

Hambleton Local Development Framework

ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT EXAMINATION

SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION

Pre-Hearings Meeting: 10 March 2010

Hearings commence: 12 May 2010

Location: Civic Centre,
Stone Cross,
Northallerton,
North Yorkshire DL6 2UU

Inspectors: Karen McCabe BA MTP DMS MRTPI
Sian Worden BA DipLH MCD MRTPI

Programme Officer: Mrs Jayne Wall
Civic Centre, Stone Cross
Telephone No: 01609 767090
e-mail: jayne.wall@hambleton.gov.uk

SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION

1. This Schedule of Matters and Issues for Examination has been prepared by the Inspectors to guide and focus the discussion at the hearing sessions of the Examination into the Hambleton Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). It has been prepared using the Planning Inspectorate's *Examining Development Plan Documents: Soundness Guidance (August 2009)*, having regard to the representations made to the DPD.
2. The Paper lists the main topics and issues which are likely to be discussed. For each topic, it sets out a series of questions on which the Inspectors invite responses from the participants. A list of the relevant participants follows at the end of each topic. Participants are invited to respond to the questions raised in brief statements (no more than 3000 words per Matter), to be received by the Programme Officer **no later than 12 noon Monday 19 April 2010**. Responses can be made on the various topics and questions by all participants listed under that Matter and Key Issue, limited to the topics and issues raised in the original representation, both by those attending the hearing and those wishing to make further written representations.
3. Participants may wish to refer to information in previous representations and statements. In particular, the Council may wish to refer to information in the Self-Assessment of Soundness and Core Documents, to avoid unnecessary repetition. However, please note that the Inspectors only have copies of the representations made at formal publication stage. It is important that the representations and responses include all the evidence and supporting material, and for the Council, reference to the "core" evidence base, since the Inspectors are unlikely to accept further/new information once the hearing sessions commence. All material which participants wish to put before the Inspectors or refer to at the hearings or in writing should be submitted by the deadline indicated. This is to ensure the efficient running of the examination process and make sure that all the relevant material is available well before the hearing sessions commence. The submission of late information or evidence can seriously disrupt the hearing sessions and could disadvantage the participants, including the Inspectors. If participants wish to rely only on their original representation, no further statement is needed, but this should be confirmed with the Programme Officer.
4. As a result of the responses received to the Matters and Issues for Examination, detailed agendas for the hearing sessions will be issued shortly before they commence. However, it is unlikely that the Inspectors will introduce new issues or questions that do not arise from the topics and issues identified. Please note that not all matters and issues will be discussed at the hearing sessions; this will partly depend on those who wish to have an oral hearing, and some matters will be dealt with by written representations. The lists of those attending the hearing sessions are based on the latest information in the database. If participants wish to attend or not attend a particular session, they should let the Programme Officer know as soon as possible.
5. Participants are reminded that the Examination focuses on legal compliance and assessment of soundness as set out in PPS12 (¶ 4.48 – 4.52), with the starting point being the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. Participants are expected to explain why the plan is unsound in terms of a specific aspect of soundness and to specify how the plan should be altered, with clear evidence to support this course of action, where necessary.

HAMBLETON ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD)

SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION

1. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS¹

Key Issue:

Has the Allocations DPD complied with the relevant legislation?

- i. Has the DPD been prepared in accordance with the current Local Development Scheme and have the relevant details in the LDS been met?
- ii. Has the DPD been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement and met the minimum consultation requirements in the 2004 Regulations?
- iii. Has the DPD been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and is there a final report of the findings of the appraisal?
- iv. Has the DPD had regard to national policy?
- v. Is the DPD in general conformity with the approved Regional Spatial Strategy and has this been confirmed by Local Government Yorkshire and Humber? Is there sufficient local justification for any proposals which are not consistent with regional planning policy?
- vi. Does the DPD have regard to the Sustainable Community Strategies for the area (both county and district), and give spatial expression to the priorities identified in those strategies?
- vii. Has the DPD been screened for likely significant effects on any European Wildlife (Natura 2000) Sites within and near the plan area? If necessary, has an Appropriate Assessment under the Conservation (Natural Habitats, etc) (Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 been carried out?
- viii. Does the DPD state which policies are intended to supersede other saved development plan policies and identify the superseded policies in accordance Reg 13(5)? Is there a clear relationship with the submission Proposals Map?
- ix. Does the DPD comply with the 2004 Regulations (as amended), specifically in terms of publication of prescribed documents, local advertisements and notification of DPD bodies?

Attendance at hearing

Hambleton District Council

2. OVERVIEW OF ALLOCATIONS

Key Issue:

Does the overall scale, type and distribution of allocated land achieve the relevant objectives and targets of the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Hambleton Local Development Framework, in a sustainable manner consistent with national policy?

