package, and the rejected alternative sites, for each settlement. The justification for advancing the preferred sites, as a strategy for each main settlement, and for individual sites, was clearly set out in the text. The rejected sites and their commentary were distinguished by the textual device of their inclusion within shaded boxes, identified as rejected development options or sites. In each case there were full reasons identified for the rejection of the site or sites.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal of the Allocations DPD (October 2007) [LCD115] published at the Preferred Options stage, provided a full assessment (Appendix 5) of the Preferred Options selected, and those options not selected. The assistance of the Sustainability Appraisal process in comparing alternatives and deriving the appropriate package, and informing the public debate about the alternatives, is explained further in the next section.</p> <p>Establishing the audit trail</p> <p>The Consultation Statement [LCD98], and the summary contained in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 2, explain the way in which the Allocations DPD was developed based on full discussion of the alternative potential sites through this Preferred Options process, and thus how a debate was conducted on the preferred package of sites in comparison with alternatives rejected, before the final Allocations DPD was developed for submission. This process clearly allowed for discussion of competing sites and areas for development, and helped to derive the appropriate balance between those competing alternatives, making explicit the reasons for how and why the decisions were made.</p> <p>In effect, this commentary describes the “audit trail” showing how the submission strategy was arrived at. Details of the argument at each stage are provided in the documents referenced in this section.</p>
<p>Does the sustainability appraisal show how the different options perform and is it clear that sustainability considerations informed the content of the development plan document from the start?</p>	<p>A full Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken in parallel with the preparation of the Allocations DPD Preferred Options. This was prepared with the benefit of the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken throughout the development of the Core Strategy (the Core Strategy Final Sustainability Appraisal report [LCD12] was published in December 2005), and also the Sustainability Appraisal conducted of the Development Policies DPD (Final Report published August 2006 [LCD69]).</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal of the Allocations DPD (October 2007)[LCD115] was published at the Preferred Options stage, and provided a full assessment (Appendix 5) of the Preferred Options selected, and those options not selected. The importance of this Report, and the need to take its conclusions into account was made clear in each of the Preferred Options sub-area documents [LCD95], para 1.21. Annex 1 (para. 2) of those documents, which set out the detailed approach to site selection, established firstly that the Sustainability Appraisal had validated the suitability of the approach proposed (which involved an iterative process, designed to establish the acceptability and sustainability of sites), and secondly that the Sustainability Appraisal had provided a commentary on the conclusions reached (which was taken into account in reaching decisions on accepting or rejecting sites).</p> <p>The Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal [LCD115] (para. 5.230) found that “the majority of predicted significant effects are positive. There are very few</p>

	<p>significant negative effects predicted to result from the development of the Preferred Option sites". The Draft Sustainability Appraisal commented that to a large extent this resulted from the adoption of a Core Strategy DPD which had already been subject to SA, and thus that development had been steered towards settlements in the District that are most likely to present opportunities for sustainable development. In addition, the SA commented that the site selection methodology described in Annex 1 of each Preferred Options sub-area document [LCD95] was successful to the extent that it concentrated development within urban areas in the first instance, helping to reduce the need to travel to reach services and facilities and reducing the need to develop on greenfield sites which may be to the detriment of local countryside character.</p> <p>It should also be noted that at the time of the preparation of the Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal, a formal Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report was prepared [LCD117], which concluded (para. 4.4) that "any adverse effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites can be avoided or mitigated through the proper application of policy safeguards within and outside the planning process. The undertaking of further stages of the HRA process should therefore not be necessary".</p> <p>The Final Sustainability Report [LCD117A] documents the full extent of the analysis undertaken into the merits of alternative sites. Section 5 (and Appendix 5) considers all the sites rejected, and Section 6 (and Appendix 7) considers the preferred sites that have been included in the Submission Allocations DPD.</p> <p>At the time of Proposed Submission Plan publication (January 2009), the formal Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report was updated [LCD118] to reflect the published proposals. This updated report retains the conclusion [LCD118 para. 4.4] reached in the earlier Screening Report (prepared at the time of the Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal) that "any adverse effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites can be avoided or mitigated through the proper application of policy safeguards within and outside the planning process. The undertaking of further stages of the HRA process should therefore not be necessary".</p>
<p>Does the development plan document adequately expand upon regional guidance rather than simply duplicate it?</p> <p>Does the strategy take forward the regional context reflecting the local issues and objectives?</p>	<p>The intention of the Allocations DPD is to identify site allocations (and define Development Limits) that are consistent with and help deliver the wider policy context established at national, regional and strategic LDF levels. By its nature the Allocations DPD for Hambleton does not contain regional level proposals, nor does it duplicate regional guidance – but seeks to provide detailed interpretation through site specific proposals which thus take forward and expand upon the regional context.</p> <p>The Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] has been prepared to be in conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82], and consistent with the Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94]. These latter documents, both found to be sound through Public Examination, provide a clear context for the Allocations DPD, in terms of establishing an approach that has been found to be in conformity with regional guidance.</p> <p>The relationship between the Allocations DPD and the Core Strategy (and Development Policies DPD) is established in the Local Development Scheme paras. 2.2 and 5.16 to 5.20 [LCD109] and the Submission Allocations document [LCD199] paras. 1.5 – 6. The Allocations DPD provides the site details that will help to deliver the Core Strategy.</p> <p>In terms of the relationship between regional policies and the Allocations DPD, Section 2 of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] explains the principles of</p>

	<p>site selection, indicating in para. 2.3 that the most important principles or objectives are (in summary) to reflect and deliver the Core Strategy; to reflect the principles of the Development Policies DPD; to reflect national and RSS guidance; and to reflect local views.</p> <p>The explanation of the objective relating to regional guidance indicates that this includes the guidance contained in the RSS on the required sequence of search for development sites.</p> <p>Further details of the implications of these principles are provided for each of the main land uses – housing, employment and other uses (town centre and community uses) in the remainder of Section 2, and in Annex 3.</p> <p>No observations were received from the Regional Planning Body that indicated concerns about conformity in these respects, or about duplication of regional level guidance.</p>
--	--

