
Regulation 20 Sustainability Appraisal Representations in Document Content Order

Hambleton Local Plan

March 2020

Comments

Hambleton Local Plan: Sustainability Appraisal (30/07/19 to 17/09/19)

Comment by	Highways England (Mr Simon Jones - 1025455)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-28
Response Date	13/09/19 10:43
Consultation Point	Hambleton Local Plan: Sustainability Appraisal (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Files	2019-09-13 Highways England LPreg19-1063_redacted.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Main Sustainability Appraisal Report

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Combined report

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

The Sustainability Appraisal has reviewed and assessed the likely effects of the draft plan. SA Topic 10 is noted as key to Highways England and the Plan strategy directs the majority of growth to settlements that are accessible in terms of jobs, services and public transport. Whilst this is positive, several of the allocated sites are at the settlement fringes and it is probable that current patterns of car use will continue which is something Hambleton Council acknowledges. Therefore, Highways England would re-iterate that key to the monitoring of the Plan will be to focus on reducing vehicular impact on the SRN particularly at peak hours.

Comment by	Historic England (Mr Ian Smith - 1025458)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-9
Response Date	03/09/19 14:39
Consultation Point	Hambleton Local Plan: Sustainability Appraisal (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.12
Files	App A Environment Record.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Main Sustainability Appraisal Report

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Paragraph 11.2.20.

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

The conclusion about the evaluation of the sites is rather sweeping, True, for the vast majority of the proposed allocations the impact upon the historic environment is likely to be a 'minor negative' effect. However, for at least one and, possibly two, the impact is likely to be significant to the point that it may be inappropriate for them to be allocated. This ought to be reflected in this Paragraph.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Proposed changes

Please tell us what changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified.

It would be helpful if you could include revised wording. Please identify additional text by underlining it (**U**) and identifying any text to be deleted by striking it through (**ABC**).

What changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified?

Amend Paragraph 11.2.20 as follows:- "Although for the majority of the sites a minor negative effect is possible because of the potential harm to their setting for a couple, the effect could be a significant negative effect. Conversely ..."

Comment by	Gladman (Mr Craig Barnes - 1025518)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-27
Response Date	17/09/19 11:24
Consultation Point	Hambleton Local Plan: Sustainability Appraisal (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Files	2019-09-17 - Gladman Reps Local Plan LPreg 19-888.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Main Sustainability Appraisal Report

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on whole document

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

3.2.1 In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies that are set out in local plans must be the subject of a Sustainability Appraisal. Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessments of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, the SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of a plan's preparation; assessing the effects of a local plans proposals on sustainable development objectives when judged against reasonable alternatives. 3.2.2 The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process conducted through the preparation of the Local Plan clearly justify policy choices made, including proposed site allocations (or decisions not to allocate sites) when considered against reasonable alternatives. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. 3.2.3 The SA must demonstrate that a comprehensive testing of options has been undertaken and that it provides evidence and reasoning as to why any reasonable alternatives identified have not been pursued. A failure to adequately give reasons in the SA could lead to a challenge of the Council's position through the examination process. The SA should inform plan making. Whilst exercising planning judgement on the results of the SA in the Local Plan is expected, the SA should still clearly assess any reasonable alternatives and clearly articulate the results of any such assessment. 3.2.4 The publication version of the Local Plan is supported by a SA. Gladman hold concerns about the soundness of the assessment made in relation to the selection of sites identified for allocation. This is owing to the absence of a distribution of development through the policies of the Local Plan which makes it impossible to assess what role a site plays in meeting housing needs and whether it is necessary to meet outstanding residual housing need, or whether more growth is needed (in terms of omission sites). 3.2.5 The Plan does include a settlement hierarchy which broadly sets out how development should be accommodated but lacks sufficient detail against which to measure the role sites have in meeting sustainability objectives. A revised SA is necessary once the spatial pattern of development has been defined at a greater detail through the Local Plan to determine whether sites are necessary or not.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Comment by	Natural England (Kate Wheeler - 1204503)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-18
Response Date	16/09/19 09:19
Consultation Point	Hambleton Local Plan: Sustainability Appraisal (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Files	2019-09-17 Natural England Preg 19-SA 18.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Main Sustainability Appraisal Report

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Monitoring Measures

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

Natural England welcomes the inclusion of net gain in the Sustainability Appraisal, however it lacks sufficient detail and will be difficult to measure and apply, for example: The proposed monitoring measure is: Area and % increase of biodiversity net – gain secured. Without more detail and a measurable baseline this will be difficult to monitor. However the Sustainability Appraisal recognises this and states, “As the application of measures to achieve net gain will need to be carefully considered and monitored over time to ensure that they are effective.”

Comment by	CPRE (- 1226618)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-14
Response Date	20/08/19 09:37
Consultation Point	Hambleton Local Plan: Sustainability Appraisal (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Files	2019-08-20 CPRE LPreg19-438 451 453 454.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Main Sustainability Appraisal Report

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on SA as a whole

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Support

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

Having had the opportunity to consider the evidence based as part of this consultation exercise which sits alongside the Publication Draft, CPRENorthYorkshire has no comment to make in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal, Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Local Green Space Assessment. The methodologies and concluding results appear to follow national guidance and are thus considered sound.