- (i) In broad terms, does the scale, type and distribution of allocated land contribute to maintaining a sustainable pattern of development in the district, consistent with the national, regional and local planning framework?
- (ii) Are there any obvious gaps in the coverage of this DPD, such as allocating sites for gypsy and traveller accommodation?
- (iii) Is the overall scale and type of allocations consistent with the relevant objectives, priorities and targets of the RSS and CS, in particular for housing and employment provision?
- (iv) Does the scale, distribution and phasing of allocations between and within the five sub areas reflect the principles of the settlement hierarchy in the CS?
- (v) In broad terms, do the allocations accord with the relevant policies of the DP DPD?

¹ These issues should be covered in the Council's Self-Assessment of Soundness

- (vi) Is there a sufficiently robust spatial framework to support housing allocations beyond 2021, having regard to the timeframe of the CS? In terms of spatial planning, is this approach reasonable and justified?
- (vii) Is the approach to phasing housing allocations, both in terms of the principle and the proposed time bands, reasonable and consistent with the LDF, regional and national policy, especially PPS3?
- (viii) Is the scale and phasing of the housing allocations sufficient to ensure a continuous five year supply of housing land, and a 5, 10 and 15 year supply of such land consistent with PPS3?
- (ix) Is the anticipated level and distribution of affordable housing arising from the allocations sufficient to meet identified need, consistent with the LDF, regional and national policy?
- (x) How will an appropriate mix of housing, including for people with special needs, be provided through the allocations, consistent with policy DP13?
- (xi) In overall terms, does the location and phasing of the housing allocations make an adequate contribution to meeting national, regional and local targets for the reuse of previously developed land?

Attendance at hearing

Hambleton District Council
 Mr GE Wright - Mr E Barker
 Mr D Mitchell, Mr N Smith (Barton Willmore) - Arla Foods; Whitfield Homes;
 Persimmon Homes
 Mr A Rose (Spawforths) - Redrow Homes

Written representations

LGYH
 HSE
 National Grid
 GOYH
 Northumbrian Water Ltd
 Yorkshire Forward
 NYCC Heritage and Environment
 English Heritage

3. APPROACH TO SITE SELECTION AND DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT LIMITS

Key Issue:

Is the overall approach based on a clear and robust process, reflecting community views and leading to sustainable outcomes consistent with the LDF spatial strategy and policies, national and regional policy?

- (i) Has the analysis of the merits and disadvantages of each site been objective?
- (ii) Has the analysis allowed an effective comparison of the sites with others in the same sub-area?
- (iii) How has site accessibility been assessed, and is this consistent with the approach in RSS policy YH7 and the criteria in Tables 13.8 and 13.9?
- (iv) Has the assessment of development viability been consistent and robust, particularly with regard to the delivery of affordable housing?
- (v) With regard to the sequential process have the sites in service villages been allocated, or phased, only where there are insufficient sustainable sites, that is sites which meet stages 1-3 of the sequential search, remaining in the service centres?
- (vi) If so, how has any short-term need for new housing in the service villages been accounted for?
- (vii) What assessment/selection process was undertaken between the Preferred Options and Allocations Submission stage? Were any new selection criteria applied and, if so, what was the justification for this?

- (viii) Has an appropriate methodology been used to review the Development Limits boundaries which will ensure the objectives and principles set down in LDF Policy DP8?

Attendance at hearing

Hambleton District Council

Mr GE Wright - Mr E Barker

Mr S Moss (HA); Mr R Edwards, Mr M Graham (Halcrow Group) - Highways Agency

Written representations

LGYH

4. OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

Key Issue:

Taken as a whole, does the Allocations DPD provide satisfactorily for the delivery of development, is it flexible, and does it enable adequate monitoring of its effectiveness?

- (i) Is there a clear and coherent policy 'audit trail' from the CS and DP DPD to enable delivery of the LDF policies through the allocations?
- (ii) Are the delivery mechanisms for the allocations clearly identified?
- (iii) Is it clear who is intended to deliver the allocated development, and are the key stakeholders 'signed up'?
- (iv) Are the allocations based on sound delivery planning of physical, social and green infrastructure?
- (v) Are the developer contributions envisaged appropriate, feasible and consistent with national policy?
- (vi) Where necessary infrastructure is likely to be publicly funded, has it been identified in relevant programmes and are the essential partners committed to delivery within the required timescale?
- (vii) Overall, are the allocations flexible, and capable of responding to varied or unexpected changes in circumstances?
- (viii) Have the main risks to delivery been identified, and how will contingencies be handled?
- (ix) Are clear targets and measurable outcomes in place for effective monitoring of delivery of the allocated sites and achievement of LDF objectives?
- (x) Are clear arrangements in place for monitoring and reporting the results?
- (xi) Are adequate management mechanisms in place to ensure delivery of allocations within the sub areas and across the district as a whole? Have remedial actions been identified?
- (xii) How will the likely significant effects identified by the sustainability appraisal be monitored?