Key question	Evidence provided
EFFECTIVE	
Deliverable	
<p>Has the Council clearly identified what the issues are that the development plan document is seeking to address?</p> <p>Have priorities been set so that it is clear what the development plan document is seeking to achieve?</p>	<p>The relationship between the Allocations DPD and the Core Strategy (and Development Policies DPD) is established in the Local Development Scheme paras. 2.2 and 5.16 to 5.20 [LCD109] and the Submission Allocations document [LCD199] paras. 1.5 – 6. The Allocations DPD provides the site details that will help to deliver the Core Strategy, consistent with the policies contained in the Development Policies DPD. The Adopted Core Strategy has established the Hambleton LDF’s portrait, spatial issues, vision, strategic objectives and strategic linkages with the delivery of the Community Plan.</p> <p>Section 2 of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] explains (para. 2.3) that the most important principles or objectives driving the allocation of land include to reflect and deliver the strategy set out in the Adopted Core Strategy. This means that the primary issues addressed by the Allocations DPD concern determining which sites should be identified, and securing that they are brought forward, in order to achieve the appropriate scale and distribution of different types of development identified in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Further details of the implications of the strategic principles established for the scale and distribution of development by the Adopted Core Strategy are provided for each of the main land uses – housing, employment and other uses (town centre and community uses) in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Section 2. The approach used in determining the appropriate sites to allocate has been described more fully above in relation to the comparison between alternatives.</p>
<p>Are there any cross-boundary issues that should be addressed and, if so, have they been adequately addressed?</p>	<p>Full consultation took place throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, the Development Policies DPD and the Allocations DPD with neighbouring authorities (Ryedale, Harrogate, Richmondshire, Scarborough, York, and the North York Moors National Park Authority, in the Yorkshire and Humber Region; and Darlington, Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees and Redcar & Cleveland in the North East Region, together with the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit). All these authorities are preparing LDFs.</p> <p>In addition to the dialogue between authorities during their preparation, the most important means of securing the satisfactory relationship between LDFs has been the context provided by the development of RSS for both Regions. The Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] Annex 4 explains this context, in particular indicating (paras. 9 –13) how the Hambleton area fits into the sub-regional context in the Yorkshire and Humber RSS [RCD5A], parts of the LDF area falling within the three sub-areas of the “Vales and Tees Links”, “York” and the “Remoter Rural”. Each of the LDFs being prepared for these areas has primarily ensured consistency by adhering to this context, and also by entering into the dialogue undertaken by the Regional Assembly whilst preparing the RSS. A similar dialogue took place with the authorities in the North East Region in the context of their emerging RSS (and was reflected in the Spatial Principles contained in the Adopted Core Strategy).</p> <p>Given that the Allocations DPD is intended to identify sites to support delivery of the Core Strategy, most of the issues in relation to the plans prepared by</p>

	<p>neighbouring authorities are likely to have been addressed in the context of the Core Strategy preparation. Correspondence at each stage of the preparation of the Allocations DPD is documented in the Allocations Consultation Statement [LCD98]. Although the adjacent authorities were consulted on the Allocations DPD at Preferred Options stage (and indeed concerning Issues and Options), only 2 responses were received (from Middlesbrough BC and the North York Moors National Park Authority). This is not surprising given the preceding dialogue on the Core Strategy, and the role of the Allocations DPD described above.</p> <p>Apart from consultation undertaken in the context of contributing to the development of RSS for this Region, formal joint work between authorities has been limited. One exception has been the joint commissioning of a study of renewable energy potential by the North Yorkshire Authorities [RCD28], which was particularly relevant in progressing Policy DP34 within the Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94, page 65].</p> <p>A Sub-regional (York and North Yorkshire) Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment was also jointly commissioned and undertaken in 2007/08 and published in May 2009 [RCD34] in accordance with Policy H6B of RSS.</p>
<p>Does the development plan document contain clear objectives?</p>	<p>Since the Allocations DPD is designed to identify site specific proposals which help to deliver the Adopted Core Strategy, and clearly sits within the framework established by the Adopted Core Strategy, there are no separate objectives set within the Allocations DPD. The objectives for the Allocations DPD are therefore set by the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The primary intention of the Allocations DPD, in terms of identifying sites consistent with national, regional and local guidance, and achieving the requirements of the Core Strategy (whilst being consistent with the policies contained in the Development Policies DPD) is set out in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Section 2.</p>
<p>Are the objectives specific to the place; as opposed to being general and applicable to anywhere?</p> <p>Is there a direct relationship between the identified issues and the objectives?</p>	<p>The Adopted Core Strategy establishes objectives specific to Hambleton, and also provides a clear link between the issues identified for the LDF to tackle, and the objectives and policies of the LDF Strategy designed to address those issues. The Allocations DPD supports the delivery of the Core Strategy by identifying site specific proposals. The principles of site identification reflect national and regional, as well as local considerations, but the selection of sites is necessarily based on direct evaluation of local circumstances.</p>
<p>Is it clear how the policies will meet the objectives?</p> <p>Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, with regard to the objectives of the development plan document?</p>	<p>The relationship between the sites proposed and the principles identified for their selection is made clear in the justification accompanying the strategy for each settlement, and the proposals made for each individual site.</p> <p>It is not believed that there are any gaps in coverage of this Allocations DPD, the context for which is set by the Adopted Core Strategy, specifically in the case of housing and employment in terms of the need to identify the scale and distribution of development determined by that Strategy. Proposals for other uses reflect local considerations, including priorities established in the Community Plan and local linked initiatives. In these cases proposals clearly must be limited by what is physically possible to identify and viable to achieve in</p>