Comment by	Mr Stuart Wilson (1225251)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-4
Response Date	13/09/19 16:20
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Nontechnical Summary (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Bedale Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on

The Assessment of B/004/001

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

Land between 39& 41 Northallerton Road Leeming Bar I have read through the sustainability appraisal for the above land and I have some concerns and would like to know if this report could be amended. Item 3. It states limited access to footpaths and public transport. There is a footpath from the village centre to the Council Depot which is past the field. There is also a good public transport system with buses every 30 minutes to Bedale /Northallerton and further afield. Item 7. It states the field is in a flood zone or subject to surface water flooding. We have owned this land for over 100 years and I never known it to flood yet. Item 9. It states it has poor access to facilities. There is a primary school within 4 minutes walk, also there is the Co-op convenience store in the village centre and the old church is also used as a village hall. As for the access to a Secondary School and Doctors, as stated above there is good public transport and school buses. Other public facilities in the centre include 2 Public houses, Café, Garage and Play Park. On the Industrial Estate there is a gym a soft play area and 2 day time nurseries. The distances from our site to the facilities in the centre of the village as identified on the sustainability appraisal are incorrect and when measured on the ground are approximately half the distance. RAF Leeming Noise This noise zone was installed when there were 3 squadrons of twin engine Tornados based at Leeming they left in April 2008 and have since been disbanded. At present there is a squadron of Hawks, a single engine aircraft based at Leeming which create nowhere near the noise of a Tornado The flying hours at Leeming are 8am to 6pm Monday to Thursday, 8am to 5pm on Friday, the aircraft based at Leeming fly mostly out of the area. they do not fly at night/ weekends or any public holidays. Our sound assessment was taken over the whole site over a 2 day period, the report stated that adequate insulation could be installed to mitigate any excess noise. This site was identified as a preferred site because it was infill between existing properties to the west and the council depot to the east. I believe that a smaller estate of approximately 33 on an infill site would be more appropriate to Leeming Bar than large scale developments extending the village boundaries.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Comment by	Mrs Sue Mawston (1225178)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-3
Response Date	13/09/19 14:51
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Nontechnical Summary (View)

Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.7

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Bedale Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Site Ref: B/004/008

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

I wish to raise my concerns about the new draft Hambleton Local Plan which has now invited representations to be made, that will be sent to an independent planning inspector. I refer to a field in Leeming Bar reference number B004/014 - B004001 (Land known as 39-41 Northallerton Road) that was identified as a preferred site for housing development and included in the Preferred Options Consultation Part 2 Bedale Sub Area dated 31 October 2016. After public consultation the land had initially been included in the New Draft Local Plan as a preferred site for housing development, but it has since been withdrawn. The conclusion on the consultation document was as follows: " The site is grade 2 agricultural land however the site adjoins the existing built form to the west and would form an infill site between the existing residential land to the west and the council depot to the east. Careful design and landscaping will be needed to reduce the potential impact of the use of the neighbouring depot and railway line on new users and also impact of new residents on the operation of the depot and railway line. The site has an acceptable access and footpath connecting the site to the centre of Leeming Bar and its facilities. Subject to the ability to address surface water flooding the site is appropriate for development. Preferred site." Housing development is well suited for Leeming Bar as the village has many facilities for sustainability. It has good transport links to Northallerton, Bedale and the A1 (the field being adjacent to the A684). The village also has many employment possibilities derived from the ever-expanding industrial estate. Facilities in the village include grocery store and other shops, primary school, frequent bus route, Wensleydale Railways Station, garage, children's playground, two public houses, hotels and café. The field itself is "infill" and there are no highways issues. It is contiguous with the A684. There are no impediments to a sale for housing and developers have been found and terms of sale have been agreed As the land was a Preferred Option, a lot of

time and money has been spent in finding developers. The land has since been conditionally sold to Developers subject to appropriate planning permission. A pre app by the developers was submitted but received a negative response due to a noise restriction relating to the Tornados aircraft being stationed at RAF Leeming. However, this restriction is now considerably out of date as it was implemented over 20 years ago and the Tornados are no longer stationed at the base. The restriction on development via the Noise zones apparently remains, just in case the Tornados come back, so is derived on a "worst case" scenario based on something that may never happen. Being a line on a map means there is an arbitrary element to it. The field is actually adjacent to the line and there should be some discretion in the interpretation. We are extremely concerned that the land was initially included following public consultation and has now been withdrawn without justifiable reason when other land in the area overlaps or is very close to the noise restriction zone. Contact has been made with the MOD about a possible review of the noise restriction zone but a response is not expected to be received until after the closing date for comments.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Proposed changes

Please tell us what changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified.

It would be helpful if you could include revised wording. Please identify additional text by underlining it (**U**) and identifying any text to be deleted by striking it through (**ABC**).

What changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified?

Addition of the specific area for development

Comment by	von Bradsky (1043036)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-1
Response Date	06/08/19 10:43
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Nontechnical Summary (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Stokesley Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Great Broughton sites

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

I object to any site being classified as SUSTAINABLE in Great Broughton I have general observations relating to appraisal of all sites in Great Broughton wrt to objectives 3 and 9. Objective 3: I have lived in Broughton for over 22 years and the buses to Stokesley and Northallerton have now reduced to 3 per day and in my experience these are not even reliable. Whilst there are many footpaths , there are no cycle routes? Therefore I cannot understand why the appraisal for obj 3 regarding public transport is not RED for all sites. There is NO functioning public transport to amenities of GP, shops, leisure facilities. Basically one cannot live in Broughton without a car. Objective 9: similarly appraisal for all sites in Broughton should give obj 9 wrt 'good connectivity to services and facilities' at least an AMBER rating since your own appraisal has rated access to Town Centre, GP, Business Park, sec school, convenience store a RED rating in all cases. Again one cannot live in Broughton without a car Hence in terms of SUSTAINABILITY if one cannot live in Broughton without a car how can any site be SUSTAINABLE

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Proposed changes

Please tell us what changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified.

It would be helpful if you could include revised wording. Please identify additional text by underlining it (**U**) and identifying any text to be deleted by striking it through (**ABC**).

What changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified?

