Planning Inspectorate

Report to Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority

By Malcolm Rivett BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Date: 11th June 2026

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and as applied by the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026

Report on the Examination of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2025-40

The plan was submitted for examination on 20 August 2025

The examination hearing sessions were held between 3 and 11 December 2025

File Ref: PINS/C9499/429/4

Contents

Abbreviations used in this report 3

Non-Technical Summary 3

Introduction 4

Context of the plan 5

Public Sector Equality Duty and National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act . 6

Assessment of Legal Compliance 6

Assessment of Soundness 8

Issue 1 – Whether the plan's housing target, settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy are positively prepared, justified and consistent with national policy 8

Issue 2 – Whether the housing site allocation selection process is robust and whether the plan is justified and effective in respect of the housing site allocations, the housing development boundaries and the likely supply of housing…… 13

Issue 3 – Whether the plan's Core policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy……..……..……24

Issue 4 - Whether the plan's Community policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy 27

Issue 5 – Whether the plan's Economy site allocations and policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy 34

Issue 6 – Whether the plan's policies in respect of Infrastructure, Access/Connectivity and Archaeology/Built Heritage are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy 38

Issue 7 – Whether the plan's policies in respect of Landscape and Natural Environment are justified, effective and consistent with national policy 40

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation 42

Schedule of Main Modifications ..... Appendix

Abbreviations used in this report

dpa	Dwellings Per Annum
MM	Main Modification
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
1949 Act	National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act (1949)
2004 Act	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2025-40 provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the National Park provided that a number of main modifications (MMs) are made to it. The Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority has specifically requested that I recommend any MMs necessary to enable the plan to be adopted.

Following the hearing sessions, the Authority prepared a schedule of the proposed modifications and, where necessary, carried out sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment of them. The MMs were subject to public consultation over a six-week period. In some cases I have amended their detailed wording and/or added consequential modifications where necessary. I have recommended their inclusion in the plan after considering the sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment and all the representations made in response to consultation on them.

The Main Modifications can be summarised as follows:

- Changing the Baliol School, Sedbergh site to an allocation for housing, instead of employment development which is unlikely to be deliverable;
- Removing from the plan the housing allocations at The Warehouse, Newbiggin-on-Lune and Ashfield Court, Orton because of flood risk;
- Including in Appendix 4 of the plan a number of specific requirements in respect of development of the Baliol School, Sedbergh and Threshfield housing site allocations;
- A range of other modifications to ensure that the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2025-40 in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and as applied by Regulation 4 and paragraph 2 schedule 1 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026. It considers whether the plan is compliant with the relevant legal requirements (including in terms of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, also as applied by Regulation 4 and paragraph 2 schedule 1 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026) and whether it is sound.

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 (paragraph 36), to which I have had regard, advises that in order to be sound, a local plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

3. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local planning authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2025-40 (Submission) submitted in August 2025 is the basis for my examination. It is the same document that was published for consultation in March 2025.

Main Modifications

4. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act, the Authority has requested that I should recommend any main modifications (MMs) necessary to rectify matters that make the plan unsound and /or not legally compliant and thus incapable of being adopted. My report explains why the recommended MMs are necessary. The MMs are referenced in bold in the report in the form **MM1, MM2** etc, and are set out in full in the Appendix.

5. Following the examination hearing sessions, the Authority prepared a schedule of proposed MMs and, where necessary, carried out sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment of them. The MM schedule was subject to public consultation for six weeks. I have taken account of the consultation responses in coming to my conclusions in this report and in this light I have made some amendments to the detailed wording of the main modifications and added consequential modifications where these are necessary for consistency or clarity. None of the amendments significantly alters the content of the modifications as published for consultation or undermines the participatory processes and sustainability appraisal/habitats regulations assessment that has been undertaken. Where necessary I have highlighted these amendments in the report.

Policies Map

6. The Authority must maintain an adopted policies map which illustrates geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan. When submitting a local plan for examination, the Authority is required to provide a submission policies map showing the changes to the adopted policies map that would result from the proposals in the submitted local plan. In this case, the submission policies map comprises the set of plans at 2025 - Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2025-40, Policies Maps - Yorkshire Dales National Park : Yorkshire Dales National Park which includes 53 Ecological Network Maps (A1 – K6), 53 Overview Maps (A1 - K6) and around 120 small area inset maps.

7. The policies map is not defined in statute as a development plan document and so I do not have the power to recommend main modifications to it. However, a number of the published MMs to the plan's policies require further corresponding changes to be made to the policies map. In addition, there are some instances where the geographic illustration of policies on the submission policies map is not justified and changes to the policies map are needed to ensure that the relevant policies are justified and effective. These further changes to the policies map were published for consultation alongside the MMs.

8. When the plan is adopted, in order to comply with the legislation and give effect to the plan's policies, the Authority will need to update the adopted policies map to include all the changes proposed in 2025 - Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2025-40, Policies Maps - Yorkshire Dales National Park : Yorkshire Dales National Park and Policies-map-changes-schedule.pdf

Context of the Plan

9. The submitted plan is intended to replace in its entirety the Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2015-2030 and policies of various development plans for Eden, South Lakeland, Lancaster, Lancashire and Cumbria insofar as they relate to the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

10. The National Park was designated in 1954 in recognition of its extraordinary natural beauty, the diversity of its wildlife habitats, its cultural heritage and its opportunities for outdoor recreation. The boundary of the Park was extended in 2016 and this local plan is the first to cover the extended Park as a whole. The area is deeply rural, generally comprising remote moors and sheltered valleys, with a population of less than 23,000 living across a very extensive expanse of North Yorkshire, Westmorland and Furness and, in small part, Lancaster. The most populous settlement is Sedbergh with a parish population of around only 2,800 residents.

Public Sector Equality Duty and National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, 1949

11. I have had due regard to the aims expressed in S149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This has included my consideration of several matters during the examination including homes for the elderly and vulnerable and gypsies and travellers.

12. In examining the plan, and as required by S11A(1)A of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act (1949), I have sought to further the purposes of (a) conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Yorkshire Dales National Park and (b) of promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment by the public of its special qualities. Moreover, where it has appeared to me that there is conflict between these purposes, I have attached greater weight to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.

Assessment of Legal Compliance

13. The plan has been prepared in accordance with the Authority's Local Development Scheme of December 2024.

14. Consultation on the plan and the MMs was carried out in compliance with the Authority's Statement of Community Involvement. Whilst it did not necessarily respond individually to everybody who submitted a consultation response, this is not evidence of the Authority ignoring consultation comments; and not agreeing with a comment (and thus not changing the plan in accordance with the comment) is not synonymous with ignoring it.

15. At key stages in the preparation of the plan the Authority carried out a sustainability appraisal (SA), prepared reports of the findings of the appraisal, and published these reports along with the plan and other submission documents under regulation 19. The appraisal was updated to assess the main modifications.

16. It has been argued that the SA is deficient in not appraising a revision to the strategy for meeting housing needs between the Preferred Options and Submission stages of the plan. Whilst page 7 of Consultation No 5 stated the housing requirement was "to be met primarily on newly allocated housing sites (to be determined)" this was simply a brief summary of the relevant policy at that stage in plan preparation (CP9, as set out on page 19 of the same document). This stated "The majority of this target [*ie the housing target of 50 dwellings per annum*] will be met through the development of allocated sites on the edge of towns and larger villages (to be determined) and through the completion of sites with existing planning consent". This policy was renumbered CP3 in the

submission plan and states "Most of this target will be met through the development of allocated sites on the edge of Local Service Centres and large villages (in Table 1) and through the completion of sites with existing planning permission."

17. Consequently, bearing in mind that the "towns" identified at Preferred Options stage were simply retitled "Local Service Centres" in the submission plan, and that completion of sites with existing planning permission was referenced at both stages, there was no change in the strategy for delivering the housing target. Moreover, it was not ever suggested that the strategy would involve the allocation of sites at all larger villages. Thus, that the submission plan does not include housing site allocations at Embsay when it did at an earlier stage in the plan preparation process is also not evidence of a change in the strategy for meeting housing needs. Therefore, I conclude that there is no deficiency in the SA in this respect.

18. I also consider that it is not a material failing of the SA to have appraised options for the housing target of 50 and 70 dwellings per annum (dpa), but not the 55 dpa which is the housing target of the extant Local Plan: at the strategic level at which the SA is appropriately undertaken, it is highly unlikely that any difference between the sustainability effects of 50 and 55 dpa would have been identified. Overall, I am satisfied that the SA provides an appropriate basis to inform my determination of whether or not the plan is sound.

19. The Yorkshire Dales Local Plan: Habitats Regulations Assessment (October 2024 and July 2025) and Addendum of March 2026 undertook an Appropriate Assessment but went on to identify that, subject to mitigation measures which have been secured through the plan as proposed to be modified, there are no likely significant effects.

20. The plan includes policies to address the strategic priorities for the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area, these priorities being detailed in paragraph 3.3 of the plan. `

21. The plan includes policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change. These include policies which seek to reduce the need to travel and to minimise the impacts of flooding.

22. The plan complies with all other relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations, subject to **MM46** which is necessary to clarify in Appendix 2 of the plan that the listed existing development plan documents will be replaced only insofar as they apply in the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

23. Taking account of all the representations, the written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearing sessions, I have identified seven main issues upon which the soundness of this plan depends. This report deals with these main issues. It does not respond to every point, issue, site or boundary raised by representors. Nor does it refer to every policy, policy criterion or allocation in the plan.

Issue 1 – Whether the plan's housing target, settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy

Housing Target

24. NPPF advises that to determine the minimum number of homes needed, local plan strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). However, PPG states that where strategic policy-making authorities do not align with local authority boundaries, such as in National Parks, an alternative approach may have to be used. It goes on to identify that such authorities may continue to identify a housing need figure using a method determined locally, but that in doing so authorities should take into consideration the best available evidence on the amount of existing housing stock within their planning authority boundary, local house prices, earnings and housing affordability [PPG, Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 2a-014-20241212].