	<p>terms of current understanding of resource availability. Other proposals may come forward through time that are not currently identified, but which will be considered against the policies and principles established in the Adopted Core Strategy and Adopted Development Policies DPD. Consultation during the preparation of the document has not revealed any gaps on the policies and proposals.</p>
<p>Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives?</p>	<p>Where appropriate and relevant, the timing of specific site proposals is indicated in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199]. This may reflect the timing of availability of the land for development, the availability of resources, or the timing of necessary infrastructure or other works required before development can commence.</p> <p>The timing of all proposals for <i>housing</i> is identified in the Submission Allocations DPD, by identifying in which of three phases development is intended to take place. The allocation of land to particular phases is necessary to achieve the required scale, distribution and availability through time established by the Adopted Core Strategy, and to meet the requirements of PPS3 – Housing [NCD4A] in establishing the necessary quantity of land over the following 5, 10 and 15 year time periods. The reasons for allocation to particular phases are indicated in each case, and reflect the general timing reasons given above as well as the site specific circumstances.</p>
<p>Are the policies internally consistent?</p>	<p>Since the Allocations DPD is designed to help deliver the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82], and clearly sits within the framework established by the Adopted Core Strategy, consistency of the proposals made in the Allocations DPD is derived largely from the consistency of the components and approach of the Adopted Core Strategy itself.</p>
<p>Does the development plan document contain material which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is already in another plan - should be logically be in a different plan - should not be in a plan at all? 	<p>The role and content of the Allocations DPD is precisely prescribed – it has a simple and limited responsibility: to identify sites for development, and establish the Development Limits for settlements defined in the Core Strategy. Thus there is no overlap of responsibilities with the Core Strategy or the Development Policies DPD. The purpose of the Allocations DPD has also been clearly established in the successive LDS documents, which have been supported by GOYH. The Allocations DPD does not contain any policies other than site specific proposals.</p> <p>The need for the Allocations DPD to identify land for development reflects the objectives of the Core Strategy (and national and regional guidance) to ensure that land for particular uses is made available and brought forward, particularly to provide land to meet plan area needs for housing and for employment related development. In these terms it also clearly discharges the requirements of PPS3 (Housing) in identifying land to meet requirements in particular time periods.</p>
<p>Does the development plan document explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</p>	<p>Intended implementation methods and agents are explained throughout the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199].</p> <p>The importance of maintaining and developing linkages with the programmes of partners is explained where appropriate – for example in relation to the achievement of proposals for community facilities, working with the house builders who will actually deliver most of the new housing; and with local communities and developers to secure the most appropriate development schemes. The major issue of securing appropriate infrastructure provision is considered below.</p>
<p>If there are</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD concerns the allocation of sites for development (and the</p>

<p>development management policies, are they supportive of the strategy and objectives?</p>	<p>definition of Development Limits around certain settlements). It does not include general policies or development management policies. Development Management policies are contained within the adopted Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD.</p>
<p>Is it clear who is intended to implement each part of the strategy/ development plan document?</p> <p>Where actions required to implement policy are outside the direct control of the council, is there evidence of commitment from the relevant organisation to implement the policies?</p> <p>Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales for implementation of the policies clearly identified?</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD is fundamentally concerned with the identification of sites for future development for particular types of use, which will contribute to the achievement of the LDF's strategic objectives. In these terms, implementation of the DPD's proposals can be expressed in simple terms as dependent on two sets of factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the willingness of the site owners, and potential developers, to bring forward the site for the type of development and in the form proposed; 2. the feasibility of development taking place, in terms of overcoming development constraints relating to the site. These are of two main categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - overcoming physical constraints such as achieving access, or avoiding risks of flooding, which could relate to on or off site issues which need to be resolved; - ensuring that infrastructure in the locality is adequate to meet the requirements of the development. <p>Taking these issues in turn, the approach of the Allocations DPD to the implementation (and the timing) of its proposals can be set out.</p> <p>In terms of the <i>willingness of site owners and developers to bring forward the individual site proposals</i>, views have been canvassed throughout the preparation of the plan. In some cases (which are indicated) the sites are within the control of the District Council. However, in most cases site ownership and delivery will not be by the Council, but by other parties. Each site is believed to be likely to be brought forward for development, and where relevant, details are included within the justification for each site. In many cases land owners and developers have engaged in a dialogue with the Council, and reference is made to masterplanning and detailed schemes where this is the case. These issues are considered further in relation to the feasibility of development below.</p> <p>In the case of housing schemes, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is particularly helpful in relation to these issues, because all the housing sites proposed (and the others surveyed in the SHLAA) have been assessed in terms of the constraints to development, and the availability and achievability of development. In the latter respects the assessment, backed by the review of the established Housing Market Partnership, has taken account of market conditions and the consequent likelihood of the site being promoted for development. Timing issues about availability and achievability have also been identified. Where relevant, details are included in the housing site justifications in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199]. In overall terms, all the housing sites, having been reviewed through the SHLAA, can be seen to be capable and likely to be brought forward by their land owners and willing developers.</p> <p>The Consultation Statement [LCD98A] and the summary contained in Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 2 provide indications of the response of landowners and developers both to the overall approach, and to the likely bringing forward for development of individual sites.</p>