Attendance at hearing

Hambleton District Council

Written representations

NYCC Children and Young Peoples Service

Yorkshire Water

5 **THE FIVE SUB AREAS – BEDALE, EASINGWOLD, NORTHALLERTON, STOKESLEY AND THIRSK**

Key Issue for each Sub Area:

Is the mix of allocated sites and defined development limits reasonable and appropriate, contributing to a sustainable pattern of development consistent with the LDF spatial strategy and policies, national and regional policy?

6 **INDIVIDUAL SITE ALLOCATIONS**

Key Issues:

Are the allocated sites appropriate, feasible and deliverable, having regard to the provision of necessary infrastructure, services, and affordable housing, and environmental constraints?

Are the detailed requirements for each allocation clear, reasonable and justified?

Particular questions for examination in relation to the soundness of each allocation are set out below:

BEDALE

- (i) **BH1** – Is there a suitable and available site on which to relocate the existing allotments so that the allocation is deliverable within Phase 1?
- (ii) **BH2 & BH3** – Is the phasing of both sites justified in terms of their brownfield/greenfield status and are they deliverable as phased given the different ownerships? Could the detailed access requirements, i.e. the loop layout and provision of access to the neighbouring site, BM2, be implemented?
- (iii) **BH4** – Why is the site considered more appropriate for housing than employment, whether the phasing is correct, whether the allocation boundary is correct, whether landscaping would enhance the site's appearance and lessen its impact from the Wensleydale Railway sufficiently?
- (iv) **BH5** – Could landscaping screen and lessen the site's impact sufficiently? Is the phasing correct and how could the clearance and remediation of the adjacent farm site be assured?
- (v) **BH6** – Is the allocation sustainable in comparison to other sites in Bedale, could the proximity to the sewage works be mitigated and how could access problems, such as increased traffic in Bedale town centre and limited availability of public transport, be addressed. Is the phasing correct with regard to the site's proximity to town centre and other facilities?
- (vi) **BM1** – Has adequate recognition been given to the position of the site within the Bedale Conservation Area, will the proposed mix of development will meet the needs of the town centre?
- (vii) **BM2** – Could development on the allocated site adequately safeguard the listed building at Warwick House? Is a local shop likely to be established at the site and if so, when.
- (viii) **BC1** – Would the amount of new parking provided adequately replace that lost during redevelopment and also meet future needs? Will funding be in place for the facility to be provided at an appropriate time and thus allow redevelopment? How would the proposed use protect the neighbouring listed buildings?

- (ix) **BC2** – Is the relief road likely to be delivered, what are the implications for other allocations if it does not come forward?
- (x) **BC3** – Are the footpath and cycleway deliverable and are they essential to the sustainability of other allocated sites?
- (xi) **BC4** – Given the anticipated date of provision is this a feasible allocation which will meet the need generated from other allocated sites? What facilities are proposed to cater for various sectors of the community taking account of the findings of the Open Space Study and is a suitable alternative site available for the relocated allotments with particular regard to accessibility for existing allotment holders?
- (xii) **BH7 (Crakehall)** – Will the allocated site meet the housing needs of the local population in the most sustainable way and at the right time, is the site boundary correct and capable of providing appropriate layout, open space, landscape buffer, affordable housing?
- (xiii) **BH9 (Leeming Bar)** – Will the site's contribution to meeting local housing needs outweigh the disadvantage to future occupiers resulting from it being within the RAF Leeming Noise Insulation Area, is the timing of the site appropriate, what is the risk of flooding at the site?
- (xiv) **BM4 (Leeming Bar)** – will the site's contribution to meeting local housing needs outweigh the disadvantage to future occupiers resulting from it being within the RAF Leeming Noise Insulation Area, are the aspirations for the site, particularly to provide a village centre and 40% affordable housing, deliverable, is the phasing of the housing element appropriate?
- (xv) **BE1 (Leeming Bar)** – Is an employment allocation needed and sustainable in this location?
- (xvi) **BC5 (Leeming Bar)** – What evidence is there that this is the most appropriate site for a motorway service station to serve this section of the A1 (M)? Is it necessary to include an allocation for a Motorway Service Area in the Allocations DPD?
- (xvii) **BH8 (Snape)** – Is it likely that an alternative site for the existing business will be identified in order for the allocation to be delivered during Phase 2. In the light of the flood alleviation measures needed, the proximity to the airfield and its position within and adjacent to the conservation area is the site the most appropriate to meet local housing needs. How will the clearance and reinstatement of the unallocated part of the site be ensured? Is the number of houses appropriate with regard to the character of the village and infrastructure requirements?
- (xviii) **BM3 (West Tanfield)** – Is an employment use needed and sustainable in this location? Is the phasing of the housing element correct? Has sufficient consideration has been taken of the listed Old Wesleyan Chapel?