25. NPPF also makes clear that "great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks……. which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues" and that "The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited." Moreover, as detailed above, there is a statutory duty on me, under the 1949 Act, to seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

26. Policy CP3 of the plan identifies an average target of 50 new dpa over the 2025 – 2040 plan period. This is informed by the 2024 Strategic Housing Market Assessment which, as an alternative approach to the standard method indicated by the NPPF, credibly concludes that this level of new housing provision would be likely to assist in reversing the projected decline in population in the National Park, resulting from out migration and a low birth rate in the period 2001 to 2021. Moreover, by enabling the delivery of a significant number of affordable homes, this target would be likely to attract and retain younger households,

thereby helping to slow the trend towards a disproportionately aged population in the Park.

27. It is the case that in contrast to earlier iterations of the document, the 2024 update of the Housing Market Assessment identifies that the population is likely to remain broadly stable to 2040. However, I agree with the Authority that this is likely to be the result of the extant local plan's success in delivering new housing in recent years and that a housing target for the period to 2040 of materially less than 50 dwellings per year would be likely to reverse the progress made to date in stabilising the population.

28. The extant plan has a slightly higher target of 55 dpa and covers a smaller area/population (the National Park boundary having been since expanded by around a quarter in area and population in 2016). Moreover, although a standard method housing need figure has not been published for the National Park, an estimate of this figure of 175 dpa has been calculated. In accordance with the PPG this is an appropriate consideration in determining the housing need figure for the Park. As detailed in Issue 4 below, it is also the case that there is an identified annual need for around 157 affordable homes.

29. However, having reviewed the approach by which the Authority selected and rejected potential sites for housing, and subject to the modifications which I conclude are necessary (as detailed in Issue 2), I am satisfied that all those available sites which would not have unacceptable impacts have been allocated in the plan. On this basis, it would not be feasible to deliver an average of 175 new dwellings a year without significantly compromising the conservation and enhancement of the Park's landscape and scenic beauty, contrary to the 1949 Act. Furthermore I conclude that such a level of new housing development would not be limited in scale and extent as required by the NPPF. On this basis the 50 dpa target figure for new housing is justified.

30. It has been cogently argued that, given the overall size and internal transport limitations of the Park, the provision of new housing in one part of the plan area may not meet the needs of people living, or wanting to live in another area – eg between Wharfedale and Wensleydale and even between Wharfedale and Malhamdale. The National Park is not unique in this respect, although I accept it may be a more dominant feature here than it is in many local plan areas.

31. In theory this could support the case for a separate housing target figure to be produced for each part of the National Park albeit, other than the standard method (which would be a share for each part of the park of the total 175 dpa figure set out above), it is not clear on what justifiable basis such figures could be produced. I consider that it would not be appropriate to disaggregate the minimum 50 dpa target figure of the submitted plan into maximum target figures for each part of the plan area. This is because the 50 dpa target is based on the

legitimate aim of reversing population decline across the National Park as a whole whilst ensuring that the Park is conserved and enhanced. If the single target figure for the plan area reverses population decline but results in a greater increase in population in some parts of the Park than others, then as long as the new housing conserves/enhances the National Park this approach is a justified one. In contrast, and as detailed below as part of my consideration of the plan's Spatial Strategy, a maximum target figure for each part of the local plan area would be likely to run the risk of not achieving the aim of reversing the decline in population across the Park as a whole.

32. The new homes built in the National Park will contribute towards meeting the housing needs, as determined by the standard method, of the local authorities which are constituent parts of the Park – North Yorkshire, Westmorland and Furness and, to a small degree, Lancaster City.

33. Taking account of existing planning permissions, the plan's housing allocations and 'windfall' housing development (including within expanded housing development boundaries as proposed in the plan), it is likely that an average of around 70 dpa can and will be delivered. I consider this would remain limited in scale and extent, in line with national policy. In recognition of this, **MM2** is necessary to make clear in policy CP3 that the 50 dwellings per year target is a minimum figure. However, given the fundamental importance of ensuring that great weight is given to conserving and enhancing the Park's landscape and scenic beauty and the threat to that which inappropriate housing development could cause, it would not be appropriate to set the plan's formal housing target figure higher than 50 dwellings per year. Moreover, for the plan to be justified it is necessary for **MM2** to make clear in the supporting text that the minimum housing target figure is not an unending requirement and that policies throughout the plan guard against a level of housing growth which would significantly conflict with National Park purposes.

Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy

34. Paragraph 4.19 of the plan makes clear that the majority of new development is to be located within or on the edge of the towns and villages within the Park where most of the area's services and facilities are located and where new development can help support those services and facilities. This approach is eminently sensible and accords with the NPPF's statement (paragraph 11) that plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development. Table 1 of the plan sets out a detailed hierarchy of settlements: local service centres (in effect the towns), large villages and small settlements. This hierarchy has its origins in the 1990s, but has been subject to comprehensive review as part of the preparation of this plan, including taking account of the Park's recently expanded boundaries. The Authority's Matter 2 statement details the methodology employed which, to my mind, was robust and thorough. Whilst there will always

be debate as to the appropriate categorisation of some "borderline" settlements, I conclude that the hierarchy set out in Table 2 is justified.

35. As detailed above, the supply of developable sites for housing across the plan period is around 70 dpa - 1,106 new homes in total. Of this around 73% are forecast to be built on new sites allocated in the plan or on 'windfall' sites, many of which are anticipated to take place on land newly included, through the plan, in the housing development boundaries of a number of settlements. In terms of the plan's housing site allocations as proposed to be modified (see Issue 3 below which details the deletion of sites in Newbiggin-on-Lune and Orton and the addition of one in Sedbergh), it is the case that these are not proportionally distributed across the National Park in line with the existing population of the towns and villages. There is proportionally significantly more housing development proposed on new site allocations in the south of the Park than in the north. Moreover, within the southern part of the Park, a large proportion of housing on the site allocations is proposed in Threshfield (part of the combined Grassington/Threshfield local service centre), whilst none is proposed in Embsay, one of the largest villages and close to the facilities, services and public transport connections of Skipton, not far outside the Park's boundary.

36. As proposed to be modified around 83% of housing on new site allocations would be within/adjoining towns (service centres). I consider the soundness of each housing site allocation in Issue 2 below. However, in principle, I consider this proportion to be appropriate, bearing in mind the services the towns offer (and which can be supported by the new housing) and that a much larger proportion of 'windfall' housing developments is likely to take place in the villages and small settlements, particularly where the plan proposes expansion of the housing development boundaries.

37. However, it is the case that some of the local service centres have more constraints to new housing development than others: development at Reeth and Hawes is limited by river floodplains, whilst there are conservation areas at Gayle, Grassington, Reeth, Sedbergh and Settle. Several local service centres also have steep topography. In contrast, Threshfield does not have these constraints.

38. The Authority has indicated that it would have liked to have been able to allocate more housing site allocations in the north of the Park. Moreover, at the hearing it stated that, notwithstanding the constraints of the northern service centres, it was aware of land in the north of the Park which it believed would be likely to be, in principle, suitable for new housing but which landowners/developers were not interested in developing for new homes. As detailed in Issue 3 below, it is also the case that housing development in the northern dales is generally less viable than in the south of the Park. Ultimately, it would not be a justified or effective plan which allocated sites for housing to

meet a desired spatial strategy, which have little or no chance of actually being developed.

39. The plan includes all the site allocations which were deemed suitable for development through the site selection process which, as set out in Issue 2 below, I conclude to have been robust. Through this process several potential housing allocations at Embsay were identified to be unsuitable. This fundamentally explains the lack of new housing allocations in this village, rather than a deliberate spatial strategy decision to direct new housing to Threshfield instead. That said (and noting that decisions through the site selection process inevitably often involve finely-balanced judgements) a significant amount of new housing development has taken place in recent years in Embsay (in both the National Park and non-National Park parts of the village) whilst only a handful of new homes have been built in Threshfield since the late 1990s. I consider that, all other things being equal (including the broad demand for and viability of development), it is an appropriate planning objective to share new housing around settlements over the long term, although in practice this will often mean the amount of new housing built in specific periods of a decade or more will vary considerably between settlements.

40. Overall, the plan's aim to locate the majority of new homes in/adjoining the service centres and large villages is a sensible one and consistent with national policy. The housing site allocations in the plan may not, in themselves, result in the perfect spatial strategy. However, having regard to (i) the constraints of many of the settlements and individual sites promoted for housing (and the importance of ensuring that great weight is given to conserving and enhancing the Park's landscape and scenic beauty), (ii) the variations in the viability of, and demand for, building new homes across the area and (iii) the new housing likely to be delivered as a result of extant planning permissions and 'windfall' development, I conclude that the plan's spatial strategy is justified and effective.

41. However, as submitted, policy CP3 does not clearly distinguish between overarching spatial strategy principles and policy in respect of the development (housing and non-residential) which will be permitted within and outside housing development boundaries. There is also some inconsistency in terminology with other policies of the plan which creates ambiguity and uncertainty. Consequently, for the plan to be justified and effective, **MM2** is necessary to address these shortcomings.

Conclusion

42. Subject to MM2 as detailed above, the plan's housing target, settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Issue 2 – Whether the housing site allocation selection process is robust and whether the plan is justified and effective in respect of the housing site allocations, the housing development boundaries and the likely supply of housing

Housing site selection process

43. The housing site selection process commenced with a "Call for Sites" in 2021 and all potential sites submitted in response to that, and others of which the Authority itself was aware, were assessed through the Housing Land Availability Assessment. This assessment is an extremely comprehensive one and is consistent with the thrust of the relevant guidance set out in the PPG. Moreover, site promoters were given the opportunity to address/rebut the initial conclusions of the assessment and the contested sites were subsequently formally reconsidered along with a number of alternative and new sites which had emerged.

44. Each site was considered against consistent assessment criteria (Suitability, Availability and Achievability) and the first of these was informed by an independently prepared Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and a comprehensive assessment of other possible constraints, informed by evidence from site promoters and consultees. The Appendices of the Housing Land Availability Assessment detail in some depth the evidence and the Authority's conclusions. The Land Availability Assessment also considers the potential for suitable 'windfall' housing developments to come forward, including all developments of less than 5 dwellings.