	<p>A number of the sites relate not to commercial opportunities for housing or employment related developments, but to provision for community facilities. In these cases the supporting justification indicates the agencies or bodies who will undertake development (and potentially run the facilities), and their commitment to the specific project. Issues of resource availability and timing of development (which may well be related) are also addressed.</p> <p>Turning to the <i>feasibility</i> of each development, issues relating to overcoming on or off site physical constraints are dealt with in relation to each site, and explained within the justification text. These concerns are not directly relevant to this soundness question (being matters for the assessment of alternatives).</p> <p>Matters relating to infrastructure capacity and provision are considered under the next question.</p>
<p>Have the infrastructure implications of the strategy/policies clearly been identified?</p> <p>Is it clear who is going to deliver the required infrastructure and does the timing of the provision complement the timescale of the strategy/policies?</p>	<p>Development of the sites proposed in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] is critically dependent on the adequacy of existing, or provision of new, infrastructure. Infrastructure issues are referred to throughout the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199], in relation to each settlement and to each specific development proposals. Annex 4 brings all the infrastructure considerations together, to form the “Strategic Infrastructure Plan”. This Annex describes the infrastructure issues in terms of requirements, future provision, resourcing, and delivery agents – both from the perspective of the categories of infrastructure and from the collective infrastructure position in each major settlement or development area.</p> <p>This fundamentally important aspect of the DPD, and its soundness, is now considered more fully, in terms of the development of the approach through the preparation of the DPD, and its final expression in the Submission Allocations DPD.</p> <p>At the Issues & Options stage, the focus was on the identification of potential sites to consider for development. The published analysis for each site identified development issues relating to availability (and thus ownership) and accessibility.</p> <p>At the Preferred Options stage, the approach to site selection (Preferred Options documents [LCD95] Section 2, and Annex 1) identified the importance of addressing development constraints and opportunities, including infrastructure issues. In terms of the assessment of site acceptability, the approach identified within those considerations to be taken into account the category of “feasibility”. This included capability of development (in particular being within the capacity of existing or proposed infrastructure, and taking account of timing implications), and likelihood of being brought forward for development during the plan period.</p> <p>Within the following consideration of proposals, for each settlement a commentary was provided on accessibility and infrastructure issues, and the explanation of the preferred and rejected sites included consideration of specific infrastructure potential and constraints. Thus feasibility issues relating to the adequacy of infrastructure, and the implications of the need for further provision, and its timing, were key elements of the assessment of sites which led to the selection of the packages of sites proposed for submission – and on which views were sought through the Preferred Options consultation process.</p> <p>In the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] the preceding structure of analysis is retained and further details and justification are provided.</p> <p>The importance of the Strategic Infrastructure Plan (included as Annex 4 to the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199]) is indicated in LCD199 paras. 1.17 – 18. Section 2 retains the description of the approach to site selection presented at</p>

Preferred Options stage. This indicates all the factors to be taken into account to deliver the scale and distribution of development required by the strategic context, and its timing – the latter requiring account to be taken of the Adopted Development Policies DPD Policy DP11 on phasing, including consideration that development is feasible in the relevant timescale, for example that infrastructure capacity exists or is programmed to be available. The detailed supporting Annex (Annex 3 in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199], Annex 1 in the Preferred Options documents [LCD95]) is also retained, providing further details on site selection concerning the importance of feasibility and infrastructure considerations.

Within the area sections of the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199], considerable attention is given to infrastructure concerns. At the start of each area section (sections 4.3, 5.3, 6.3, 7.3 and 8.3), a review of Strategic Infrastructure provides a summary by sub area, settlement, or area, of the main infrastructure issues, identifying issues of timing, resources and implementation agencies. Infrastructure issues are also expressed where relevant in the strategic overview of the characteristics of each Service Centre and Service Village.

Most of the infrastructure issues however are addressed in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] on a site by site basis, within the details of each site proposal. The format adopted for each proposal is to define formal requirements in bold in the policy itself, which could include infrastructure provision. Within the reasoned justification, a standard format has been adopted, which includes details of major requirements (explaining the policy requirements) in the section headed Development Requirements and Explanation, and more specific details of implementation agents and timing under the Implementation heading. Where the scheme is particularly complex (for example North Northallerton, or South West Thirsk), reference is made to supporting studies and masterplanning work, which address specific infrastructure provision, resourcing and timing matters.

Annex 4 draws together all the infrastructure considerations, providing an overview in the form of the Strategic Infrastructure Plan. This reviews the treatment of infrastructure in the DPD, and indicates the intention to provide more detailed guidance on Infrastructure Provision and Delivery through the preparation of an SPD. The Annex indicates that this SPD, together with the infrastructure context established in the DPD and drawn together in the Annex, will help provide the means of implementing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that is currently being developed by the Government (PPS12 para. 4.12).

Details of the content and timing of the proposed Infrastructure Provision and Delivery SPD is set out in the Local Development Scheme No.4 paras 5.41 - 5.44 [LCD109].

Annex 4 then provides a review of the scale of change expected in the District as a result of the LDF's proposals, to understand the extent of the burden on future infrastructure capacity. The remainder of the Annex addresses infrastructure issues in two ways.

Firstly, Annex 4 Section 3 analyses infrastructure issues by infrastructure category. The analysis takes the broadest possible definition of infrastructure, to include *physical infrastructure* (such as transport facilities, utilities and waste disposal), *environmental (or "green") infrastructure*, which includes open spaces, provision for biodiversity, and flooding prevention; and *social infrastructure*, including education, health, culture and leisure facilities. This commentary refers to the ongoing dialogue with the relevant agencies concerning the adequacy of existing provision, and future proposals, demonstrating the