Classify all sites in Great Broughton for Objective 3 as RED and 9 as at least AMBER as per my comments or provide a functioning bus service

Comment by	Mr Simon Smith (1225636)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-6
Response Date	17/09/19 16:41
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Bedale (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web

Version 0.10

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Bedale Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on B/004/010

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

The allocation of land at Leeming Bar is supported as is the level of allocation proposed (20.65ha). Both reflect the strategic role of Leeming Bar to provide employment land to meet the future needs of the district to 2035 and to enable delivery of the Council's Economic Strategy 'A Place to Grow' which promotes inward investment. The scale of allocation means that LEB3 is best-suited to meet the need for employment land at Leeming Bar at a single site. It is well-related to the existing Industrial Estate with immediate access from the A1 and so with good connection to the strategic national transport network. Part of site LEB3 is owned by the Representor and is suitable and available for development for employment purposes as part of the wider allocation. Access to LEB3 could be achieved directly from the Bedale By-pass but, if this for any reason was not feasible, could be achieved from a new spur taken from the existing roundabout (created to accommodate the Bedale By-pass). The access would pass through land which forms part of a site previously assessed for allocation in the Local Plan and known as B/004/010. This land is owned by the representor and would be available for such use. However, the proposed safeguarding of 10 ha of land (SAFEGUARD (Lbar Ext)) to the east of LEB3 is not supported. Future employment development would be better achieved on the site formerly known as B/004/010 before resorting to the land proposed to be safeguarded. The proposed safeguarded land represents a major extension into open countryside which will be highly visible from the by-pass. In contrast Site B/004/010 is contained on all sides by development: the existing industrial estate, LEB3, the by-pass and development forming part of Leeming Bar to the south. Although smaller than the land proposed to be safeguarded it should be first used to meet future employment needs before encroaching further into open countryside. Although site B/004/010 was initially identified as a Preferred Site it is not clear why it has been excluded from the Publication Draft of the Plan. Employment use was supported by the owner. However, the site appears to have been assessed only for housing purposes in the Sustainability Appraisal submitted with the PLP. This is evident from questions 11, 13 and 15 of the Appraisal which refers to site B/004/010 'only being considered for residential development'

and 'has the potential to provide mix of housing types, and tenures'. If it had been properly assessed for employment purposes it is likely to have 'scored' better than the SAFEGUARD (Lbar Ext) site with red scores unlikely for question 5c) in the Sustainability Appraisal Assessment (is the development in an area where noise, dust light or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new or existing residents?) or 5d) (is the proposed preferred use for the site appropriate to the land uses of the surrounding land?). Policy EG1 is considered sound in respect of the amount of land to be provided in the district for employment purposes, the general location of such land along principal transport corridors and the allocation of LEB3. However, Policy EG1 is not considered to be sound in its allocation of site SAFEGUARD (Lbar Ext) to provide additional capacity to the allocated employment land provision. This approach is neither effective nor justified. The site known as B/004/010 should be allocated in its place to make the Plan sound.

Comment by	Historic England (Mr Ian Smith - 1025458)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-10
Response Date	03/09/19 14:45
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Bedale (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.13
Files	App A Environment Record.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Bedale Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Site B/011/022

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

The SA considers that this site will have a 'minor negative effect' against the SA Objective for the historic environment. However, unlike the majority of the other allocations, there has been no evaluation of the impact that the loss of this site and its subsequent development as a coach park might have upon the heritage assets in its vicinity. The site lies adjacent to the boundary of the Bedale Conservation Area and to the curtilage of the Grade II Listed St Gregory's House. The development of this area could also impact upon the significance of these assets and, potentially, the setting of the Grade I Listed Church of St Gregory. Whilst this may be an existing allocation in the Adopted Allocations DPD, that document pre-dates the NPPF by over two years. Consequently, it is necessary to assess whether or not the allocation of this site would be compatible with the current national policy guidance regarding the conservation of the historic environment. In order to demonstrate that the allocation of this area is not incompatible with the requirements of the NPPF, as part of the Evidence Base underpinning the Plan there needs to be an assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of the adjacent Listed Buildings and Conservation Area and what effect the loss of this site and its subsequent development as a car park might have upon their significance.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Proposed changes

Please tell us what changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified.

It would be helpful if you could include revised wording. Please identify additional text by underlining it (**U**) and identifying any text to be deleted by striking it through (**ABC**).

What changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified?

Site B/011/022 amend the assessment against the historic environment as 'uncertain'

Comment by	Wharfedale Homes (Wharfedale Homes - 1229253)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-15
Response Date	17/09/19 16:23
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Bedale (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Files	2019-09-17 Wharfedale Homes LPreg19-823.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Bedale Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on

Ref. B/004/008b

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

It is noted that the Council's Sustainability Appraisals (SA) has assessed the Site (Ref. B/004/008b) against 14 criteria. On review of the SA, we have the following observations: The Site is scored 'Amber' in relation to access to public transport. However, it is considered that this should be 'Green' on the basis that the Site lies close to existing bus stops on Northallerton Road providing daily services; and

It is noted that the Site scores 'Green' for 7 of the 8 questions under criteria 10. Despite this, it is scored 'Amber' overall. It is considered that this should be amended to score 'Green' overall. Whilst reference is made in the Site conclusions to "issues that need addressing," this is not considered to be the case; there are no insurmountable constraints to the delivery of the Site, and it is considered that the SA conclusions should read more positively as a reflection of this.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Comment by	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (- 1048401)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-21
Response Date	17/09/19 10:15
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Bedale (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Files	2019-09-17 PBP Taylor Wimpey_redacted LPreg19-1032.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the