45. As a result of this Assessment the Authority concluded that 23 sites (with an estimated capacity for a total of 369 dwellings) were suitable, available and achievable for housing development and should, thus, be allocated in the plan. Additionally, it is forecast that 422 dwellings on 'windfall' sites are likely to come forward during the plan period, together with 300 dwellings in respect of existing planning permissions. The overall total of 1,091 dwellings[1] (an average of around 70 dpa) would comfortably exceed the housing target figure of 50 dpa. On this basis (and in view of my conclusions on the supply of housing set out below) there was not a need for the Authority to reconsider the constraints to development identified in the Housing Land Availability Assessment, or the potential to mitigate them, in order to identify more sites suitable for allocation in the plan.

46. Unsurprisingly, a number of conclusions of the Housing Land Availability Assessment have been challenged by both those in support of and opposed to the development of specific sites. This is almost inevitable given that many of

[1] This figure has been subsequently revised to 1,106 as a result of the proposed modifications to site allocations.

the conclusions involve, often finely balanced, planning judgements. However, based on my analysis of this Assessment, having given careful consideration to the critiques of it (put both in writing and at the relevant hearing session), and in light of my visits to all the sites proposed for allocation and a number of those which were not deemed suitable for allocation in the plan ("omission sites"), I am satisfied that, other than in relation to SED4 (Baliol School site) as detailed below, the conclusions reached are justified and credible ones. Moreover, there is not evidence of there being any significant inconsistency in the judgements made across the sites appraised.

47. Rightly, matters raised in public consultation were taken into account in the judgements made, but I am not persuaded that public opposition in itself, as distinct from relevant planning concerns raised by local residents, inappropriately influenced the Authority's conclusions. In view of this, the extremely comprehensive nature of the assessment and the fact that it identifies more than sufficient site allocations in the plan to ensure that there is a realistic prospect that the housing target figure will be met, I am satisfied that the housing site selection process is robust.

Housing site allocations

48. The plan is unusual in not including a specific policy or policies for any of the individual site allocations. However, in this respect it is the same as the extant plan and there is not any evidence of this having caused any significant problems. Moreover, none of the sites are large ones, in comparison with those included in most local plans, and many are very small. Having regard to this, the comprehensive nature of the plan's development management policies and the requirement that the development of site allocations has regard to a development brief, I conclude that a specific policy or policies for all or even some of the individual site allocations is/are not necessary for the plan to be sound.

49. Moreover, notwithstanding that, in the light of the development briefs to be prepared and consideration of specific planning applications, the appropriate number of new dwellings on these allocations may differ, to some degree, from the indicative capacity identified in Appendix 4, there is not the evidence in respect of any of the sites to justify altering the indicative figures at this stage. However, as detailed below, there is a need to include in Appendix 4 a limited number of specific requirements for a small number of the sites.

THR4 and THR5 (Threshfield – Land north of Upper Wharfedale School and Land north of the B6265, opposite Woodlands View) and THR8 (Land east of the B6160, Threshfield)

50. Conjoined sites THR4 and THR5 (indicative total of 75 dwellings) and THR8 (indicatively 60 dwellings) are the largest housing site allocations in the plan. I

have considered the, in principle, suitability of this amount of new housing in Threshfield in Issue 1 above and there is no substantive evidence to support the view that THR4/THR5 are required for expansion of Upper Wharfedale School, that local facilities/services would be overwhelmed or that unacceptable traffic impacts would be likely to result. Moreover, I am satisfied that, subject to appropriate detailed design at the planning application stage, unacceptable harm in respect of wildlife or dark skies would be unlikely to be caused.

51. Their size and location mean that these developments would inevitably alter the character and appearance of Threshfield to some degree. However, whilst they would materially expand the population and built-form of the settlement, I consider that their size would not be disproportionate to Threshfield as it currently is: the increase in built-development across all three sites would, together, have a smaller footprint than the existing eastern part of the settlement centred around the school.

52. The new developments would be seen in a number of views within the settlement and out of and into Threshfield from the surrounding landscape. As is almost inevitable with any new development they would obscure the views from one particular location to another. The impact of this will very much depend on the precise layout, design and landscaping of the developments and emphasises the importance of high priority being given to the proposals being designed to minimise this impact. However, in most of the views of these allocations, the new housing would be seen immediately adjacent to existing built development. Importantly, the plan provides for gaps between the new housing and the existing built development, such gaps being redolent of many of the National Park's settlements. On this basis, and having regard to my visits to these sites and the surrounding area, I conclude that it is feasible that, subject to careful detailed design and layout and appropriate mitigation, the overall impact of the development of these allocations on the landscape would be a moderate one.

53. As with all the housing site allocations the estimated dwelling capacity of these sites, as detailed in Appendix 4 of the plan, is indicative, subject to detailed design. However, in view of the importance of minimising the landscape impact of these developments, and in particular the need to maintain gaps between the new houses and existing built development in Threshfield, it would not be justified for the plan to assume that more than the currently stated indicative capacities for these sites could be delivered.

54. The boundaries of these site allocations as shown on the proposed policies map are, in effect, the anticipated extent of built-form of the developments. However, the written evidence, the discussions at the hearing session and my visits to the area demonstrate the fundamental need for land around these boundaries to be used for open space, landscaping, habitation creation etc and, in the case of THR8, access to the site and a short link road between the two separate parts

of the allocation. Consequently, for these allocations to be justified and effective it is necessary for the boundaries of the allocations to include the land likely to be required for these purposes. To not include it would run the risk of the developments not being deliverable or, worse, them being developed without the necessary surrounding open space, landscaping and habitat. Thus, changes to the policies map to include this land in these site allocations will be needed in order that they are justified.

55. That said, given the sensitivity of these allocations, the policies map also needs to specifically identify the "housing footprint" within these expanded site allocation boundaries. Furthermore, for the allocations to be justified and effective, it is necessary for Appendix 4 of the plan to explain that the proposed residential buildings and gardens will be restricted to the identified "housing footprint" (**MM47**). Notwithstanding the indicative scheme layouts which have been prepared to date, it would not be appropriate for the "housing footprints" to be shown as merely indicative because minimisation of the landscape and visual impacts of these allocations is of fundamental importance. However, it seems to me likely that if the detailed design process were to convincingly demonstrate that a slightly different configuration of the "housing footprints" of these sites would as, or more, effectively conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the National Park, then such a proposal would be permitted.

56. In the light of consultation comments I have adjusted **MM47** to ensure consistency of wording and to make clear the roads from which the sites must be accessed.

57. As detailed in Issue 3 below, whether or not a proposal constitutes major development in the National Park, and if so whether the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify it exist, (in line with the NPPF) is fundamentally a test for the planning application stage. However, clearly for these allocations to be sound, there needs to be a reasonable prospect that they will be granted planning permission and delivered.

58. The setting and scale of these allocations are such that, at this stage, I consider it is not possible to reach a view as to whether or not the resulting housing proposals (ie the relevant planning applications) would be likely to be determined to constitute major development in the National Park; much will depend on the precise design and layout of the proposals and the careful assessment of their likely impact. As part of this it may also be appropriate for consideration to be given to the cumulative impact of the THR4/THR5 and THR8 sites. Overall, at this point in time, I envisage that it is about equally likely that one or both of the proposals would be determined to constitute major development as that they would not.

59. However, were one or both of these proposals determined to be major development, in line with policy CP10 (as proposed to be modified – see Issue 3 below), consideration would have to be given at the planning application stage to the need for the development (including in terms of any national considerations and impact on the local economy), the scope for the development being located outside the National Park and the extent to which detrimental effects could be moderated.

60. National planning policy gives significant weight to the provision of new housing. And, as detailed in Issue 1 above, within the Yorkshire Dales National Park itself there is need for new homes to provide affordable housing for existing residents of the area in need of it and to help reverse population decline which, if not addressed, has the potential to threaten the economy and social viability of the Park. These needs would not be met by providing new homes outside the National Park. Furthermore, as set out in Issue 1, the evidence indicates that they could not be located elsewhere within the Park without causing more harm. Moreover, these allocations would be likely to deliver more than 60 affordable homes, located in one of the Park's local service centres and in close proximity to shopping facilities, a secondary school and bus stops with Skipton less than half an hour away.

61. Whilst emphasising that it would be a decision for the Authority in considering specific planning applications, in the light of the above I consider that if one or both of the proposals for these site allocations were to be determined to constitute major development in the National Park then there is a reasonable prospect that the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the proposals would be identified to exist.

62. Consequently, subject to **MM47** and the identified policies map changes, I conclude that site allocations THR4, THR5 and THR8 are sound.

<u>HAW1, HAW2 and HAW3 (sites at Burtersett Road, Hawes)</u>

63. These sites, which adjoin each other, are situated adjacent to the housing development boundary at the eastern end of the Hawes/Gayle local service centre. Together the sites would indicatively provide for 28 dwellings. It is almost inevitable that development of greenfield sites will have some adverse impact on the character of the area and the landscape but it is the case that there are simply not sufficient brownfield sites in the Park on which the area's housing needs could be met. Moreover, whilst I have had careful regard to the opposing detailed evidence on the point, assessment of the impact of development on the landscape is ultimately one of judgement. In the light of my visit to these sites and the surrounding areas from where they would be likely to be seen, I conclude that their overall effect on the landscape would, at most, be a moderate one. This is so, particularly bearing in mind that, notwithstanding the

natural contours of the sites, in many vistas they would be seen alongside the existing residential development on Burtersett Road. The size of these allocations, even when considered cumulatively, and their locations are such that I envisage it unlikely that they would be determined to constitute major development within the National Park.

64. The flagged path is an attractive historic feature of the HAW2 site, the setting of which would be substantially altered by the development of the land for housing. However, it appears to be feasible that it could be retained in some form and this is a matter appropriately addressed by the forthcoming design brief to which the development would be required to have regard.

65. The overall scale of new housing proposed on new site allocations in Hawes/Gayle (indicatively 38 dwellings across these sites and HAW4) is such that it is highly unlikely that it would result in overdevelopment of these settlements. Instead, I envisage they would be likely to have a modest benefit in supporting the viability of their services/facilities.

66. In summary, I conclude that the benefits of these allocations would outweigh the harm they would be likely to cause and, thus, they are sound.