	<p>feasibility of the scale of change and individual proposals advanced in the Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199].</p> <p>Secondly, Annex 4 Section 4 analyses strategic infrastructure issues by location (sub area and settlement), enabling a perspective to be taken on the overall feasibility of development proposals in that locality. This analysis identifies infrastructure category, scheme, purpose, resourcing (in terms of future requirements and gaps), the agencies involved and the timing of provision.</p> <p>Both sections have been the subject of detailed dialogue with the agencies concerned, and the contents reflect the outcome of this dialogue. This dialogue is now continuing on a more formal basis with two LSP Infrastructure Groups (Physical & Social/Community) being established in June 2009 and meeting every few months.</p> <p>In summary, as the feasibility of the DPD's proposals (and thus the soundness of the DPD) is critically dependent on infrastructure provision and timing, these are matters addressed throughout the DPD.</p>
<p>Does the development plan document reflect the concept of spatial planning?</p> <p>Does it go beyond traditional land use planning by bringing together – and integrating – policies for development, and the use of land, with other policies and programmes from a variety of organisations that influence the nature of places and how they function?</p>	<p>The Allocations DPD is designed to identify site specific proposals which will help deliver the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82].</p> <p>The approach of the Adopted Core Strategy in relation to spatial planning provides a secure context for the Allocations DPD. The Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] Annex 1 (page 61) explains the concept of “spatial planning”, and sets out the key components of spatial planning in terms of national guidance published at the time of its adoption.</p> <p>The proposals of the Submission Allocations DPD relate specifically to the allocation of land for development – and thus are similar in purpose to the traditional focus of land use planning. However, the intentions of allocating land are driven specifically by the objectives of the Core Strategy, which has a clear spatial planning focus. This can be seen clearly in terms of the identification of the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy (Spatial Principle 3, and Core Policy CP4). This strategy, in terms of the identification of specific settlements with specific roles, with consequent implications for development and land release, has direct “place-shaping” intentions that are at the heart of the concept of spatial planning. These intentions seek to co-ordinate the plans and strategies of other bodies and the delivery of their services.</p> <p>These “place-shaping” responsibilities are thus delivered in part by the allocations made in the Submission Allocations DPD, and which in themselves take a place-shaping approach to determining the appropriate forms and directions of development in each of the settlements considered. The ‘place-shaping’ approach has involved a more visionary and ambitious approach to making allocations; seeking where possible to ensure that development delivers a range of community benefits and reflects the priorities of partners.</p>
<p>Does the development plan document take into account matters which may be imposed by circumstance, notwithstanding the Council's views</p>	<p>As the preceding responses indicate, most of the implementation of the Allocations DPD lies within the hands of agencies other than the District Council. The actions of others are therefore critically important for the achievement of the proposals contained in the DPD. At this stage, it is possible to form a view that all the proposals are likely to be <i>capable</i> of being brought forward during the plan period, and also that they are <i>likely</i> to be brought forward. In the latter case, clearly market conditions are at the best of times difficult to be accurate about – and at the current time, extremely difficult to be confident about in detail. But the Allocations DPD (and the LDF) seeks to provide a long term framework, for a period of at least 15 years from adoption. If sites are not brought forward, then</p>

about the matter?	<p>the Council, with its partners (and in particular the Local Strategic Partnership) will do all in its power to encourage delivery and tackle obstacles to delivery which may arise. At the present time, as the previous answers have indicated, it is considered that realistic and deliverable proposals have been included.</p> <p>It may be that future reviews of the DPD would enable alternatives to be considered – if it is that current proposals prove in future market conditions to be unviable. But that is not the current starting point. The Adopted Core Strategy provides a strategic context for the future development of Hambleton that, in being found to be sound through Public Examination, can be seen to be resilient and robust. Further consideration to the flexibility of the DPD will be given under the next questions.</p>
-------------------	--

Flexible	
Is the development plan document flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances?	<p>The Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82] was developed against the context of an analysis of the issues and circumstances of Hambleton, demonstrated by the evidence base, and reflected in the portrait of the District contained in LCD82 paras. 2.3 -14 (page 6), and the issues to be addressed in para. 2.15 (page 10). The Core Strategy provides a robust basis for responding to these issues.</p> <p>The Allocations DPD is designed to elaborate and provide further detail about the Core Strategy. The robustness of its approach derives largely from the Core Strategy.</p> <p>However, it is clear that some of the proposals in the Allocations DPD are based upon major decisions concerning for example the availability of infrastructure, which could jeopardise the delivery of the Plan. Plan components in these cases could theoretically be outside the capability of delivery of the Council and its partners. Nevertheless, the preceding commentary has demonstrated the lengths that the Council has pursued to achieve agreement, and undertakings, with the landowners, developers, infrastructure providers and key delivery agencies, to ensure that all the proposals advanced are capable of delivery and will be delivered.</p> <p>In the event that future obstacles become apparent, the Council, with its delivery partners (and in particular the Local Strategic Partnership) will do all in its power to secure a resolution of such difficulties. This might be through diverting funding, eg. through the Council’s Economic Development Fund or the programmes of partners, such as Yorkshire Forward). There are, in terms of the proposals in this DPD, no significant risks, in response to which at this stage the Council considers it necessary to identify contingency options.</p> <p>Most of the development proposals in this Allocations DPD are relatively self-contained. Thus failure to bring forward a specific site for development should not have major implications for the overall delivery of the LDF strategy. Some proposals are however large in scale and complexity (in particular North Northallerton, South West Thirsk and several others in the main Service Centres). In relation to these schemes, the DPD explains in more detail, backed by specific studies, the key components of the schemes, and the likelihood of development. In these schemes, as in the overall package of sites presented, there will also be scope to rephase development if necessary – and the masterplanning of the major schemes will need to take this into account.</p> <p>Mechanisms are in place through the definition of indicators and the process of producing the AMR, to monitor the overall delivery of the Allocations DPD (and the sustainability indicators identified in the Sustainability Appraisal), and to</p>