Site Assessments - Bedale Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on

Site Ref. ALT/B/004/030

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

The appraisal identified the following “amber” and “red” scoring in the Council's assessment of the site: - ALT/B/004/030: - • Amber: - o Biodiversity issues o Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land o Scope to improve green infrastructure o Potential to increase flooding elsewhere o Proximity to recreational areas o Impact on non-designated archaeological site • Red: - o The development is within, or impacts up on, a mineral safeguarding area o Links to footpaths and cycle routes o Site has poor connectivity to a bus stop or train station o Development will not redevelop previously developed land o Location in respect of services and facilities The appraisal concludes that the site represents a: - A greenfield site on the north eastern edge of Bedale. The sustainability assessment is mixed; the site has some positive effect against sustainability objectives with further assessment and mitigation required to balance other objectives. The site performs poorly against objective 3, 5 and 9 and the site is distance from services, amenities, sustainable forms of transport and its impact on the settlement pattern due to it being disconnected from the existing settlement. Mitigation is only appropriate if the site is brought forward with other sites adjacent. It is clear from the evidence presented within these representations that the “amber” and “red” concerns associated with the development of the expanded site area are either incorrect or can be overcome. As the concerns listed are similar for both assessed parcels of the expanded site area, we respond to both parcels together. With regards to landscape and visual impact, the expanded site area is located in the least sensitive area for new development in Bedale/Aiskew in respect of landscape and visual impact, as identified in the Council's Landscape Character Assessment and Sensitivity Study (May 2016). Furthermore, the site itself will be viewed within the context of the existing and future developed areas which surround it. The expanded site area would also aid the rounding off of the settlement area, taking into account the proposed site allocation boundary and the Barratt Homes Wilbert's Farm development. For these reasons the site clearly does not extend into the open countryside or compromise the rural character of the area. The site is located within a sustainable location, with good access to local services and facilities in the area, along with good public transport links. The site lies within walking and cycling distance to number of facilities and services located in Bedale and Leeming Bar. Including the newly proposed employment allocations at Leeming Bar. Bus stops are available on Bedale Road adjacent to the site's frontage. With regards to the loss of best or most versatile agricultural land, the surrounding areas of the site (including the proposed allocation AIB1) share the same classification. Accordingly, in order to meet the identified housing needs of Bedale such land will need to be developed. Due to the size of the site,

areas of identified biodiversity value can be preserved and enhanced within a green infrastructure led development scheme. Suitable mitigation measures to overcome this issue can be delivered. Particularly in respect of enhanced planting on the site's northern boundary. An expansion to the site area would also present an opportunity to deliver more on-site recreational facilities for prospective and existing residents of the area. A site specific flood risk assessment would be submitted with any planning application to confirm the nature and scope of any mitigation necessary in respect of surface water flooding. Though no issues are expected. This was confirmed by the recent pre-application work undertaken with the Council. With regards to heritage matters, an archaeological and heritage assessment would be submitted alongside any planning application to demonstrate that the site's development would not have any adverse impact on any non-designated archaeological assets. The newly proposed allocations in Bedale are located on greenfield sites, presenting evidence that there are no other previously developed sites available to meet the Council's objectively assessed housing needs. With regards to mineral safeguarding, the emerging Proposals Maps do not locate the site in a minerals safeguarding area. In addition, no minerals of any use or significance present having been previously worked at the site. Furthermore, as the site will be surrounded by development, there is clearly no prospect of the site ever being used for quarrying. Consequently, as part of any future planning application, we would submit a minerals resource assessment which would identify any required mitigation as part of the new development to avoid impact on the safeguarded site. Finally, the Council's conclusion identifies that mitigation to the concerns raised can only be "appropriate if the site is brought forward with other sites adjacent". Which is exactly what our development proposals are seeking to deliver. It is clear from our assessment above that our proposed expanded site area represents a deliverable residential development site. There are no technical or environmental constraints that would preclude its development for residential use. Which is of course why the Council identified the sites as preferred options in the Alternative Sites Consultation document.

Comment by	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (- 1048401)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-20
Response Date	17/09/19 10:13
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Bedale (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Files	2019-09-17 PBP Taylor Wimpey_redacted LPreg19-1032.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Bedale Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Site Ref. ALT/B/004/022

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

The appraisal identified the following “amber” and “red” scoring in the Council’s assessment of the site: - ALT/B/004/022: - • Amber: - o Biodiversity issues o Links to footpaths and cycle routes o Site has poor connectivity to a bus stop or train station o Scope to improve green infrastructure o Prominent in views towards the settlement o Construction impact on existing residents o Potential to increase flooding elsewhere o Proximity to employment uses o Impact on non-designated archaeological site • Red: - o The development is within, or impacts up on, a mineral safeguarding area o Development will not redevelop previously developed land o Location in respect of services and facilities The appraisal concludes that the site represents a: - A greenfield site on the north eastern edge of Bedale. The sustainability assessment is mixed; the site has some positive effect against sustainability objectives with further assessment and mitigation required to balance other objectives. However, the site is particularly distant from some amenities and services. It is clear from the evidence presented within these representations that the “amber” and “red” concerns associated with the development of the expanded site area are either incorrect or can be overcome. As the concerns listed are similar for both assessed parcels of the expanded site area, we respond to both parcels together. With regards to landscape and visual impact, the expanded site area is located in the least sensitive area for new development in Bedale/Aiskew in respect of landscape and visual impact, as identified in the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment and Sensitivity Study (May 2016). Furthermore, the site itself will be viewed within the context of the existing and future developed areas which surround it. The expanded site area would also aid the rounding off of the settlement area, taking into account the proposed site allocation boundary and the Barratt Homes Wilbert’s Farm development. For these reasons the site clearly does not extend into the open countryside or compromise the rural character of the area. The site is located within a sustainable location, with good access to local services and facilities in the area, along with good public transport links. The site lies within walking and cycling distance to number of facilities and services located in Bedale and Leeming Bar. Including the newly proposed employment allocations at Leeming Bar. Bus stops are available on Bedale Road adjacent to the site’s frontage. With regards to the loss of best or most versatile agricultural land, the surrounding areas of the site (including the proposed allocation A1B1) share the same classification. Accordingly, in order to meet the identified housing needs of Bedale such land will need to be developed. Due to the size of the site, areas of identified biodiversity value can be preserved and enhanced within a green infrastructure led development scheme. Suitable mitigation measures to overcome this issue can be delivered. Particularly in respect of enhanced planting on the site’s northern boundary. An expansion to the site area would also present an opportunity to deliver more on-site recreational facilities for prospective and existing residents of the area. A site specific flood risk assessment would be submitted with any planning application to confirm the nature and scope of any mitigation necessary in respect of surface water flooding. Though no issues are expected. This was confirmed by the recent pre-application work undertaken with the Council. With regards to heritage matters, an archaeological and heritage assessment would be submitted alongside any planning application to demonstrate that the site’s development would not have any adverse impact on any non-designated archaeological assets. The newly proposed allocations in Bedale are located on greenfield sites, presenting evidence that there are no other previously developed sites available to meet the Council’s objectively assessed housing needs. With regards to mineral safeguarding, the emerging Proposals Maps do not locate the site in a minerals safeguarding area. In addition, no minerals of any use or significance present having been previously worked at the site. Furthermore, as the site will be surrounded by development, there is clearly no prospect of the site ever being used for quarrying. Consequently, as part of any future