CPY1 (Land at East End Farm, Carperby)

67. This site, partly within and partly immediately adjacent to the housing development boundary, is allocated in the plan, as submitted for examination, for (indicatively) six dwellings. Since publication of the plan some redevelopment of the site has taken place and, in the light of this, the Authority argued that the allocation should be deleted on the grounds that housing is no longer deliverable. Moreover, it has argued that its use for housing is no longer necessary to secure redevelopment of the previously derelict site and that it would lead to undesirable displacement of agricultural activity.

68. It is the case that prior to the relevant hearing session the landowner's/site promoter's intentions for the site were somewhat unclear. However, at the hearing session they were plain that they still intend to develop the site for housing and, based on my visit to the site, this appears to be feasible. Whilst use of the site for housing would be likely to displace its current agricultural activity, given the scale of this impact in comparison with the landowner's agricultural activities in the surrounding area, I conclude that the benefits of a small number of new dwellings within/immediately adjoining the large village of Carperby would outweigh any such harm. In view of its scale and location, it is also highly unlikely to be determined that the scheme would constitute major development in the National Park. On this basis the allocation is sound and there is, thus, no case for it to be deleted from the plan as, at one stage, suggested by the Authority.

ORT1 (Land east of Ashfield Court, Orton) and NLU2 (Land at the Warehouse, Newbiggin-on-Lune)

69. Whilst the evidence in the Housing Land Availability Assessment justified these allocations, broadly simultaneously with the publication of the plan, the Environment Agency published updated modelling which identifies a greater than previously modelled risk of fluvial flooding at these two sites. In terms of ORT1, whilst the majority of the site itself is outside a flood zone, access to the site from the B6261 crosses an area now within Flood Zone 3. In terms of NLU2 it is now modelled that 80% of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3.

70. NPPF paragraphs 172-175 are clear that plans should, where possible, avoid flood risk to people and property (including access routes). It also advises that the aim of the, required, sequential test is to ensure that development is not allocated in a plan if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. Whilst as detailed in Issue 1 above, there is an identified need for 50 dpa across the National Park, this is likely to be met on land not subject to flooding, irrespective of these two sites. Moreover, there is no identified need for new housing specifically in Orton or Newbiggin-on-Lune and nor does the plan set a strategy which seeks to ensure that new housing is provided in every village. On this basis, the sequential test set out in the NPPF would not be met and, thus, these site allocations are not sound.

71. Consequently, for the plan to be justified and consistent with national policy **MM47** is required to delete site allocations ORT1 and NLU2 from Appendix 4.

SED4 (Baliol School, Sedbergh)

72. In the plan as submitted for examination this is an allocated opportunity site for new employment uses. However, despite also being allocated for employment uses in the extant plan for nearly a decade and advertised for such uses for around 5 years, the site has not been developed. Furthermore, the viability assessment submitted by the major landowner convincingly demonstrates that office or industrial development of the site would not be viable. Moreover, it is the case that, unlike for housing, there is not an objectively identified need for new employment development in the plan area. I therefore conclude that, notwithstanding the Authority's and Parish Council's reasonable desire for there to be more employment opportunities in the Park, this site is unlikely to be deliverable for employment uses, even in part, for the foreseeable future and, thus, the allocation in its current form is not sound.

73. Nonetheless, given the site's location in Sedbergh, largely surrounded by built development within the town's housing development boundary and the presence of the attractive, but decaying, Baliol School building, there is a strong

case for sensitive redevelopment of the site. I agree with both the major landowner and the Authority, that if the site is not developed for employment uses then housing is the justified use for it. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the updated Sustainability Appraisal's assessment of use of the site for housing instead of employment development and the fact that Vacant Building Credit means that less affordable housing is likely to be delivered on the site than would otherwise be the case. Fundamentally I conclude that the provision of housing arising from the site's redevelopment and the retention/redevelopment of the historic parts of the existing building outweigh the possible (although unlikely) use of the site for employment. Moreover, given the development's scale and location it is unlikely that it would be determined to constitute major development within the National Park.

74. Consequently, for the plan to be justified **MM47** is required. This modifies Appendix 4 of the plan, to delete the site's allocation for employment uses and instead identify it as a housing allocation for, indicatively, 30 dwellings with the necessary requirements that development has regard to a development brief for the site as a whole and that the historic parts of the school building are retained and converted as part of the development. A consequent change to the policies map will also be required. The retention/conversion of the historic parts of the school building would be a key benefit of allocating this site for housing and there is no substantive evidence to indicate that this would not be physically possible or economically viable.

Other housing allocation sites

75. In the light of the written and verbal evidence and, importantly, what I saw on my site visits I conclude that the other allocated housing sites listed in Appendix 4 of the plan (AIR1, BOL1, GRA5, GRA7, HAW4, HOR6, LON5, LON8, NAT2, NLU1, SED2, SED9, SED15 and SED16) are unlikely to constitute major development, would be unlikely to result in unacceptable impacts (including on the landscape, local infrastructure/services and transport) and are in other respects justified and effective and, thus, are sound. In particular:

- The extent of SED2 (Land south of Station Road and East of Busk Lane, Sedbergh), as proposed in the plan, is justified on the basis that housing development on the rising and vegetated land to the south of the allocation would be likely to unacceptably harm the character and appearance of this part of Sedbergh.

- Given their limited size, and their potential access arrangements, I do not envisage that significant traffic problems would be likely to arise from the GRA5 (Land south east of Aynham Close, Grassington) or GRA7 (Land north of Moody Sty Lane, Grassington) allocations. Furthermore, there is no indication from the relevant utility companies

that the level of development proposed in Grassington would exacerbate any sewage problems which already exist in the area.

- I agree with the Authority that flood risk in respect of LON5 (Land rear of Moorfields & Guy's Cottages, Long Preston) can appropriately be dealt with through the development brief for the site and at the planning application stage.

Housing development boundaries

76. Housing development boundaries have been a feature of successive local plans in the National Park since the mid-1990s and are intended to provide a broad indication of the locations in which infill housing developments may be acceptable, subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the plan. The boundaries were reviewed as part of the preparation of the submitted plan, with the aim of affording additional opportunities for sensitive, small scale 'windfall' housing developments at settlements (including, for the first time, in a number of small villages/hamlets) and to define boundaries, also for the first time, for the settlements within the area newly designated within the Park in 2016.

77. The logical approach of basing the boundaries on the core developed footprint of each settlement was adopted which, thus, newly included a number of employment sites and other uses such as car parks. These uses are generally protected by various policies of the plan but their inclusion in the housing development boundaries means that, should the use no longer be needed or viable, the plan would be supportive, in principle, of their redevelopment for infill housing. However, larger areas occupied by farm sheds/yards and caravan sites were, appropriately, excluded from the boundaries on the basis that the likely housing capacity of such sites would be more suitably considered through the process of identifying housing site allocations.

78. The Authority's Matter 3 Statement and the Housing Land Availability Assessment detail the approach adopted in reviewing the boundaries and the Assessment's Appendices 19-21 set out comprehensively and in some detail the reasons for either including or excluding in the housing development boundaries the various parcels of land considered. As set out below, it is likely that the objectively assessed need for housing across the plan area will be met. Given this, and bearing in mind the need to conserve and enhance the National Park's landscape and scenic beauty and to ensure that new development is limited, the plan would not be sound if the housing development boundaries were to be significantly expanded beyond those currently proposed, to permit much more 'windfall' housing.

79. Having regard to the written evidence and that heard at the hearing sessions, I am satisfied that, overall, the review of the housing development boundaries

was robust. This conclusion is supported by my having visited a sample of the parcels of land proposed for inclusion within and exclusion from the revised boundaries. In particular the contours of the land at Carr Holme mean that, on the ground as opposed to on a plan, this site does not appear to form part of the core developed footprint of Stainforth; the land behind Garrs End Laithe would represent a protrusion of development beyond the core developed footprint of Grassington; and the walled garden at Askrigg would, if used for new dwelling(s), prominently extend the developed footprint of this part of the village northwards up sloping land. Nonetheless, I see no reason why the exclusion of this particular land from the housing development boundary would prevent its continued use as a residential garden if that currently is its lawful use.

80. However, in the light of the comments made in response to the Regulation 19 consultation, I conclude that the land south of Newlands, High Casterton does form part of the core developed footprint of this settlement. Consequently, for the plan to be justified in respect of the housing development boundaries (in particular policies CP3, C1 and C2 which set out requirements in respect of them) this land should be included within the boundaries and a policies map change will be needed to effect this.

Supply of housing

81. Evidence on the likely supply of housing land has been updated during the examination, in particular to reflect the addition and deletion of housing allocation sites as detailed above. In summary, the Authority's anticipated trajectory of dwelling completions is as follows:

	2025/26 – 2029/30	2030/31 – 2034/35	2035/36 – 2039/40	Total
Extant planning permissions	122	143	35	300
New site allocations	54	165	165	384
Future windfall supply	62	173	187	422
Total	**238**	**481**	**387**	**1106**

82. Following the hearing sessions, the Authority prepared a note [Doc 110] which together with the Housing Land Availability Study comprehensively explains the evidence and assumptions used in determining the likely number of new dwelling completions across the plan period, on a site by site basis for the extant planning permissions (at June 2025) and for the new site allocations. Appropriate deductions have been applied to avoid any double counting between extant permissions and new site allocations/'windfall' supply, along with credible deductions to reflect dwellings permitted specifically for holiday letting purposes, those which could be used for holiday letting, permissions likely to expire and partially implemented permissions which are deemed unlikely to be completed in full. The evidence also sets out credible assumptions

for determining the five year period in which the dwellings are likely to be completed.

83. The proportion of overall housing supply arising from future 'windfall' developments is relatively high (around 38%) but that is not surprising given the preponderance of very small (less than five dwellings) schemes in the National Park where national policy requires new development to be limited in scale, and where housing allocations are, sensibly, limited to those of at least five dwellings. That said more than 90% of the total housing target requirement of 750 dwellings is likely to be met by extant permissions and the new site allocations.

84. The Housing Land Availability Assessment sets out a compelling case that an average of 39 new 'windfall' dwellings per year is likely to be completed during the plan period. 39 is the long term average annual delivery of such dwellings yet that figure is largely based on the smaller plan area, prior to the expansion of the National Park in 2016. Moreover, as detailed above, the housing development boundaries have been specifically reviewed as part of this plan with the aim of increasing opportunities for 'windfall' housing development.