	<p>assess the changing context and relevance of the Allocation DPD's (and the other LDF components') approach.</p>
<p>Is the development plan document sufficiently flexible to deal with any changes to, for example, housing figures from an emerging Regional Spatial Strategy?</p>	<p>As commented above, the Adopted Core Strategy provides a strategic context for the future development of Hambleton that is resilient and robust (and has been judged to be sound in that respect through Public Examination). Most of the major contextual changes likely (eg. changes in the approach of the RSS, perhaps in terms of the quantity of development required) are matters for the Core Strategy. The approach of the Core Strategy has been to provide a strong set of principles to guide development, which are likely to be flexible enough to guide development despite potential variations in strategic requirements (eg. from the RSS), or changes in market conditions over a limited period. The directions and form of development proposed in the Adopted Core Strategy, which are progressed in terms of real sites through this Allocations DPD, are thus likely to form a continuing basis for directing change in the District.</p>
<p>Does the development plan document include the remedial actions that will be taken if the strategies/policies are failing?</p>	<p>The response to the previous questions indicates that the Allocations DPD sits within the robust and resilient context of the Adopted Core Strategy. The nature of the Allocations DPD, in bringing forward site proposals to deliver the intentions of the Core Strategy, is such that no specific remedial actions are included. If individual sites are not brought forward on the timescale proposed, efforts will be made, as indicated above, to overcome obstacles to development. Rephrasing of proposals may be necessary. The overall delivery of the developments intended by the Allocations DPD will be kept under review through the proposed monitoring arrangements, including by the publication of the AMR. Full or partial review of the DPD will be possible if such monitoring warrants changes to be considered. Partial reviews are more likely, given the nature of the site specific proposals in this DPD.</p>

Monitoring	
<p>Does the development plan document contain targets and milestones that relate to the delivery of the policies, including housing trajectories where the plan contains housing allocations?</p>	<p>Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 6 describes the arrangements for monitoring, and Table 1 identifies the indicators and proposed targets. Since the LDF will be monitored as a whole, the Table also explains where the monitoring will actually be undertaken in relation to the Core Strategy, Development Policies and Allocations DPDs.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Core Strategy also proposes a monitoring framework, to assess the sustainability effects of implementing the LDF as a whole – this was considered in the Core Strategy Final Sustainability Appraisal (December 2005) [LCD12: see Section 7, page 87]. Monitoring of these sustainability effects will also be undertaken within the Annual Monitoring Report (see below).</p> <p>Within the Hambleton LDF, housing trajectories are defined for the LDF area as a whole, and for each sub-area, within the Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94]: see Policy DP11 and Annex 6.</p>

<p>Is it clear how these are to be measured and are these linked to the production of the annual monitoring report?</p>	<p>Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 6 paras. 2 – 3 describe the monitoring process, and the key role in this that will be provided by the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The monitoring process will be reported annually each December, through the AMR. The latest AMR (December 2009) [LCD111A] explains this context, reviews progress on the LDF, and sets a context for the annual review of the LDF.</p> <p>Annex 6 para. 6 also explains that the involvement of partner organisations in monitoring will be sought wherever appropriate, including that a close relationship will be maintained with the monitoring process being undertaken at the regional level, since there will also be an annual monitor of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>Are suitable targets and indicators present (by when, how and by whom)?</p>	<p>The Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] Annex 6 (see paras. 4 – 5) explains how the measuring process and indicators used relate to and are compliant with the latest national guidance.</p> <p>No adverse comments have been received on these matters from either the GOYH, or Local Government Yorkshire and Humber (which is taking a major role in co-ordinating consistent information gathering at the regional level).</p>

NATIONAL POLICY

<p>Does the development plan document contain any policies or proposals that are not consistent with national planning policy? If yes, is there a local justification?</p>	<p>The Council does not believe that there are any policies or proposals contained in the Submission Allocations DPD that are not consistent with national guidance. There has been no intent to develop any approach not consistent with national guidance, and thus no argument will be found in the Submission Allocations DPD seeking to justify a local departure from the national approach.</p> <p>The Submission Allocations DPD [LCD199] has been prepared to be in conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy [LCD82], and consistent with the Adopted Development Policies DPD [LCD94]. These documents, both found to be sound through Public Examination, provide a clear context for the production of the Allocations DPD, in terms of establishing an approach which is consistent with national guidance, and against which alternative sites should be evaluated.</p> <p>The relationship between the Allocations DPD and the Core Strategy (and Development Policies DPD) is established in the Submission Allocations document [LCD199] paras. 1.5 – 6. The Allocations DPD provides the site details that will help to deliver the Core Strategy.</p> <p>In terms of the relationship with national policies, Section 2 of the Submission Allocations document [LCD199] explains the principles of site selection, indicating in para. 2.3 that the most important principles or objectives are (in summary) to reflect and deliver the Core Strategy; to reflect the principles of the Development Policies DPD; to reflect national and RSS guidance; and to reflect local views.</p> <p>The explanation of the objective relating to national guidance indicates that this includes the approach to building sustainable communities, and the guidance on the selection of housing land in PPG3 (now PPS3).</p> <p>Further details of the implications of these principles are provided for each of the main land uses – housing, employment and other uses (town centre and community uses) in the remainder of Section 2, and in Annex 3.</p> <p>No observations were received from GOYH that indicated concerns about consistency or conformity in these respects.</p>
<p>Does the development plan document contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance? If so, why have they been included?</p>	<p>The intention of the Allocations DPD is to identify site allocations (and define Development Limits) that are consistent with and help deliver the wider policy context established at national, regional and LDF levels. By its nature the Allocations DPD does not contain general policies – but seeks to provide detailed interpretation through site specific proposals which thus take forward and expand upon the national, regional and LDF context.</p> <p>The relationship between the Allocations DPD and the Core Strategy (and Development Policies DPD) is established in the Submission Allocations document [LCD199] paras. 1.5 – 6. The Allocations DPD provides the site details that will help to deliver the Core Strategy.</p> <p>No observations were received from GOYH that indicated concerns about failure to add to national guidance (where this might be thought necessary), nor about duplication of national guidance (which clearly would be unnecessary).</p>

APPENDIX:

Documents referenced in the Allocations DPD Soundness Self Assessment Statement

- for ease of reference, all the documents referenced in this Statement are listed in this Appendix. It represents a sub-set of the full *Public Examination Core Document List*

National Planning

- NCD4A: PPS3: Housing (November 2006)
- NCD14A: PPS12: Local Spatial Planning (June 2008)
- NCD15A: Plan making Manual (published by Planning Advisory Service, on-line: <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pagelId=51391>)
- NCD20: PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- NCD30: Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004
- NCD30A: Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008
- NCD30B: Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009
- NCD32: Local Strategic Partnerships; Shaping their Future (ODPM) (December 2005)
- NCD33A: Local Development Frameworks – Examining Development Plan documents: Soundness Guidance (PINS) July 2008
- NCD34: Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM November 2005)
- NCD53: PPG17 Companion Guide

Regional and Sub-Regional Planning

- RCD5A: The Yorkshire & Humber Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy) (approved May 2008) (incorporating Regional Transport Strategy).