planning application, we would submit a minerals resource assessment which would identify any required mitigation as part of the new development to avoid impact on the safeguarded site. Finally, the Council's conclusion identifies that mitigation to the concerns raised can only be "appropriate if the site is brought forward with other sites adjacent". Which is exactly what our development proposals are seeking to deliver. It is clear from our assessment above that our proposed expanded site area represents a deliverable residential development site. There are no technical or environmental constraints that would preclude its development for residential use. Which is of course why the Council identified the sites as preferred options in the Alternative Sites Consultation document.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Comment by	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (- 1048401)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-19
Response Date	17/09/19 15:57
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Easingwold (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.11
Files	2019-09-17 Litchfields Taylor Wimpey redacted LPreg19-SA-19.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Easingwold Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Land at Alne Road, Easingwold (Site ref. E/041/006 and E/041/012)

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

In the context of the above, land at Alne Road remains available as a housing site which, if allocated, can help ensure the draft Local Plan is able to meet the identified local housing needs. Accordingly, Taylor Wimpey's masterplan for the site is included in Annex 2, alongside copies of our earlier representations to the Local Plan as Annex 3. The suitability and availability of the site for housing development is confirmed in these appendices and is summarised as follows: 1 The masterplan demonstrates how the site is capable of being developed to provide a high quality residential scheme of 84 dwellings with a good mix of housing types, including bungalows. In doing so, it is able to provide a type of housing in Easingwold that may not otherwise be delivered through the single proposed allocation; 2 The site is well related to the existing settlement, with the masterplan demonstrating how it represents a logical extension to the current built-up area of Easingwold; 3 The site is located within close walking distance to the town centre and has good proximity to shops, services and community facilities; 4 The masterplan demonstrates how vehicular and pedestrian routes can be accommodated safely within the development, with the main vehicular access provided off Alne Road. Pedestrian connections to the town centre are also capable of being provided via Drover's Court to the south east; 5 The masterplan can deliver a new amenity green space (identified in the Local Green Space Assessment evidence base document as a recommended 'Local Green Space') that can be managed and maintained for public use; 6 There are no heritage or environmental constraints that would prevent the (early) delivery of the site; and 7 The site is available for development now, with no significant infrastructure required to support its development in the short-term. These attributes contribute towards the Alne Road site scoring well in the Site Selection Methodology and Results document (July 2019) that forms part of the evidence base to the Local Plan. Indeed, it is noted that the proposed allocation site (EAS1) performs marginally worse against the sustainability criteria, with its ability to provide expansion of the primary school cited in the document as being the main reason as to why it was allocated over other preferred sites in Easingwold, also stating at page 20 that "all other sites do not provide public benefit or enable service/facility or delivery". Given the ability of the land at Alne Road to provide a public amenity space; a full housing range that is able to meet local needs (including the delivery of affordable housing) and; the opportunity to provide developer contributions (as appropriate) to help support the delivery of services and facilities, Taylor Wimpey strongly disagree with this sweeping assertion and, in turn, question the robustness as to how the site selection methodology has been applied in Easingwold

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Comment by	Mr Geoff Ellis (1225771)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-22
Response Date	17/09/19 09:00
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Easingwold (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.9
Files	Geoff Ellis_redacted LPreg19-1038.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the

Site Assessments - Easingwold Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on

Sites E/041/028 and E/041011

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

1 Site E/041/028 The site location is stated as 'West side of Millfield Lane' in fact it is the North side of Raskelf Road (600 metres away) the correct location should be stated in the report) 2 Identified site E/041/011 -- Millfield Surgery --G P Surgery Although there has being discussions for requiring a new larger health facility in Easingwold for several years, I believe the current doctors surgery site is in a suitable location for local residents I acknowledge there is a need to increase its size because of the increasing number of patients, this could be achieved by building another floor on top the current footprint or extending the current building. The site plan area shown of the surgery including car parking area is 'totally incorrect' it includes land owned by HDC (leased to ETC 99 year lease to 2100) which includes ETC car park for 30 cars & part of Millfields recreational land. The site plan shows the area of 0.65 Ha = 6677 m2,-- the area of the surgery buildings 415 m2 & the area outside including car parking is significantly less probably 75% less, the details of the millfield surgery boundary & ownership/control shown on the site details which should be correct, FURTHER INVESTIGATION NEEDED --OFFICER SITE VISIT ??