85. From the above it is clear that, with there being 'headroom' of housing supply over and above the plan period housing requirement figure of around 47% (1,106 supply against the 750 requirement), confidence can be had that the housing requirement figure will be met across the plan period. However for consistency with national policy **MM18** is required to include in the plan (supporting text of policy C1) a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period. That said, a more detailed, year by year and site by site trajectory is not required for the plan to be sound – it would serve little purpose in the particular circumstances of the National Park and would almost certainly very quickly become inaccurate and misleading.

86. Based on the most recent data (April 2025) and applying the relevant buffer, the Authority cannot quite demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land – the figure being around 4.5 years. However, depending on the number of completions to April 2026 (the data for which is likely to be available later in 2026), there is a realistic prospect (although not an absolute certainty) that, at the point of adoption of the plan a supply of at least 5 years would be demonstrable.

87. Nonetheless, as detailed above, the realistic supply of housing over the plan period as a whole substantially exceeds the requirement for new housing and all potential housing sites which have been demonstrated to be suitable, through the robust site selection process, have been allocated in the plan. Furthermore, national policy is clear that development in National Parks should be limited in extent. In the light of this, I conclude that it would not be appropriate to seek

ways for the plan to provide for even more housing, simply in an attempt for there to be a greater level of confidence that the Authority would be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land on adoption of the plan.

Conclusion

88. Subject to the MMs detailed above the housing site allocation selection process is robust and the plan is justified and effective in respect of the housing site allocations, the housing development boundaries and the likely supply of housing.

Issue 3 – Whether the plan's Core policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy

89. Core policies CP1 – CP10 are the plan's strategic policies which apply to all development and set the overarching context for the other policies in the plan.

90. Consistent with the NPPF as a whole, policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) identifies that development which is sustainable will be permitted and details a wide range of criteria against which sustainability will be assessed. However, to be justified **MM1** is required to include criteria in respect of land instability and crime/fear of crime reduction. Moreover, in the interests of the policy's effectiveness, **MM1** also rewords criteria in connection with transport and reducing the need to travel, removing the ambiguous reference to "avoidable" travel, and includes reference to "cultural heritage" in line with the provisions of the 1949 Act. **MM1** is slightly altered from that consulted on to retain the reference to historical environment which was deleted from the policy in error.

91. Policy CP2 concerns National Park purposes and sets out that development will be refused if it significantly conflicts with the statutory National Park purposes. The "significantly conflicts" wording is appropriate given that the 1949 Act requires the Authority to seek to further these purposes whilst, at the same time, to also seek to foster the economic and social wellbeing of communities within the Park. Consequently, some level of conflict with the National Park purposes may be appropriate in order to foster economic and social wellbeing, and for the reasons detailed throughout this report, I am satisfied that the plan (as proposed to be modified) strikes an appropriate balance in this respect. However, as the economic and social wellbeing obligation is not one of the National Park statutory purposes it is not necessary for soundness for it to be specifically referenced in policy CP2.

92. Policy CP3 (Spatial Strategy and Housing Target), and the need for **MM2**, is largely addressed elsewhere in this report, in particular in Issues 1 (above) and 4 (below). However, a minor adjustment to **MM2**, as consulted on, is required

such that policy CP3 makes clear that the sites allocated for new employment development are listed in the plan's Appendix 4.

93. Policy CP4 details how development will be assessed to minimise flood risk. However, to ensure that its wording is effective and consistent with national policy, **MM3** is required to make clear that all the policy's criteria 1, 2 and 3 must be met by development in areas at risk of flooding and to clarify the application of the sequential test where flood risk only relates to surface water.

94. To ensure that it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy, a number of changes are required to policy CP5 (Sustainable Drainage – Foul and Surface Water). As such **MM4** is necessary to (i) make explicit that all development must make appropriate provision for foul and surface water management and the requirements for drainage management and maintenance plans; and (ii) to detail in the policy's supporting text requirements in relation to nutrient neutrality and the relevance of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plans. In the light of consultation comments I have adjusted the wording of **MM4** to ensure consistency of terminology and consistency with the NPPF in terms of minor development. However, I am satisfied that for the plan to be sound it does not need to be more specific about positive enhancement opportunities for the water environment and water resource management, these being appropriately dealt with by other strategies including River Basin Management Plans.

95. Policy CP6 (Design) is consistent with section 12 of the NPPF (Achieving well-designed places) in the context of legislation and national policy in respect of National Parks. Nonetheless, for the policy to be justified, **MM5** is needed to explicitly reference landscape/townscape character and visual amenity, to make clear that development should "have regard to" (rather than "conform with") the local Design Guide (bearing in mind that this does not form part of the development plan) and to make clear in the supporting text that development briefs will be prepared for <u>all</u> of the allocated sites. However, given the policy's requirement for "resilient construction", a specific reference to constraints on utilities is not necessary for the policy to be sound. Furthermore, given that the National Park is not an area of water stress it would not be justified for the plan to require development to comply with national optional standard for water efficiency.

96. In respect of policy CP7 (Energy Requirements) **MM6** is required for the policy to be consistent with national policy, justified and effective. This clarifies that use of decentralised sources of energy and measures to mitigate disruption in energy supplies/communications are encouraged rather than being a requirement. The modification also includes a necessary reference to consideration of archaeology and built heritage and removes the ambiguous "in relation to" wording. In my judgement the policy as proposed to be modified

strikes an appropriate balance between the objectives of achieving energy efficiency and protecting the significance of heritage assets.

97. Policy CP8 (Landscape Character) is key to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Yorkshire Dales National Park in line with the 1949 Act. However, in the interests of effectiveness, **MM7** is required to replace ambiguous wording and in the interests of clarity (and in the light of consultation comments) I have reworded the policy's fifth bullet point from that consulted on. As originally written, footnote 70 of the policy, concerning the visual and perceptual impact of development, is inappropriately definitive. Consequently, for the policy to be justified **MM7** also modifies this to provide the necessary flexibility.

98. In order to assist readers of the plan, policy CP9 (Biodiversity Net Gain) seeks to summarise statutory requirements in this respect. But, in doing so, it has the potential to not fully accurately express these requirements. Consequently, for the policy to be effective, **MM8** is required to remove this summary. However, irrespective of the statutory biodiversity net gain requirements, it is justified and consistent with paragraph 187(d) of the NPPF for the policy to require development to include measures such as swift bricks and bat roost boxes. Nonetheless, the wording makes clear that these are only examples and, as such, it is not necessary for the policy to specifically refer to every species for which measures may be required (eg hedgehogs), nor to the precise number of such measures which will be needed. Moreover, whilst ultimately it is for developers to decide how to meet the statutory biodiversity net gain requirements, given the 1949 Act's obligation to enhance wildlife in the National Park, it is justified for the policy to encourage developers to meet the requirements within the Park, and, to maximise its benefit, to do so preferably within its defined ecological network. In view of consultation comments I have adjusted **MM8**, from that consulted on, to make clear that development should "ensure" that wildlife is conserved.

99. Policy CP10 details how major development within the National Park will be assessed. The policy itself is consistent with paragraph 190 of the NPPF, apart from the bullet point concerning carbon emissions, which in any case is addressed by various other policies of the plan. Consequently, to be consistent with national policy, **MM9** is required to delete this bullet point. Furthermore, the supporting text of the policy sets out a definition of major development which is not consistent with footnote 67 of the NPPF and the text goes on to detail development in the area which would and would not constitute major development.

100. Given that the NPPF is clear that its major development test concerns specific applications for development in National Parks and that it is for the decision maker to determine whether or not a specific proposal is major development taking into account its nature, scale and setting, it is inappropriate for the local

plan to detail what would and would not constitute major development: by definition that will depend on an assessment of the precise design and location of specific applications for planning permission. Thus, for consistency with national policy, **MM9** also deletes this supporting text and replaces it with brief explanation of the policy, consistent with the NPPF. However, for the policy to be sound it is not necessary for this supporting text to repeat aspects of national policy in respect of National Parks which are already referred to elsewhere in the plan.

101. That said, proposals for new development in the plan would be unlikely to be deliverable, and thus not sound, if there were not a realistic prospect that they would comply with policy CP10, as proposed to be modified. Accordingly, Issue 2 above assesses the plan's proposed housing site allocations in this particular respect.

Conclusion

102. Subject to the MMs detailed above the plan's Core policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Issue 4 – Whether the plan's Community policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy

Principal residency, affordable and local occupancy homes

103. Central to the plan's strategy for housing is that all new homes should be the occupant's principal residence, that as many as possible are affordable and that a small number should be for local occupancy only.

104. Currently around 20% of dwellings within the National Park are in use as holiday lets, second homes or are otherwise vacant. Whilst holiday lets and second homes are not without benefit (and many existing dwellings will continue to be able to be used for these purposes), the market for holiday lets/second homes is such that it has significantly restricted access to housing for local people and has eroded community vitality.

105. There appears to be widespread, albeit not unanimous, support for the plan's requirement that all new dwellings should be occupied as a principal residence – that is to say not as a holiday let or second home. In the light of the above, I consider this to be, in principle, a justified approach to help attract and retain people who need or wish to live permanently within the Park, thereby supporting its social and economic vitality.

106. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2024 Update) identifies an annual need of around 157 affordable homes within the National Park. The area is not

unique in this figure being higher than the objectively assessed annual need for all homes – in essence there is an imbalance between the affordability of the existing housing stock and many existing and emerging households' ability to pay for it. Having regard to the NPPF, this situation strongly supports the plan's approach of seeking to maximise the proportion of new homes which are affordable within the constraints of financial viability.