EASINGWOLD

- (i) **EH1** – Could landscaping screen and lessen the site's impact sufficiently and, if so, where it is needed. Is the phasing, affordable housing requirement and density appropriate? What is the potential extent and severity of any land contamination within the site?
- (ii) **EH2** – Is the density and phasing appropriate? Would the special character of Kellbalk Lane be adequately protected? Would the eastern boundary require landscaping to reduce the site's impact? Would the particular traffic circulation

measures be feasible and what would be the likely extent of any highway improvements required?

- (iii) **EH3** – Is the density and phasing appropriate? Have existing rights of way and links to those around the site been adequately considered?
- (iv) **EM1** – Is housing on this site necessary and sustainable and, if so, is the phasing and density appropriate? Are employment uses needed and sustainable? Would the impact of the allocation, both within and beyond its boundaries, be sufficiently reduced by landscaping?
- (v) **EC1** – What evidence is there that an extension to the cemetery is necessary; could it be provided in another location?
- (vi) **EH7 (Helperby)** – Is the phasing and mix of housing is appropriate and what is the likely extent of improvements needed to Back Lane?
- (vii) **EH5 (Husthwaite)** – Are the access and phasing appropriate and should the possibility of future development to the south and west should be taken into account?
- (viii) **EH4 (Shipton)** – What is the likely level of contamination from the previous use, is the low density justified, should additional land to the north be included in the allocation (as in the Preferred Options)?
- (ix) **EH6 (Stillington)** – Is the phasing and mix of housing is appropriate? What is the likely extent of highway improvements needed? Would landscaping along the southern boundary sufficiently reduce the allocation's impact?

NORTHALLERTON

NM5 (North Northallerton Area)

- (i) Having regard to the proposed scale and mix of uses, is this strategic site the most appropriate option for the sustainable expansion of Northallerton?
- (ii) What are the implications for the form, character and landscape setting of Northallerton? In particular for the open gap between Northallerton and Brompton?
- (iii) Is an allocation partly within flood zones 2 and 3, and with known local flooding and drainage issues, appropriate, having regard to national, regional and local policies for minimising flood risk? Are the proposed flood and drainage measures achievable?
- (iv) Is the link road a critical element of the overall allocation and is it deliverable in the plan period? Will this scheme deliver wider accessibility benefits and improve sustainable transport options?
- (v) Are the planned sports and recreation facilities appropriate, in terms of type and location, and deliverable? How do they integrate with existing facilities, in particular the proposed relocation of Northallerton Town FC?
- (vi) Is the proposed mix of uses viable and deliverable, having regard to phasing and infrastructure requirements?
- (vii) Are the arrangements for developer contributions, in particular a tariff, clear and reasonable? Is the scope of this tariff justified and consistent with national policy, in particular Circular 5/2005?
- (viii) Is the planned level of affordable housing achievable?
- (ix) In terms of scale, type and location, does this site make an appropriate contribution to meeting local employment needs?
- (x) Has the potential impact on biodiversity been adequately assessed?
- (xi) What are the likely effects of this proposal on the quality of life for nearby residents?

- (xii) **NH1** – Is reuse of this site for housing justified and consistent with national, regional and local policy for protection of existing employment areas? What are the implications for local employment land provision? Are sustainable transport routes to the town centre and employment areas feasible and deliverable?
- (xiii) **NH2, NM1, NM2, NM3, NM4** – Are developer contributions to the possible expansion of the CCTV system clear, justified and reasonable?
- (xiv) **NM1 & NM2** – Is the amount of office development anticipated on these two sites clear and achievable? Are the access arrangements feasible and deliverable?
- (xv) **NM3** – Is this allocation appropriate and justified, having regard to the historic buildings on and adjacent to the site and its prominent location within Northallerton Conservation Area? Is the proposed mix of uses feasible and viable?
- (xvi) **NM4** – Is this allocation capable of being delivered, having regard to the physical and environmental constraints and the need to relocate the Fire Station? Is the provision of public car parking here reasonable and justified? Is the amount anticipated clear and deliverable?
- (xvii) **NE1** – Is the site area correct and if not, what are the implications for overall employment provision?
- (xviii) **NE2** – Is this allocation in flood zone 3 appropriate, having regard to national, regional and local policy for minimising flood risk?
- (xix) **NC1** – Is this Town Park deliverable? Is it appropriate, given its location in flood zones 2 and 3? Has adequate recognition been given to the Scheduled Ancient Monument and the wider archaeological potential of this site? Are developer contributions towards the development and maintenance of this Park clear, reasonable and justified, consistent with national policy?
- (xx) **NC2** – Is the development and management of this transport interchange achievable? Has adequate recognition been given to the relationship of this site with the adjacent Conservation Area?
- (xxi) **NH3 (Brompton)** – Is this the most appropriate location for new housing in Brompton?
- (xxii) **NH4 (East Cowton)** – Is this the most appropriate location for new housing in East Cowton? Is this allocation feasible and deliverable? Does it adequately address local flooding and drainage problems and enable proper management of flood risk?
- (xxiii) **NH5 (Morton-on-Swale)** – Is the requirement for a central village green within this allocation reasonable and justified?