Local Planning

main reports

Core Strategy

- LCD77: PINS Report on the Examination into Hambleton Core Strategy DPD (February 2007)
- LCD82: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (Adopted April 2007)

Development Policies DPD

- LCD93: PINS Report on the Examination into Hambleton Development Policies DPD (November 2007)
- LCD94: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Adopted Development Policies DPD (February 2008)

Allocations DPD

- LCD50: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Issues & Options Consultation (5 documents: Northallerton, Thirsk, Bedale, Easingwold, Stokesley) (November 2005)
- LCD95: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Preferred Options documents – for each sub area: Bedale, Easingwold, Northallerton, Stokesley, Thirsk, plus Overview (October 2007)
- LCD96: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Proposed Submission Document, i.e. publication draft (January 2009)
- LCD199: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Submission Document, i.e. draft subject of Public Examination (December 2009)

consultation statements and responses

Core Strategy

- LCD8: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Core Strategy Pre-Submission Consultation Statement (February 2006)

Allocations DPD

- LCD97: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Report of Issues and Options Consultation - Allocations DPD (August 2007)
- LCD98: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Consultation Statement (January 2009)
- LCD98A: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Consultation Statement (June 2009)
- LCD99: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Preferred Options Consultation Responses Schedules
- LCD100: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Preferred Options representations
- LCD200: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Representations Statement (December 2009)

Background Studies

- RCD28: Delivering Sustainable Energy in North Yorkshire – Recommended Planning Guidance and Guidance for Developing Energy Action Plans and Strategies (October 2005)
- RCD34: Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment - North Yorkshire sub-region (May 2008)
- LCD19: Spatial Report of the Community Plan (November 2004)
- LCD26: Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Stage 1 (January 2006)
- LCD26A: Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Stage 1 Supplement (January 2009)
- LCD27: Housing Needs Survey (November 2004)
- LCD29: Hambleton Town Centres Study – Executive Summary & Volumes 1-3 (December 2004)
- LCD30: Car Parking Study (January 2002)
- LCD30A: Car Parking Validation Study (February 2003)
- LCD30B: Car Parking Strategy (April 2004)
- LCD32: Village Services and Town Council & Parish Council Consultation Report (June 2005)

- LCD33: Economic Development Study – Executive Summary & Report (June 2005)
- LCD34: Urban Potential Study – First Review (November 2004)
- LCD65: Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study and Appendices (August 2006)
- LCD101: Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (July 2008)
- LCD102: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (March 2008)
- LCD102A: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (November 2008)
- LCD103: Housing Market Demand Study (July 2008)
- LCD104: Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (December 2008)
- LCD105: Northallerton LDF Allocations and Traffic Model (November 2006)
- LCD106: Northallerton Northern Link Road Deliverability Report (October 2008)
- LCD107: Proposed Submission Allocations - Viability Studies of Housing Sites (January 2009)
- LCD108: Northallerton LDF Strategic Options Testing Report (December 2008)

other

- RCD2: Regional Economic Strategy 2003 – 2012
- RCD10: North Yorkshire Community Strategy – North Yorkshire Together – A Strategy for Local Communities 2005-08 Main document and summary
- RCD12: North Yorkshire County Council – Local Transport Plan for 2006 – 2011 (March 2006)
- LCD1: Hambleton District Wide Local Plan (1999)
- LCD15: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Statement of Community Involvement (28th March 2006)
- LCD16, 17, 84 & 109: Hambleton Local Development Scheme – 1st (15th March 2005), 2nd (21st April 2006), 3rd (24th April 2007), 4th (6th March 2009)
- LCD18: First Community Plan for Hambleton (June 2003)
- LCD18A: Community Plan for Hambleton 2006 – 2011 (June 2006)
- LCD55: Core Strategy Soundness Self Assessment Document (June 2006)
- LCD75: Development Policies DPD Soundness Self Assessment Document (March 2007)
- LCD110: Hambleton District Council Annual Monitoring Report (December 2007)
- LCD111: Hambleton District Council Annual Monitoring Report (December 2008)
- LCD111A: Hambleton District Council Annual Monitoring Report (December 2009)
- LCD112: Allocations DPD Soundness Self Assessment Document (January 2010)
- LCD112A: Allocations DPD SSA Reference Documents File (ASSA1-35)

Council reports

- LCD113: Cabinet Approval (18th September 2007) and Council Approval (18th September 2007) of Consultation on Allocations DPD Preferred Options and Final Draft Sustainability Appraisal
- LCD114: Cabinet Approval (25th November 2008) and Council Approval (16th December 2008) of Publication of Proposed Submission Allocations DPD and Sustainability Appraisal, and intention to submit
- LCD214: Cabinet Approval (4th August 2009) and Council Approval (22nd September 2009) of Second Stage Publication of Proposed Submission Allocations DPD and Final Sustainability Appraisal, and intention to submit

Sustainability Reports

- Core Strategy
- LCD9: Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Stage 1 Report (March 2004)