107. It is the case that the Economic Viability Assessment Addendum (2025) identifies that schemes of up to five dwellings on brownfield sites are potentially unviable and that schemes of 2-4 dwellings were not specifically assessed. It is also debateable as to whether the Assessment fully takes account of the costs of the requirements for open space and bio-diversity net gain in relation to larger housing sites. Consequently, there may need to be some flexibility in the application of the affordable housing requirements on a case by case basis. Paragraph 8.26 of the plan makes clear that the Authority will consider applying such flexibility when necessary. However, if the affordable housing requirements were to be set at the "lowest common denominator" level to ensure that every conceivable scheme would be viable, it is almost certain that in many developments less affordable housing would be delivered than was actually viable. Such an approach would not be justified given the level of identified need for affordable housing in the National Park. Consequently, in the context of paragraph 8.26's provision for the application of flexibility in terms of affordable housing provision, the plan's reference (Appendix 7) to the rejection of schemes which deliver "well below" the affordable housing policy requirement is justified.

108. The likely supply of an average of around 70 dwellings per year, in comparison with the requirement of a minimum of 50, should assist in maximising the delivery of affordable homes. However, given that, at most, it is viable for 50% of new housing to be affordable (and it is significantly less than this in large parts of the National Park) the total number of new homes would need to be at least double the annual requirement for affordable homes (157 x 2 = 314 dpa) in order to fully meet the requirement for affordable housing. In the light of my conclusions in Issue 1 above, even if there were to be the demand to build this number of new dwellings, it would not be possible to do so whilst also conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Park.

109. Given that for the foreseeable future the demand for affordable housing is likely to outstrip the availability of it, the plan justifiably seeks to restrict affordable housing to those who work or have another specific need to live in the National Park. However, for viability reasons single dwelling schemes, subdivision of existing dwellings and conversions of traditional buildings are not subject to affordable housing requirements. Nonetheless, such schemes make up a significant proportion of overall new housing provision in the Park, and without some form of control over them, people who have a need to live in the area would be likely to be priced out of these homes by relatively wealthy incomers,

including the many people who are attracted to retire to the area. Bearing in mind the Park's disproportionately ageing population (as detailed in Issue 1 above), I conclude that the plan's requirement that these schemes should be restricted to local occupancy only (ie those with a need to live in the National Park) is justified.

110. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the detailed evidence which persuasively demonstrates that a particular housing proposal would be rendered unviable by the local occupancy requirement and it is the case that the requirement would be likely to reduce the market value of local occupancy housing by around 20%. Balanced against this is the fact that the local occupancy restriction is a requirement of the extant local plan and there is little evidence to suggest that it has had a significant adverse effect on the delivery of housing. Whilst evidence suggests that, in theory, most single dwelling schemes are unviable even without the local occupancy restriction, many single dwelling schemes have been built in the National Park in recent years, demonstrating that theoretical unviability is not necessarily a barrier to the construction of single dwellings.

111. Consequently, in principle there is a strong case for the plan's requirements in respect of principal residency, affordable and local occupancy homes. However, a number of detailed modifications are required to ensure that the plan is justified and effective in relation to these matters:

- **MM2** – to include in the supporting text for policy CP3 (Spatial Strategy and Housing Target) brief justification for the affordable and local occupancy homes requirements and a table setting out the requirements for principal residency, affordable and local occupancy homes in respect of each of the plan's policies which provide for new housing. The requirements are inherently (although justifiably) complicated and the table is necessary to provide as much clarity as possible.

- **MM16** – to make clear in policy AB2 (Conversion of Traditional Buildings – Acceptable Uses) that conversion of traditional buildings to dwellings will be subject to local occupancy restrictions, whilst indicating in the supporting text that, on a case by case basis, the Authority will consider the appropriateness of an element of affordable housing provision instead of local occupancy. However the plan cannot be prescriptive about every possible building conversion which may be proposed and I am satisfied that the policy, its footnotes and its supporting text (as proposed to be modified) together provide an effective level of detail, whilst enabling appropriate flexibility to be applied in determining specific planning applications.

- **MM18** – to make clear that principal residency applies to all new dwellings, to ensure consistency of wording across the plan in relation to local occupancy requirements and to include a more comprehensive justification of the principal residency, affordable and local occupancy homes requirements in the supporting text to policy C1 (Housing in Towns and Large Villages). In the light of consultation comments I have altered the wording of supporting text paragraph 7.16 in the interests of clarity.

- **MM19** – to modify policy C2 (Housing in Small Settlements) to ensure consistency of wording across the plan in respect of principal residency housing.

- **MM45** - to ensure that the wording of the plan's Glossary is consistent with the rest of the plan in respect of principal residency, local occupancy and affordable homes.

- **MM48** – to make clear in Appendix 7 of the plan (which sets out further details of the affordable housing requirements) how requirements for fractions of a dwelling to be affordable (eg 50% of 7 dwellings) should be addressed and to provide for some limited cross-boundary flexibility in determining eligibility for affordable housing. The latter is justified given that the boundary of the National Park bisects a number of settlements.

- **MM49** – to remove from Appendix 8 (which sets out qualifying criteria for local occupancy) text which justifies the principle of local occupancy restrictions and which is more appropriately included in the supporting text of the relevant policy (C1) by **MM18**.

- **MM50** – to expand the requirements in Appendix 9 for demonstrating compliance with the principal residency restriction and to identify that the restriction will be secured by planning obligation. This is necessary to ensure that the restriction is enforceable. The modification also removes from Appendix 9 the text which justifies the concept of principal residency and which is more appropriately included in the supporting text of the relevant policy (C1) by **MM18**.

Other housing issues

112. In addition to the other matters detailed above, policy C1 (Housing in Towns and Large Villages) includes requirements in respect of the size of dwellings, in line with paragraph 63 of the NPPF. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies a need of between 45% and 55% of homes to be one and two bedroom dwellings. As submitted for examination, policy C1 requires at least

45% of these sized homes on schemes of five or more dwellings. However, the 45% figure would result in the awkward requirement for fractions of a dwelling to be one or two bedroomed in the majority of schemes likely to come forward. Consequently, for the policy to be justified and effective **MM18** is required to change the requirement to 50% (the midway point in the range of identified need) but to include a clause permitting a different proportion where specific evidence is submitted to justify an alternative figure. **MM18** also includes other minor wording changes to policy C1, to ensure clarity and consistency within the plan and, thus, its effectiveness.

113. Policy C1 also requires all new build dwellings to be constructed to M4(2) accessible and adaptability standards. In the light of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment's evidence on the proportion of the area's population which is elderly and/or disabled, and the Viability Assessment's credible assumption that M4(2) would cost £2,000 per dwelling on average, I am satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of need and viability to justify this requirement. However, given that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies the need for only two M4(3) dwellings per year, a policy requirement in respect of this would not be justified. In reaching this conclusion I have borne in mind that policy C7 encourages, but does not specifically require, M4(3) dwellings in order to meet the needs of elderly and vulnerable adults. Nonetheless, to ensure its effectiveness, some wording changes are required to policy C7 (**MM23**) to make clear that it applies within (as well as on the edge of) towns and large villages and that all three of the criteria in respect of extra care and residential care facilities must be met.

114. To provide clarity, and thereby ensure its effectiveness, **MM19** also makes clear that policy C2 (Housing in Small Settlements) only concerns new-build housing, conversions being addressed by other policies of the plan.

115. The wording of the first part of policy C3 (Rural Exception Sites) lacks clarity and, thus, **MM20** is necessary to address this to ensure the policy's effectiveness. Also, to be justified, **MM20** makes clear that dwellings on rural exception sites should remain affordable "in perpetuity".

116. Policy C4 (Rural workers' dwellings) stipulates that such developments should be limited to 120 sq m, unless otherwise specifically justified. It is appropriate, in principle, to restrict the size of such dwellings given that they will mostly be in locations which, otherwise, would not be suitable for a new dwelling and bearing in mind the need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the National Park. To my mind the 120 sq m limit is reasonable given that the Nationally Described Space Standard for a four bedroom, six person, dwelling is 99 sq m. That permitted development rights would allow a farm building of up to 155 sq m to be converted to a dwelling outside a protected landscape does not, in my view, justify the same figure for rural workers' dwellings within the protected landscape of the National Park. That said, where there is an identified need for

a rural workers' dwelling, I envisage it likely that the provision of this through the sensitive, and otherwise appropriate, conversion of a farm building would constitute the evidence to specifically justify a dwelling somewhat larger than the normal 120 sq m limit. However, in the interests of clarity, and thus effectiveness, **MM21** is required to make clear that the size limit relates to the internal floor area of the dwelling.

117. In principle, policy C5 sets out justified requirements in respect of shared housing, sub-division of dwellings, residential annexes and replacement dwellings. However, as written, the policy is confusing and ambiguous, and in order for it to be effective **MM22** is required to redraft the policy to address this.

118. Given their potential adverse landscape impacts, policy C6 justifiably states that caravans, mobile homes and other forms of non-permanent accommodation will not be permitted for permanent residential use. However, it goes on to identify that, as an exception to this, where there is evidence of need in the plan area, residential caravans for Gypsies and Travellers will be permitted subject to a number of criteria. The approach of seeking to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers through such a policy, rather than the allocation of sites, is justified given that the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Craven and Cumbria (2022) credibly identifies that there is no need for new pitches or plots within the National Park. The same conclusion is reached for the parts of the Park within Richmondshire. Whilst the relevant study for Richmondshire is somewhat dated (2013), a new study for this area (as part of the new North Yorkshire Unitary Authority) is currently being compiled. Given the potential for a specific proposal for accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers to come forward through policy C6, it would not be justified to delay adoption of the plan pending the production of this study.

Important Open Space, Community Facilities and Waste Management

119. Important Open Spaces have been a longstanding designation in development plans in the National Park and it is clear that there is a strong level of support for them. The criteria for their designation is that the open space (a) provides a valuable/sporting or recreational resource for the local community; (b) allows important public views into or from within the settlement; (c) is of historical significance contributing to the understanding of the settlement's development or the setting of important historical buildings; (d) provides important wildlife habitat or helps mitigate flood risk; or (e) is crucial to the character or setting of the settlement. In my judgement these criteria mean that, in principle, the designation of these spaces, and their protection by policy C9, is justified by their role in helping to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park and in protecting open space and sports/recreational land in line with NPPF paragraph 104.

120. In preparing the plan the Authority comprehensively and robustly reviewed the land to be designated as Important Open Space, as detailed in its Matter 4 Statement. I agree with the Authority that only the highest quality spaces are appropriately designated, given the protection they are given by the plan, Moreover, if lesser quality open spaces were to be designated, this could undermine the Important Open Spaces designation as a whole and thereby undermine the protection ultimately given to the highest quality spaces.