STOKESLEY

- (i) **SH1 & SH2** – Is this the most appropriate and sustainable location for new housing to meet the needs of Stokesley? Given the required layout and density, what are the implications for the form, character and landscape setting of the town? Is the proposed level of affordable housing achievable? Are the required contributions to the provision of site SC1 and the Great Ayton-Stokesley footpath/cycle link justified and reasonable? Is this allocation feasible and viable, having regard to the constraints, infrastructure requirements and phasing?

- (ii) **SC1** – Is the provision of allotments and a recreational facility for young people here appropriate and justified? Are the requirements for community uses clear and deliverable, having regard to site constraints such as flood risk and accommodating SUDS and the likely level of developer contributions?
- (iii) **SE1** – Is employment development here reasonable and achievable, bearing in mind the constraints imposed by the flood plain? Can the site be integrated with the existing business park and the landscape setting of Stokesley? Would the site be accessible by a choice of transport modes, and what are the implications for the local highway network?
- (iv) **SE2** – Is this allocation for employment starter units justified and feasible, bearing in mind the constraints and infrastructure requirements of this site? Is the future of the existing farm buildings sufficiently clear and reasonable in the circumstances? Are the sustainable transport requirements justified and reasonable?
- (v) **SH3 (Great Broughton)** – Does this allocation respect the form, character and wider landscape setting of the village? Is the level and type of affordable housing proposed achievable? Is the development feasible, bearing in mind the constraints and infrastructure requirements for the site?
- (vi) **SH4 (Great Ayton)** – Is this allocation for very sheltered housing appropriate and justified? Is it sufficient to meet the housing needs of the village? Is its scale and location reasonable, having regard to the setting of Cleveland Lodge, the Conservation Area, adjacent trees and woodland and its location in flood zones 2 and 3? Would it be accessible by a choice of transport modes, and what are the implications for the local highway network? Is this allocation feasible, viable and deliverable, bearing in mind its constraints, infrastructure requirements and phasing?
- (vii) **SH5 (Hutton Rudby)** – Is this the most appropriate location for housing to meet the needs of the village? Given the scale of the development, what are the implications for the form, character and landscape setting of Hutton Rudby? Has the potential impact on biodiversity been adequately assessed? Would the site be accessible by a choice of transport modes, and adequately integrated with the rest of the village? Is the level and type of affordable housing proposed achievable? Is this allocation feasible, having regard to the constraints, density and infrastructure requirements?

THIRSK

- (i) **TH1** – On what evidence is this allocation based and what area would it serve, would it be suitable for all the residents of the existing care home? Would the need to temporarily re-house existing residents allow its delivery within Phase 1? Have other matters such as the site's relationship with the surrounding area and access and infrastructure been properly accounted for?
- (ii) **TH2** – Is the density and dwelling type appropriate? Would the access arrangements be practicable and safe? Could the site assembly and other matters be resolved in sufficient time for it to be completed during Phase 1?
- (iii) **TH3** – Is the extent of the allocation, phasing and dwelling type appropriate? Would landscaping reduce its impact sufficiently and would open space provision be made in the locality?
- (iv) **TM1** – Is there a need for the employment element of the allocation? Would the leisure and retail uses benefit Thirsk town centre? Has sufficient regard been paid to Thirsk Castle SAM and the prominent position of the site? Is the allocation deliverable given the complexity of ownerships and need for relocation?

TM2A–E South West Thirsk Area

- (v) What considerations resulted in the site being allocated after having been rejected at the Preferred Options stage? Is it justified?
- (vi) Having regard to the proposed scale and mix of uses, is this strategic site the most appropriate option for the sustainable expansion of Thirsk? Why is it preferable to sites to the north east of the town or in Station Road?
- (vii) Are all elements of the allocation deliverable within a reasonable period?
- (viii) Is the site within a reasonable distance of the town centre? How and where would links improve access to facilities?
- (ix) Is the mix, amount and phasing of housing appropriate?
- (x) Would the new primary school serve only the housing allocation TM2A? Would the identified site be the most accessible location? When during the development of the wider site would the school be provided?
- (xi) Is the amount of employment land allocated necessary to meet the needs of Thirsk and its sub area? Is it in the most accessible location?
- (xii) What would be the likely impact of the allocation on traffic movement in Thirsk? Has this been given adequate consideration?
- (xiii) Would landscaping around the boundaries adequately soften the impact of the allocation from the surrounding area?
- (xiv) Has the potential impact on biodiversity been adequately assessed?
- (xv) **TE1** – Is the allocation needed and has sufficient regard been paid to its location in a prominent, gateway position?
- (xvi) **TC1** – Is the site in an appropriate location and large enough to meet the recreational needs of the surrounding area, what are the implications of the site being within a flood zone?
- (xvii) **TC2** – Have the implications of increased traffic, particularly leaving and joining the A61, been adequately considered? Is the allocation deliverable?
- (xviii) **TH5 (Carlton Miniott)** – Would development of the allocated site affect existing traffic congestion?
- (xix) **TH4 (Dalton)** – What exceptional circumstances resulted in the allocation? What uses does it include and what contribution would it make to the amount of employment land in the district? Would the development of the site be sustainable? Is its phasing appropriate? How would development be controlled on the remaining, unallocated part of the site? How would landscaping and other improvements be ensured outside of the allocated site?