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Comment by

Trustees of The Lady Milnes Coates June 1987 Settlement (1227682)

Comment ID

LPreg19-SA-13

Response Date

17/09/19 15:44

Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Easingwold (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7
Files	2019-09-17 Lady Milnes Coates Settlement.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Easingwold Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Site reference E/063/001

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

[Comparison of LPA's scoring and agent's scoring is available from the attached file] In summary, should Aecom's assessment be undertaken again in the context of AY's comments above. the site would score no worse than an 'amber' score to any of the objectives and would result in significant benefits to the community. Therefore, further consideration should be given to the allocation of this additional site. An Available Site There are no legal or ownership constraints on the site that might prohibit or delay development of the site, or any current uses which would need to be relocated. The site is in single ownership and the landowners, The Trustees, are willing to release the site for development. The site is therefore available for accommodating development now, and it is not dependent on any external factors.] An Achievable Site The site has no known issues or constraints that would prevent it from being developed in a viable manner, once allocated for development. The development of the site would clearly be achievable.

Comment by	Church Commissioners for England (- 1049922)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-23

Response Date	17/09/19 09:24
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Northallerton (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7
Files	2019-09-17 Deloitte Church Commissioners Written Representation 2019-09-17 Deloitte Church Commissioners SA Form LPreg19-SA-23.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Northallerton Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on N/110/011d

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

4.1 Overview As a legal requirement under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal ('SA') of the Publication Draft, it supported by the Commissioners. 4.2 Assessment of Sites We wish to comment in response to the Sustainability Site Appraisal Assessment ('SSAA') for emerging allocation NOR1 (also referred to as N/110/011d within the SA), as follows: With regards to meeting the objective of minimising traffic congestion by encouraging the use of public transport, cycling and walking (sustainability objective 3), the Commissioners disagree with the Council's 'red' scoring of the site when considering whether there are links to footpaths and cycle routes. The red score in respect of this consideration means that there is little or no prospect of improved connectivity or creation of new routes or footpaths. However, as is shown within the Delivery Document that has been submitted to the Council to support the Church's representation to the Local Plan Publication Draft, there are existing public rights of way within proximity

to the site and as such there is the potential opportunity to enhance pedestrian links as part of future development proposals. Sustainability objective 5 seeks to ensure a good quality built environment. As a prompt question to assessing the site, consideration is had as to whether the site is prominent in any significant view towards a settlement. In response the Council score the site a 'red', where development will have a negative impact which cannot be mitigated. Whilst there will be an impact, the Commissioners do not agree with the Council in that there is not an opportunity to reduce this through sensitive design which is of an appropriate scale. Potential mitigation is detailed within the aforementioned Delivery Document and accompanying Landscape Visual Assessment. Again, in response to sustainability objective 5, the Commissioners do not agree with the 'red' scoring of prompt question 5e, which asks whether the proposed preferred use is appropriate to surrounding land uses. The site is adjacent to greenfield and existing residential development, it should therefore achieve a 'green' score as categorised within the SSAA. The summary for the SSAA states that "the site score poorly against objectives three and five". However, for the above reasons, it is considered that the assessment should be amended in future iterations, improving the sites ability to help meet these objectives.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Comment by	Stuart Wilson (1027750)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-8
Response Date	11/08/19 14:11
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Northallerton (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Files	2019-08-11 Wilson Lpreg 19 SA-8.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Main Sustainability Appraisal Report

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Land between 39 & 41 nortallerton road Leeming Bar

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

Land between 39& 41 Northallerton Road Leeming Bar I have read through the sustainability appraisal for the above land and I have some concerns and would like to know if this report could be amended. Item 3. It states limited access to footpaths and public transport. There is a footpath from the village centre to the Council Depot which is past the field. There is also a good public transport system with buses every 30 minutes to Bedale /Northallerton and further afield. Item 7. It states the field is in a flood zone or subject to surface water flooding. We have owned this land for over 100 years and I never known it to flood yet. Item 9. It states it has poor access to facilities. There is a primary school within 4 minutes walk, also there is the Co-op convenience store in the village centre and the old church is also used as a village hall. As for the access to a Secondary School and Doctors, as stated above there is good public transport and school buses. Other public facilities in the centre include 2 Public houses, Café, Garage and Play Park. On the Industrial Estate there is a gym a soft play area and 2 day time nurseries. The distances from our site to the facilities in the centre of the village as identified on the sustainability appraisal are incorrect and when measured on the ground are approximately half the distance. RAF Leeming Noise This noise zone was installed when the Tornados were based at Leeming they left approximately 10 years ago. At present there is a squadron of Hawks based at Leeming which create nowhere near the noise of a Tornado. The flying hours at Leeming are 8am to 6pm Monday to Thursday, 8am to 5pm on Friday, the aircraft based at Leeming fly mostly out of the area. they do not fly at night/ weekends or any public holidays. Our sound assessment stated that adequate insulation could be installed to mitigate any excess noise.

Comment by	Mr Stephen Watson (1225626)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-7
Response Date	17/09/19 11:29
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Northallerton (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Northallerton Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on East Cowton sites N/042/001 to N/042/010

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

•any site specific requirements detailed in the allocation for the site The sites shown N/042/001 to N/042/010 contain several errors and inconsistencies. Reference is made in particular to criteria within sections 3,5,9 and the answers within that area vary wildly regarding transport, facilities, amenities and infrastructure. I.E . The village does have a shop, a play area, outdoor area and transport to get to work etc. This is not reflected in the document as presented. Several references are made to linear development - this is incorrect and any viewing of an ordnance map of East Cowton clearly demonstrates that a disproportionate amount of development has taken place to the south of the High Street. Based on the "facts" as submitted a different picture altogether is given of East Cowton. This is identified as a service village and it is essential that all references to future development are factually correct.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Proposed changes

Please tell us what changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified.

It would be helpful if you could include revised wording. Please identify additional text by underlining it (**U**) and identifying any text to be deleted by striking it through (**ABC**).

What changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified?

Review the document and amend the errors.