121. On this basis, and having considered the detailed arguments made for and against their designation, I consider that (i) Hallgarth field (Airton) is justifiably designated, having particular regard to the importance of maintaining a gap between the proposed housing allocation and the settlement's historic core; and (ii) residential gardens and grass verges at Cracoe are crucial to the character of the settlement and are, thus, appropriately designated as Important Open Space. Moreover, in my judgement the verge in front of Dacre/Sargill Cottage and Sunny Holme (Sedbusk), effectively acts as village green, and on this basis also justifies designation as Important Open Space, requiring a change to the policies map to effect this.

122. Conversely, I conclude that land off Fell Lane/Back Lane (Cracoe) and the verge on Station Road (Threshfield) do not warrant designation as Important Open Space – the former being a small pasture croft with no public access or recreational value and not within a conservation area, and the latter forming part of the access to site allocation THR4/THR5. Designation of this verge would be incompatible with the site allocation and I consider that the benefits of the allocation's housing provision would outweigh the loss of the road verge.

123. An objection to the designation, as Important Open Space, of part of the grounds of the Reeth Medical Centre was made at a very late stage in the examination process. Whilst it is unfortunate that the objector was not aware of the proposed designation at a much earlier stage, as detailed above in my assessment of Legal Compliance, I am satisfied that consultation on the plan accorded with the Statement of Community Involvement. Furthermore, there is no statutory requirement for the Authority to directly consult a landowner about proposed local plan policies/designations which may affect their property. Moreover, the designation is not for Local Green Space (as defined in the NPPF) and the restrictions on its development would not be the same as national policy for Green Belt.

124. The land is used as a community allotment, which I understand is part of the 'Incredible Edible' initiative. As such it has recreational value which in my view justifies its designation as Important Open Space. In reaching this judgement I have borne in mind that it is unlikely that policy C9, as proposed to be modified, would prevent development of the land if the allotment no longer existed, was no longer needed or if it was to be relocated/replaced as part of the development.

125. However, in terms of policy C9 (Important Open Space) itself, **MM24** is required to ensure that it is effective, replacing "designated" with "important" in the policy's second sentence which refers to land of sporting or recreational value. This reflects the fact that, although the open spaces were appraised against a range of criteria as set out above (including their importance in terms of sporting/recreation value) they were not formally designated in connection with any specific criterion or criteria.

126. In the light of all that I have read and heard, policies C8 (Community facilities) and C10 (Waste management) are consistent with national policy and are justified having particular regard to the plan area's designation as a National Park.

Conclusion

127. Subject to the MMs detailed above the plan's Community policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Issue 5 – Whether the plan's Economy site allocations and policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy

128. The plan does not identify a required amount of additional land for employment development. This is justified given the dominance of agriculture in the area, the preponderance of very small other types of business and the national policy requirement for the scale and extent of development in the National Park to be limited. However, Appendix 4 of the plan details five sites for new employment development, selected on the basis of specific, available opportunities.

129. As detailed in Issue 2, above, the Baliol School, Sedbergh site is not justified as an employment allocation and, thus, **MM47** deletes its allocation as such. However, based on all that I've read, heard and seen on my site visits, the other identified employment sites at Toll Bar (Sedbergh), Threshfield Quarry, Former Linton Camp site and Giggleswick Quarry, and the requirements for their development set out in Appendix 4, are justified and effective.

130. Policies E1 – E15 are a suite of policies addressing employment, retail and tourism uses, home working and rural based enterprises and rural estates. In principle they are consistent with the objectives of the NPPF in terms of supporting a prosperous economy, whilst being appropriate to the NPPF's statement that the scale and extent of development within the National Park should be limited.

131. In this context, policy E1 details the locations where new employment development will be permitted. However, for it to be justified **MM25** is required to make clear that such development will be permitted within, as well as on the

edge of, local service centres. For the plan to be effective **MM25** also corrects the supporting text of the policy in respect of the allocated opportunity sites for employment, including the deletion of the Baliol School site, for employment purposes, as detailed in Issue 2.

132. The Authority's intention is, appropriately, that policy E2 should be supportive of the development and diversification of rural land based enterprises, subject to their environmental, and other, impacts being acceptable. However, as written, the policy, whilst supportive of a number of specific types of development, is unintentionally silent about many other forms of development, which nonetheless could well be acceptable and beneficial. Moreover, the policy lacks clarity. Consequently for the policy to be justified and effective **MM26** is needed. This redrafts the policy to make it clearer and to make plain in the first paragraph that the development and diversification of rural land based enterprises is supported subject to the criteria/requirements set out in the four bullet points and in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4. The fifth paragraph of the policy as proposed to be modified appropriately sets out farm operation development which the Authority seeks to particularly encourage, but this does not prevent other forms of development taking place which are consistent with paragraphs 1 – 4 of the policy.

133. Policy E3 is justifiably supportive of the re-use of existing buildings for employment uses, subject to a number of appropriate criteria. However, for the policy to be justified and effective **MM27** is required to introduce a criterion concerning traffic movements and to replace the ambiguous "in relation to" wording with "in accordance with".

134. Policies E4 and E5 seek to safeguard existing retail, employment and tourism uses whilst setting out appropriate criteria against which changes to other uses will be considered. However, for the policies to be effective, **MM28** and **MM29** are needed to refer to "services for residents and visitors" in policy E4 and to "land and buildings currently or last used for employment or tourism uses" in policy E5.

135. In the light of the positive experience of Rural Estate Plans in other National Parks, the Authority has proposed policy E6. There are several dozen or so rural land estates within the Park and, given their number and size, the Authority considers that they have a significant role to play in the conservation of the landscape and the development of a sustainable rural economy. As such it is the Authority's intention that some development outside settlements, which would otherwise be contrary to various policies of the plan, could be permitted if it was consistent with a Rural Estate Plan which had been agreed by the Authority.

136. However, as originally drafted, policy E6 indicates that development conforming with a Rural Estate plan will be permitted, where the Rural Estate Plan has been agreed by the Authority and is "in conformity with the Local Plan and National Park Management Plan". The requirement for conformity with the Local Plan and National Park Management Plan, means that, contrary to the Authority's aim, it is likely to be difficult for Rural Estate Plans to propose development which the plan would not otherwise permit. On the other hand, the policy's statement that development conforming with such a Rural Estate Plan will be permitted would, effectively and inappropriately, give development plan status to the Rural Estate Plan.

137. Consequently, for policy E6 to be justified and effective, **MM30** is required. This redrafts the policy to state that the Authority will endorse Rural Estate Plans which accord with the objectives (paragraph 3.3) of the Local Plan and the ambitions of the National Park Management Plan and which are informed by appropriate stakeholder consultation. This would, legitimately, allow Rural Estate Plans to include proposals not in accordance with specific policies of the local plan as long as they accord with its objectives. In the light of consultation comments I have removed the reference in this modification, as consulted on, to the Authority "considering" endorsing Rural Estate Plans: this is unnecessary given that the policy sets out the requirements which such a plan must meet to be endorsed.

138. The revised policy goes on to state that an endorsed Rural Estate Plan will be a material consideration in the determination of proposals covered by a Rural Estate Plan. In the light of consultation comments I have removed the reference to "substantial weight" being given to endorsed Rural Estate Plans. "Substantial" is a very subjective term, but could run the risk of, in effect, giving the Rural Estate Plan near development plan status. In my judgement the policy as now proposed to be modified will ensure that appropriate weight in decision making is given to Rural Estate Plans and their potential landscape conservation/sustainable rural economy benefits, whilst not, in effect, requiring decisions to be made in accordance with a document which does not form part of the development plan.

139. **MM30** also modifies policy E6's supporting text accordingly. Whilst this illustratively refers to some of the types of development/uses which Rural Estate Plans might propose, it would not be appropriate for the text to list exemptions to specific local plan policies which would be permitted: this would have the potential to, again, give inappropriate development plan type status to the Rural Estate Plan. Moreover, given the urgent need for it in the National Park, the supporting text's reference to affordable housing is appropriate, and the reference to "other forms of housing" means that there is not an embargo on any particular type of housing.

140. The Authority is particularly supportive of home working as a means of attracting to, and retaining in, the National Park working age residents and policies E7 and E8 concern home working and live/work units respectively. However, where, as in most instances, home working does not change the principal use of the property as a dwellinghouse, planning permission will not be required for the home working itself. Moreover, where an extension to the property is proposed to enable the home working (whilst retaining its principal use as a dwellinghouse), it is appropriate that this is considered in the same way as any other residential extension. On the other hand, where homeworking, by its nature and scale, would change the principal use of the property, it would be likely to create a live/work unit. On this basis there is no need for policy E7 and, thus, for the plan to be justified and effective **MM31** deletes it and its supporting text.

141. Modification (**MM32**) is also required to ensure that policy E8 (Live/Work Units) is justified and this:

- sets out appropriate criteria, to protect the landscape and residential amenity, for live/work units within housing development boundaries, and makes clear that this part of the policy also applies to changes of use from dwellings to live/work units;

- extends the policy's requirements in respect of live/work units on former employment sites to all previously developed land; and

- makes clear that outside housing development boundaries and previously developed sites, live/work unit proposals will need to be supported by a business plan demonstrating the need for a business unit with ancillary living accommodation in that location and that the business is likely to be viable.

142. Policy E9 concerns campsites for tents and camper vans, whilst policy E10 addresses touring caravan and motor home sites. The likely impact of sites for touring caravans/motor homes is such that it is appropriate that they are, from the outset, already well screened. In contrast, (generally lower intensity/impact) sites for tents/camper vans may well be appropriate subject to new landscaping provision as part of the development. Nonetheless, the effectiveness of the two policies is compromised by the lack of definition of camper vans and motor homes. Furthermore, the landscaping requirements aside, in many instances the criteria of the two policies differ without justification.