7 ALTERNATIVE / ADDITIONAL SITES

Key Issues:

Is each suggested alternative site appropriate, deliverable, supported by robust evidence and necessary to ensure a sound and sustainable mix of allocations? Is it consistent with the LDF spatial strategy and policies, national and regional policy? Has it been subject to sustainability appraisal compatible with that for the LDF and public consultation?

Bedale

- a) Extension to allocation BH7
- b) Rear of Methodist Church, West Tanfield
- c) Meadowfields, West Tanfield
- d) Northallerton Road, Leeming Bar
- e) Hackforth Mill, Hackforth
- f) Extension to allocation BH5

- g) Aiskew Mill
- h) Bedale Road, Well
- i) Extension to allocation BH4

Easingwold

- a) Church Farm, Shipton
- b) Extension to allocation EH4
- c) North of Authitts Cottages, Shipton
- d) South of the Grange, Shipton
- e) South of Sports Ground, Huby
- f) Stillington Road, Huby
- g) Central Depot, Back Lane, Helperby
- h) West of Easingwold
- i) Hagg Lane/Whiteoak Avenue, Easingwold
- j) West of Stillington
- k) St John's House, Church Hill, Easingwold
- l) Extension to allocation EH2

Northallerton

- a) Extension to allocation NM5C
- b) Castle Hills Dairy, Romanby
- c) South of Northallerton
- d) Football Ground, Ainderby Road, Northallerton
- e) Tannery Lane, Northallerton
- f) Station Road, Brompton

Stokesley

- a) Extension to allocations SH2 and SC1
- b) Union Mill, Stokesley
- c) Tanton Estates, Stokesley
- d) South of Ellerbeck Court, Stokesley Business Park
- e) Angrove Drive/Marwood Drive, Great Ayton
- f) Extension to allocation SH5, Hutton Rudby
- g) Langbaugh Road, Hutton Rudby
- h) Belbrough Lane, Hutton Rudby

Thirsk

- a) Station Road, Thirsk (sites 139/04, 139/10, 139/23)
- b) Station Road, Thirsk (sites 139/03, 139/10, 152/06)
- c) Saxty Way, Thirsk
- d) Moor Road, Dalton
- e) Station Road, Thirsk (sites 139/03, 139/04, 139/10, 139/11, 139/23, 152/02)
- f) Chapel Farm poultry sheds, Pickhill
- g) Plump Bank, Thirsk
- h) West of York Road, Thirsk
- i) Stockton Road, Thirsk
- j) Rybeck Farm, Thirsk
- k) Shire Road, Thirsk
- l) Sandholmes Lane, Sowerby
- m) North-east of Thirsk/Stockton Road, Thirsk

Attendance at hearing - Bedale

Hambleton District Council

Mr M Briggs/Mr P Dixon (Savills) - Moto Hospitality (BC5)

Mr C Simkins (RPS Group) - Malthouse UK Ltd (BC5)

Mr R Edwards, Ms R Thomas (Halcrow Group), Mr S Moss (HA) -Highways Agency (BC5)

Mr J Edmond (Marrons) - Mrs H Ive (BC5)

Mr D Brocklehurst (Ward Hadaway) - Mr C Les (BC5)

Mr B Stainsby, Bedale Allotments Association (BH1)
Mr J Burton (BH1)
Mr I Lyle (England & Lyle) - Taylor Wimpey NY Ltd (BH2, BH3, BH4);
Mr S Harris (EPP) - Mr R Stead (BH5) (alternative site f); Mr M Webster (alternative site e); Mr S Lancaster (alternative site h); Mr JR Wilson (alternative site d)
Ms C Easton (Spawforths) - Mr & Mrs Clark (BH6) (alternative site g)
Mr D Mitchell/Mr N Smith (Barton Willmore) - Persimmon Homes (Yorks) Ltd (BH6)
Yorkshire Water Land Property & Planning (BH6)
Ms C Asquith (Savills) - Mrs M Finkill (BH7) (alternative site a)
Mr & Mrs EG Lowe (BH8)
Mr D Crisp (BH9)
Snape with Thorp Parish Council (BH8)
Mr G Arrowsmith (Arrowsmith Associates) - Mr D Eyles (BH9, BM3, BM4)
Mr T Axe (Barber Titleys Solicitors) - Bourne-Arton Estates (BM3) (alternative sites b & c)
Mr S Barker (Prism Planning) - Messrs C & A Blanchard (BM4)
Ms S Taylor (Knight Frank LLP) - Hares of Snape (BH8)