This is a document that will be used as a reference point for future development of the village. As a rural community it is vital that the sustainability of such communities is supported with correct information.

Comment by	East Cowton Parish Council (Mrs Judith Kilsby - 1100271)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-12
Response Date	16/09/19 10:08
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Northallerton (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email

Version 0.4
Files [2019-09-16 J Kilsby_redacted.pdf](#)

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Northallerton Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Site in East Cowton

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Have observations

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

At its recent meeting East Cowton Parish Council considered the information in the draft local plan and was concerned to note that there appears to be no consistency between the various sites referred to in East Cowton in so far as local amenities are concerned. I have therefore been requested to email you to highlight this, rather than seeking to make piecemeal comments using the various links. Services which appear to vary depending which site is examined include the fact that the village has a Community Shop in addition now to a visiting Post Office, a play area, a regular bus service (the number of services having been increased since the initial draft of the local plan was prepared) as well as a public house. It would be grateful if the details could be amended.

Comment by	Historic England (Mr Ian Smith - 1025458)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-11
Response Date	03/09/19 14:49
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Stokesley (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

Files

[App A Environment Record.pdf](#)

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the

Site Assessments - Stokesley Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on

ALT/S/058/016

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

The SA considers that this site will have a 'minor negative effect' against the SA Objective for the historic environment. We disagree with this evaluation. This site lies close to the boundary of the Great Ayton Conservation Area and its development would impact upon the setting of a number of Listed Buildings in its vicinity including the Grade I Listed Church of all Saints and the Grade II* Listed Ayton Hall. The Heritage Background Paper considers that the development of this site will harm elements which contribute to the significance of these assets but that there is an opportunity for enhancement through reinstatement of the historic strip field alignment. We disagree with that conclusion and consider that the Heritage Background Paper has underplayed the very important role that the allocated site makes to the setting and appreciation of the highly-graded listed buildings and the conservation area. Comparison of the first edition OS county series of 1856 with the current map shows the degree to which historic settlement of Great Ayton has expanded to its north and east. The allocated site forms part of the last vestige of the rural setting of the village. This agricultural character makes an important contribution to the setting and appreciation of the listed buildings and conservation area. The existing residential development to the west of the A173 already impinges on views from the churchyard of the Grade I Listed All Saints Church and from the Grade II* Ayton Hall. The loss of the site of this proposed allocation, would effectively sever these buildings from their rural setting harming their setting and appreciation. We do not agree that the harm is capable of effective mitigation. suggested comments.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Proposed changes

Please tell us what changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified.

It would be helpful if you could include revised wording. Please identify additional text by underlining it (**U**) and identifying any text to be deleted by striking it through (**ABC**).

What changes would address the issue(s) that you have identified?

Site ALT/S/058/016 amend the assessment against the historic environment as 'significant negative effect'.

Comment by	Linden Homes (David Hill - 1229520)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-16
Response Date	17/09/19 16:27
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Thirsk (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.6
Files	2019-09-17 Linden Homes LPreg19-905.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the Site Assessments - Thirsk Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on Site ref T/139/017

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

The site was identified again as Site Ref. T/139/017 within the Sustainability Appraisal, with an indicative yield of 150 homes. The appraisal identified the following “amber” and “red” scoring in the Council’s assessment of the site: - Amber: - o Biodiversity issues Red: - o The development is within, or impacts up on, a mineral safeguarding area o Links to footpaths and cycle routes o Site has poor connectivity to a bus stop or train station o Development will not redevelop previously developed land o Development will lose best and most versatile agricultural land o The site is prominent in any significant views towards a settlement o Impact on form and character of a settlement o Location in respect of services and facilities The appraisal concludes that the site represents a: - A greenfield site beyond the boundary of the Sowerby Gateway development. At present this site is distant from services and amenities, however, this will alter on completion of the Gateway development. The site scores poorly against objective five. It is very clear that the Council’s scoring of the site seems to ignore the very reasons why they allocated the Sowerby Gateway site previously. Our response to the Preferred Options Consultation assessment above provides evidence to establish that the biodiversity, agricultural land classification and landscape concerns raised by the Council can be mitigated or are simply not backed up by any evidence. Indeed the Council’s own landscape assessment confirms that the south-west area of the urban edge of Thirsk is the most appropriate location for future residential development. The site benefits from the same sustainability credentials as the Sowerby Gateway development. Indeed, the site will actually benefit from services, facilities and bus routes that were not present prior to the Sowerby Gateway coming forward for development. The site lies adjacent to the Sowerby Gateway scheme and thus if the site isn’t sustainable, then neither is the Sowerby Gateway scheme. The site is also connected by an existing footpath to the Sowerby Gateway development and the main Thirsk/Sowerby settlement area. Furthermore, as identified above, there is also the prospect of the delivery of a foot/cycle path from the Sowerby Gateway development directly to Thirsk Train Station. The two proposed allocations in Thirsk are located on greenfield sites, presenting evidence that there are no other previously developed sites available to meet the Council’s objectively assessed housing needs. Finally, with regards to mineral safeguarding, no minerals of any use or significance are present onsite as it has previously been worked. Furthermore, as the site will be surrounded by development and infrastructure on all sides, there is clearly no prospect of the site ever being used for quarrying. Consequently, as part of any future planning application, we would submit a minerals resource assessment which would identify any required mitigation as part of the new development to avoid impact on the safeguarded site. The Local Geological Area designation identified on the proposed Proposals Maps for Thirsk covers the majority of the area around the Town, thus making it clear that this is not a matter that would preclude the future development of the site. It is clear from our assessment above that the Topcliffe Road, Thirsk site represents a deliverable and sustainable residential development site. There are no technical or environmental constraints that would preclude its development for residential use. Evidence of which is presented by the Council’s own evidence base and its previous allocation of the Sowerby Gateway site.