- LCD11: Core Strategy Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Report (including Non-Technical Summary of the Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal (June 2005)
- LCD12: Core Strategy Final Sustainability Appraisal + Appendices 1-6 (December 2005)
- LCD47: Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report 1 (March 2005)

Development Policies DPD

- LCD69: Sustainability Appraisal of Development Policies Submission Final Report (including Appendices 1-6 (August 2006)

Allocations DPD

- LCD201: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (March 2005)
- LCD115: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal + Appendices 1-5 (October 2007)
- LCD116: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Preferred Options document – Habitats Regulations Screening Report (October 2007)
- LCD117: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal + Appendices 1-7 (November 2008)
- LCD117A: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal + Appendices 1-7 (April 2009)
- LCD118: Hambleton Local Development Framework: Allocations DPD Proposed Submission DPD – Habitats Regulations Screening Final Report (January 2009)

Allocations DPD Soundness Document Set

Notices & Proposals Matters

- ASSA1 Allocations DPD Preferred Options: notice in two local newspapers (12th October 2007)
- ASSA2 Allocations DPD Preferred Options: Statement of Proposals Matters (12th October 2007)
- ASSA3 Proposed Submission Allocations DPD: notice in two local newspapers (23rd January 2009)
- ASSA4 Proposed Submission Allocations DPD: notice in two local newspapers (2nd October 2009)
- ASSA5 Proposed Submission Allocations DPD: Statement of Representations Procedure and Document Availability (23rd January 2009)
- ASSA6 Proposed Submission Allocations DPD: Statement of Representations Procedure and Document Availability (2nd October 2009)
- ASSA7 Submission Allocations DPD: notice in two local newspapers (18th December 2009)
- ASSA8 Submission Allocations DPD: Statement of Document Availability (18th December 2009)
- ASSA8A Submission Allocations DPD: Representations Statement (18th December 2009)
- ASSA8B Submission Allocations DPD: Public Examination notice in two local newspapers (5th February 2010)

Consultation Letters

Sustainability Appraisal – Scoping Report

- ASSA9 cover letters to 4 statutory consultees (plus list of consultees), and to other consultees (plus list of consultees), (11th March 2005)

Issues and Options (Reg 25)

- ASSA10 advance notification to Parish Councils (22nd September 2005); Parish Councils and District Councillors (4th November 2005); general consultees (and list of consultees) (11th November 2005); NYCC Highways & Transportation and Sport England (11th November 2005); specific consultees (and list of consultees) (17th January 2007)
- ASSA10A Press Release 17th May 2004 – Call for sites

Preferred Options (Reg 26)

- ASSA11 GOYH (11th October 2007)
- ASSA12 PINS (11th October 2007)
- ASSA13 general consultees (11th October 2007); other consultees (11th October 2007); all Parish Councils (including adjacent) (11th October 2007); list of consultees

Publication of Proposed Submission document

- ASSA14A GOYH, letter (22nd January 2009)
- ASSA14B GOYH, letter (2nd October 2009)
- ASSA15A Y&HA (seeking conformity statement) (22nd January 2009)
- ASSA15B Y&HA (seeking conformity statement) (2nd October 2009)
- ASSA16A notification to all specific consultees (and list of consultees) (22nd January 2009)
- ASSA16B notification to all specific consultees (and list of consultees) (2nd October 2009)
- ASSA17A notification to all general consultees (and list of consultees) (22nd January 2009)
- ASSA17B notification to all general consultees (and list of consultees) (2nd October 2009)

Submission

- ASSA18 letter to PINS supplying Reg. 30(1) documents to Secretary of State (18th December 2009)
- ASSA19 cover email to PINS sending electronic Reg. 30(1) documents to Secretary of State (18th December 2009)
- ASSA20 notice of Examination to all respondents to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD (18th December 2009)
- ASSA21 notification to all specific consultees (and list of consultees) (18th December 2009)
- ASSA22 notification to all general consultees (and list of consultees) (18th December 2009)

Examination

- ASSA23 details of Examination on website: copy of webpage (3rd February 2010)
- ASSA24 letters notifying respondents to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD of Examination Hearing sessions and Pre-Hearing meeting (1st and 9th February 2010)

Consultation and Formal Responses

GOYH

- ASSA25 response on Preferred Options, 22nd November 2007
- ASSA26A formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 1 (3rd March 2009)
- ASSA26B formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 2 (28th October 2009)
- ASSA26C formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 2 (12th November 2009)

Yorkshire & Humber Assembly/ Local Government Yorkshire and Humber

- ASSA27 response on Preferred Options (20th November 2007)
- ASSA28A formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 1 (5th March 2009)
- ASSA28B formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 2 (10th November 2009)
- ASSA28C formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 2 (Addendum) (9th December 2009)

Yorkshire Forward

- ASSA29 response on Issues and Options (20th December 2005)
- ASSA30 response on Preferred Options (20th November 2007)
- ASSA31 formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 1 (6th March 2009)

North Yorkshire County Council

- ASSA32 response on Issues and Options (Education Service, 16th February 2006; Heritage Section, 31st January 2007)
- ASSA33 response on Preferred Options (Rights of Way Section, 23rd October 2007; Children and Young People's Service, 19th November 2007; Countryside Service, 4th December 2007)
- ASSA34A formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 1 (Highways Section, 5th March 2009; Development and Countryside Services, 4th March 2009; Countryside Section, 24th February 2009; Heritage Section, 24th February 2009)

ASSA34B formal response to Proposed Submission Allocations DPD Stage 2 (Children and Young People's Service, 11th November 2009)

Other

ASSA35 letter from Chairman of Hambleton Strategic Partnership on Proposed Submission Allocations DPD (6th March 2009)

Hambleton District Council

Civic Centre, Stone Cross, Northallerton, North Yorkshire DL6 2UU
Tel: 0845 1211 555 Fax: 01609 767248 Email: planning.policy@hambleton.gov.uk

www.hambleton.gov.uk