Written representations – Bedale

GOYH (BC5)
Broadacres Housing Association (BH2, BH3, BH4) (alternative site i)
Diocese of Ripon and Leeds (BH1)
NYCC Heritage and Environment
Yorkshire Water
English Heritage
Yorkshire Forward (BC4, BM1)
Yuill Homes (BH3)
Harrogate Borough Council (BC5)
Ms S Bailes (BC5)
Mr L Green and Ms A Barnes (BH7)
Aiskew and Leeming Bar Parish Council (BH9, BM4)

Attendance at hearing – Easingwold

Hambleton District Council
Mr D Mitchell/Mr N Smith (Barton Willmore) - Persimmon Homes (EH1, EH2, EH3, EM1) (alternative site l); Whitfield Homes (alternative site e)
Mr A Rose (Spawforths) - Redrow Homes (EH1, EH2, EH3, EM1)
Mr R Barnes - Mr J Sparrow & Others (EH6)
Mr T Axe (Barber Titleys Solicitors) - Mr & Mrs Walker (EH5)
Mr P Leeming (Carter Jonas LLP) The Blacker Family (alternative site a)
Mr S Johnson (George F White LLP) - Mrs JM Hunton (alternative site c & d)
Mr J Swiers (alternative site g)

Written representations – Easingwold

NYCC Heritage and Environment
Yorkshire Water
English Heritage
Mrs Freeman-Grenville (EH2)
Mrs J Judson Smith (EH2)
Easingwold Town Council (EC1, EH3)
Forest of Galtres Society (EH3)
Mr P Harrison (EH4)
Thirsk Fabrications (EH5)
Mr & Mrs P Harrison (alternative site b)
Dr T Hutchinson (alternative site f)
Mr F Waterworth (alternative site h)
Care and Lifestyle Villages Ltd (alternative site j)

Mrs J Wilkinson-Green (alternative site i)
Easingwold Town Council (alternative site k)

Attendance at hearing – Northallerton

Hambleton District Council

Mr D Mitchell/Mr N Smith (Barton Willmore) - Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd (NH1) (NM5) (alternative site b); Arla Foods (alternative site b)

Mr GE Wright - Mr E Barker (NM5)

Mr R Irving (ID Planning) - Northallerton Gateway Ltd (NM5)

Mr AJ Webster - BANAGE (NM5)

Mr A Hutton (Smiths Gore) - Church Commissioners for England (NM5) (NM5C) (alternative site a)

Mr S Phillpotts (Strutt and Parker) - Mrs Gamon & Mrs Bunyan (NM5A) (alternative site c)

Mr T Axe (Barber Titleys Solicitors) - Mr W Calvert (alternative site d)

Mr J Tait (Planning Prospects Ltd) - Simon Bailes Ltd (alternative site e)

Mr S Watson (NH4)

Mr S McKee (NM5)

Brompton Town Council (NM5)

Written representations – Northallerton

NYCC Heritage and Environment

Yorkshire Water

Yorkshire Forward (NC1)

English Heritage

Yuill Homes (NE1, NH1, NH4)

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (NE1, NH1)

Wordsworth Holdings PLC (NH1)

Buenaventura Estates (NH3) (alternative site f)

East Cowton PC (NH4)

Mr B Robinson (NH4)

Mr R White (NH5)

North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue HQ (NM4)

Mr A J Webster (NM5)

Mr D Rigby (NM5)

Mr A McKee (NM5)

Mrs S Richardson (NM5)

Broadacres Housing Association (NM5)

Mr J Naylor (NM5)

Mrs D Newcombe (NM5)

Mrs J Whitham (NM5)

Brompton Village Design Group (NM5)

Mr D M Ferry (NM5)

M E Horner (NM5)

Mrs M Craske (NM5)

E W Horner (NM5)

Mr D Bond (NM5)

The Gill Family (NM5)

Mr D Murdoch (NM5)

M A Horner (NM5)

Mr & Mrs RK Wilkinson (NM5)

Mr A Blewitt (NM5)

Mr W Hartley (NM5)

Mrs E Thompson (NM5)

Mr & Mrs Alexander (NM5)

Mr N Pritchard (NM5)

Mr HCD Brown (NM5)

A Wilkinson (NM5)