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes

Comment by	Mr Steve Barker (1046388)
Comment ID	LPreg19-SA-17
Response Date	17/09/19 14:30
Consultation Point	Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessments - Thirsk (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8
Files	2019-09-17 S Barker_redacted PLreg19-918.pdf

Please tell us which part of the Sustainability Appraisal you are commenting on.

I am commenting on the

Site Assessments - Thirsk Area

Please tell us which section you are commenting on.

Please use paragraph numbers (e.g. 4.1.2), table numbers (e.g. Table 5.1), sub-section numbers (e.g. 4.1) or site references (e.g. N/003/003).

Please **do not** use page numbers to identify the section you are commenting on.

I am commenting on

Site T/152/004a

Please tell us whether you support, object or have observations.

Object

Comments

Please enter your comment here. You should say why you either support or object to this part of the document.

Please remember that comments will be made publicly viewable. Therefore please do not include information of a personal nature that you would want to be kept confidential.

You can put forward changes to address the issue(s) you have identified (see below).

Please note: There are no limits on the length of comments, but please be as concise as possible, including only that which is necessary to explain your comment.

You can support your comment with supporting documents if you wish (see below) but please include clear references and reasoning as to why any attachments support your comment.

Note: Any comments that rely entirely on supporting documents and state 'See attached report' or similar for this question will not be accepted.

Please enter your comment here.

To inform the selection of sites for development within the Local Plan, the sustainability implications of potential sites have been established through the Sustainability Appraisal process. Our Client's site has been assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal but has been scored incorrectly against a number of the Sustainability Objectives, as discussed within this Section. Objective 7 Sustainability Objective 7 is to protect and improve air quality, reduce climate change and reduce the risk of flooding. Parts 7c, 7d and 7e of this objective have been incorrectly scored. Objective 7c – Is part of the site or whole site in Flood Zone 3 or 2 or at risk from Surface Water Flooding? The scoring criteria are as follows: • Red: "Yes, extremely significant (more than 40% of site within any event)". • Amber: " A significant part of the site at risk from surface water flooding or where the site is over 1ha and any part of the site is within an area of surface water flooding". • Green: " Site does not fall within a flood zone and has minimal or no risk of surface water flooding". The Site has incorrectly been scored red. Below are extracts from the Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Weetwood in support of the outline planning application for development of the Site. These demonstrate that the Site is located mainly within Flood Zone 1 and is at very low risk of flooding from surface water. There have been no objections from the Environment Agency or Lead Local Flood Authority in relation to the planning application. The Site is not at risk from surface water flooding, however due to being over 1ha and to the small amount of the site within Flood Zone 2, should be scored Amber.[See full representation for flood zone mapping] 7d – Will development increase the risk of flooding? The scoring criteria are as follows: • Red: "yes – whole of part of the site is within flood zone 3 or there is a history of surface water flooding". • Amber: "Yes, all new development could be considered to lead to an increase in the risk of flooding due to materials used but situation could be managed through mitigation". • Green: "No, the site is within Flood Zone 1 or there is no history of surface water flooding on or near the Site". Again, the red score is simply incorrect given the low risk of surface water flooding and that none of the Site is within Flood Zone 3. The Site should be scored amber as it has been demonstrated through the planning application that risk of flooding can be satisfactorily managed through mitigation. 7e – Can any increase in risk of flooding be mitigated? 4.14 The scoring criteria are as follows: • Red: • Amber: • Green: Again, the

Site has been incorrectly scored as red for the reasons discussed above. The Site should be scored green as any increase in risk of flooding can be mitigated and this has been satisfactorily demonstrated within the Flood Risk Assessment appended to these representations. Sustainability Objective 9 SA Objective 9 relates to accessibility to adequate leisure facilities, recreational activities, health services, education and training opportunities and to ensure health and well-being improves. Each sub-category of this Objective includes a distance from the Site to facilities which then dictates the score it achieves. The scoring is not however clear where distances are measured from or how they are measured. The Sustainability Plan at Appendix 1 demonstrates that a significant proportion of facilities are within a circa 10 minute walk distance from the Site meaning that local residents can enjoy access to a range of services and amenities. These include: • Thirsk Community Primary School; • Sowerby Community Primary School; • Thirsk School and Sixth Form College; • Small supermarkets/convenience stores; • Sports and recreation facilities including: Thirsk and Sowerby Leisure Centre; • GP Surgery; • Veterinary Practice; • Police Station; • Shops including: convenience stores, post office, food and retail, household, beauty services and many more; • Places of Worship; and • Employment Areas including Thirsk Industrial Park and Coquet Enterprise Park. Our Client's Site is in a highly sustainable location, within easy walking distance of Thirsk Town Centre which is a main focus for growth. A number of the scores within Objective 9 are incorrect and distances have been over-estimated. Stage 4 of the Site Selection Methodology The Site Selection Methodology and Results Document explains the stages and steps associated with the assessment process. Stage 4 was added to the site selection process in 2018 in order to apply the emerging spatial strategy of the Local Plan and to consider the most appropriate sites to allocate, taking account of the full range of planning considerations. The summary of results within Table 4.7 of the Document provides a rationale for either allocating or discounting sites. In relation to our Client's Site (T/152/004a), it simply states "part of the site within flood zones 3b, 3a and 2 – although this could be accommodated the site is not sequentially preferable". As discussed within these representations, this is simply incorrect. The Site is mostly situated within Flood Zone 1, with part of the western boundary within Flood Zone 2. The planning application submitted for development of this Site has satisfactorily demonstrated that the built development could be accommodated purely within Flood Zone 1. An indicative site plan, showing how development could come forward within Flood Zone 1 is shown in Figure 4.3 below.[See full representation for indicative site plan]

Please tell us whether changes can be made to address the issue(s) you have identified.

Can the issue(s) you have identified be addressed by making changes to the plan? Yes