Mr T Perry (NM5)

Mr P Thompson (NM5)
Mr F Morrith (NM5)
Mr E Triggs (NM5)
CL & M York (NM5)
Mrs C Corner (NM5)
Mr R A Call (NM5)
Environment Agency (NM5)
Mr G Clarke (NM5)
Appletons (NM5)
Northallerton RUFC (NM5)

Attendance at hearing – Stokesley

Hambleton District Council

Mr N Morton (Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners) - Northumbria Land (SC1) (SE2) (SH1)
Mr I Lyle (England & Lyle) - Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (SH1) (SH2) (alternative site a);
Messrs Richardson, Jawad & Cook (SH5)
Mr R Smith (Peacock & Smith) - Kebbell Development Ltd (SH1) (alternative site b);
Mr & Mrs Holmes-Smith (SH1) (alternative site b); Carpenders Park Estates Ltd (SH1)
(alternative site b); Armstrong Richardson (SH1) (alternative site b)
Mr JR Wilson (Appletons) (alternative site d)
Dr Simpson - Dr & Mrs Simpson (SH5) (alternative sites g, h)
Mr A Moss (Ward Hadaway) - Kudumba Ltd (SH5) (alternative site g)
Mr S Hesmondhaigh - DKS Architects (SE1)
Dr W Lancaster (SH5)

Written representations – Stokesley

Yorkshire Water

NYCC Heritage and Environment
Environment Agency
Kirkby-in-Cleveland PC (SE1; alternative site d)
Great and Little Broughton PC (SE1)
Mr I Henderson (SH1)
Mrs ER Towler (SH4)
English Heritage (SH4)
The Southall Family (SH4) (alternative site e)
Mr P Scrope (SH4)
Natural England (SH4)
Mr H A Stonehouse (SH4)
Richardson, Jawad & Cook (alternative site f)
Mrs M Hoggarth (SH5)
Mr B Simpson (alternative site c)
Mr & Mrs A Ward (SH4)

Attendance at hearing – Thirsk

Hambleton District Council

Mr GE Wright - Mr E Barker (TC1, TH3, TH5, TM2) (alternative sites g, h, i, j, k & m)
Ms C Asquith (Savills) - Belt & Braces No.1 Ltd (TM2) (alternative site b); Austin Reed
Group Plc (TM2)
Mrs M Ferguson (Geroge F White LLP) Mr J Wakeham (TM2) (alternative site c)
Mr R Smith (Peacock & Smith) - Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (TH5)
Mr S Barker (Prism Planning) - Mr & Mrs Taylor (TM2) (alternative site a)
Mr N Chambers -Tangent Properties (North) Ltd (TM2)(alternative sites a, b & e)
Mr R Irving (ID Planning) Sowerby Gateway Ltd (TM2)
Mr S Barker (alternative site k)

Written representations - Thirsk

Yorkshire Water

NYCC Heritage and Environment

English Heritage
Carlton Miniott Parish Council (TC2, TM2)
Thircon Ltd (TE1)
West Park Estates (TH4)
Broadacres Housing Association (TM2)
Mr T Sowerby (TM2)
Mr A Kirby (alternative site d)
The Barningham Family (alternative site f)
Mr M Coy (TM2)

8 DEVELOPMENT LIMITS

Key Issue:

**Is each change to the proposed development limits appropriate and justified?
Is it consistent with the objectives and principles in LDF policy DP8 as applied to that particular settlement, and compatible with the outcomes of consultation about its development limits?**

Bedale

None

Easingwold

- a) Central Depot, Back Lane, Helperby
- b) Woods Farm, Sutton-on-the-Forest
- c) Pidgeon Cote Farm, Raskelf
- d) North of Cleveland House, Low Street, Husthwaite

Northallerton

- a) Football Ground, Ainderby Road, Northallerton
- b) East of Railway View/North of Green, Ainderby Steeple

Stokesley

- a) No 18 The Holme, Great Broughton

Thirsk

- a) Dalton Transport and Storage, Dalton
- b) Pickhill Engineering, Pickhill
- c) Chapel Farm poultry sheds, Pickhill
- d) Station Road, Carlton Miniott
- e) Station Road, Thirsk (site 152/19)

Attendance at hearing

Mr J Swiers (Easingwold a)
Mr T Axe (Barber Titleys Solicitors) - Mr J & Mrs L Walker (Easingwold d)
Mr P Leeming (Carter Jonas LLP) - Dalton Transport and Storage (Thirsk a); Pickhill Engineering Ltd (Thirsk b)

Written representations

Mr D Mitchell-Innes (Easingwold b)
Mr P Kilvington (Easingwold c)
Mr W Calvert (Northallerton a)
Mr G Place (Northallerton b)
Mr T Walker (Stokesley a)
The Barningham Family (Thirsk c)
Mr W Calvert (Thirsk d & e)