143. To address this **MM33** and **MM34** are required which merge the two policies as one, ensuring that all relevant criteria apply to sites for tents, camper vans, touring caravans and motor homes. Additionally, **MM33** includes footnotes to define camper vans and motor homes (and modifies the supporting text

accordingly) and changes the requirement to "deliver environmental benefits" to "minimise environmental impacts". It is not justified to require development which is likely to be beneficial to the economy of the National Park to specifically deliver environmental benefits beyond what policy CP9 requires of all development in terms of measures to support nature and biodiversity.

144. Policies E11 (Sustainable Self-catering Visitor Accommodation), E12 (Visitor Infrastructure), E13 (Visitor Facilities) and E15 (Staff Accommodation) are positively-prepared and justified approaches to help support tourism in a manner consistent with conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Park. In particular, I consider policy E11's embargo on new static caravan sites is justified, given the likely extent of their adverse impact on the Park's natural beauty. However, to be effective these policies require modifications as follows:

- in policy E11, replacing the ambiguous "sustainable self-catering" and "in relation to" wording with "non-permanent self-catering" and "in accordance with" respectively (**MM35**)

- in policy E12 ensuring consistency with the rest of the plan by use of the phrase "accordance with" (rather than "conformity with") (**MM36**)

- correcting cross references to other policies of the plan in policy E15 (**MM38**)

145. Policy E14 sets out criteria against which new development at Bolton Abbey, a popular tourist attraction, will be assessed. However, for the policy to be justified and effective, **MM37** is needed to make clear that the policy relates to the Core Visitor Area identified on the policies map (for which a policies map change is also required), to refer to the in-principle acceptability of new housing (bearing in mind the housing development boundary within the area) and to clarify the evidence required in support of planning applications. I have adjusted **MM37** from that consulted on to refer to the "Core" Visitor Area to ensure consistency with the wording of the Craven Local Plan and thus avoid confusion.

Conclusion

146. Subject to the MMs detailed above the plan's Economy site allocations and policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Issue 6 – Whether the plan's policies in respect of Infrastructure, Access/Connectivity and Archaeology/Built Heritage are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy

Infrastructure, Access and Connectivity

147. It is the case that public transport provision in the National Park is not as comprehensive as many people would like it to be. However, the Park is not unique in this respect and, indeed, it is not surprising, given that it is a deeply rural area, that many residents have access to a car and that there are limitations on the availability of funding to subsidise public transport services. Nonetheless, within these constraints, I consider that the plan appropriately seeks to encourage travel other than by car, requiring new development to provide facilities for active and sustainable travel, appropriate to the nature and scale of the development, by supporting business and tourism development along the Settle and Carlisle railway line and by safeguarding several former railway lines for future sustainable transport use.

148. Policy AC1 (Infrastructure needed to support development) justifiably requires that where existing infrastructure is not adequate new development should ensure that it is provided in connection with the scheme, although for the policy to be justified **MM10** is necessary to make clear that this provision need only cater for the demand likely to be generated by the development. For the same reason it is necessary to remove the requirement that all dwellings on allocated housing sites will be able to connect to gigabit-capable broadband: this is not wholly within the control of developers and, in any case, is addressed by Building Regulations.

149. In respect of policy AC2 (New and Improved Infrastructure) **MM11** is necessary, in the interests of the plan being justified and effective, to make clear that it is proposals with an adverse impact which will need special justification.

150. Policies AC3 and AC5 concern Active and Sustainable Travel and Vehicle Movements respectively. There is considerable overlap between the policies, and requirements in respect of vehicle movements under AC5 will often need to be considered in the context of the potential to promote active and sustainable travel as part of new development under AC3. Consequently, for the policies to be positively-prepared and effective, **MM12** and **MM14** are required to combine the two policies and their supporting text as one. To be justified **MM12** also makes clear that the requirement for new development to improve existing rights of way concerns extending access opportunities for users of the new development, albeit that the wider community is likely to also benefit from such improvements. **MM12** is also required to specifically reference the needs of horse riders, in the supporting text and with this modification I am satisfied that

the plan is sound in respect of this particular issue. However, further guidance on Travel Plans and Transport Assessments is not necessary for the plan to be sound, particularly as these are documents on which the input of one of three different highway authorities would be required.

151. In order to promote sustainable travel to and within the Park, Policy AC4 appropriately seeks to promote new, and safeguard existing, railway infrastructure. It also safeguards the former Wensleydale railway line for reinstatement or (along with the former Swinden Quarry – Threshfield and Clapham to Low Gill lines) as a recreational route for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Nonetheless, whilst it is not certain that the Wensleydale line will be reinstated for railway use during the plan period, based on the discussion at the relevant hearing session, the supporting text is unnecessarily 'downbeat' about the prospects of this happening. Therefore, for the plan to be positively-prepared, **MM13** is necessary to modify the supporting text accordingly. For the plan to be justified **MM13** also makes clear that development may be permitted along the safeguarded former railway line where, for example, by a suitable and deliverable diversion, use of the line as a recreational route would not be significantly prejudiced. However, there is no substantive evidence to suggest that railway use of the other named lines is a likely proposition which would warrant reference in the plan.

Archaeology and Built Heritage

152. The National Park's heritage assets and traditional buildings form a very important aspect of its character and appearance, and through policies AB1 – AB4 the plan appropriately seeks to conserve and enhance these, whilst supporting the social and economic development of the area.

153. However, for policy AB1 (Heritage Assets) to be consistent with national policy and effective, **MM15** is required to ensure that its terminology is consistent with the relevant parts of the NPPF.

154. As submitted for examination, policy AB2 (Conversion of Traditional Buildings - Acceptable Uses) is complicated and confusing, with a number of footnotes, inconsistent phraseology (including with other parts of the plan) and a table in the supporting text which hinders rather than aids clarity. Consequently, for the policy to be effective, **MM16** is necessary. This substantially rewrites the policy and alters the table and supporting text accordingly to address these problems. However, the requirement for a traditional building proposed for conversion to a dwelling to abut a sealed, metalled road is justified in the light of the likely adverse landscape and sustainability impacts of permitting the conversion to dwellings of very remote and isolated field barns etc. In the interests of effectiveness, modification of the definition of a traditional building (as set out in the Glossary) is also required (**MM45**), to include elements of the definition originally set out in policy AB2.

155. For policy AB3 (Conversion of Traditional Buildings – Treatment) to be justified, **MM17** is required to make clear that development should "have regard to" (as opposed to "conform with") the Design Guide given that this document is not part of the development plan.

Conclusion

156. Subject to the MMs detailed above the plan's policies in respect of Infrastructure, Access/Connectivity and Archaeology/Built Heritage are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Issue 7 – Whether the plan's policies in respect of Landscape and Natural Environment are justified, effective and consistent with national policy

157. Policies L1 – L6 and NE1 and NE2 are a suite of policies concerning minerals and building stone, the open upland, dark skies and protection of wildlife and habitat. In principle they are supportive of the NPPF's objectives in respect of the sustainable use of minerals and conserving and enhancing the natural environment, whilst being appropriate in the context of national policy concerning National Parks.

158. However, the following modifications are necessary for the plan to be sound:

- Policy L1 (Crushed Rock Quarrying) – in the interests of clarity, and thus effectiveness, **MM39** is required to make clear that all aspects of the first sentence relate to crushed rock quarries. For the plan to be justified this modification also removes the supporting text's statement on what would/would not constitute major development – this being a matter appropriately determined in relation to a specific planning application.

- Policy L2 (Building Stone) – to ensure consistency of wording across the plan, and therefore its effectiveness, **MM40** is needed to refer to "accordance with" rather than "conformity with" other aspects of the plan.

- Policy L3 (Re-working Mineral Waste) – for the policy to be justified **MM41** is necessary to refer to agreed after-use schemes and to include an exemption to the policy where there is a need for the mineral which cannot reasonably be met by alternative methods.

- Policy L6 (Dark Night Skies) – **MM42** is required for the policy to be justified, making clear that development will only be permitted if it maintains/enhances the Yorkshire Dales Dark Sky Reserve and to require mitigation to "have regard to" (rather than "meet or exceed") the

Authority's lighting guidelines bearing in mind that these do not themselves form part of the development plan.

- Policy NE1 (Protecting Wildlife Sites, Species and Networks) – for the policy to be justified and effective **MM43** is necessary to ensure that the policy accurately reflects the requirements of the Habitats Directive and that its supporting text sets out guidance on its application in respect of specific Special Protection Areas. Swifts, bats, ground nesting birds and badgers are examples of species which are the subject of the policy's requirements, but it is not necessary for them to be specifically referenced for the policy to be justified, effective or consistent with national policy. I am satisfied that, as proposed to be modified, policy NE1 would prevent development taking place (including on 'windfall' sites) for which "likely significant effects" could not be ruled out.

- Policy NE2 (Protecting Irreplaceable Habitat, Trees, Hedgerows and Walls) - **MM44** is required for the policy to be justified by making it explicit about the requirement for development to protect, conserve and where possible enhance irreplaceable habitat; by requiring "regard to be had to" (rather than "conformity with") guidance which does not form part of the development plan; and by the supporting text making clear that replacement trees can be on or off site, depending on the specific opportunities and constraints of the site, in order that the viability of development and the efficiency of its use of land is not unnecessarily compromised.

Conclusion

159. Subject to the MMs detailed above the plan's policies in respect of Landscape and Natural Environment are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

160. The plan has a number of deficiencies in respect of soundness and legal compliance for the reasons set out above, which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the 2004 Act. These deficiencies have been explained in the main issues set out above.

161. The Authority has requested that I recommend MMs to make the plan sound, legally compliant and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended main modifications set out in the Appendix the Yorkshire Dales

National Park Local Plan 2025-40 satisfies the requirements referred to in Section 20(5)(a) of the 2004 Act and is sound.

Malcolm Rivett

Inspector

This report is accompanied by an Appendix containing the Main Modifications.

Appendix – Schedule of Main Modifications

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM1	Policy CP1 – Sustainable development	Policy changes	**CP1 - Sustainable Development** The National Park Authority will permit development that is sustainable, and which accords with the development plan. Sustainable development in the context of the Local Plan area is defined as development that either achieves or does not prejudice each of the following: • improves or retains existing services, infrastructure and facilities; • ~~sites new buildings and new or more intensive uses~~ reduces the need to travel by siting new development in locations that comply with the Plans' spatial strategy (CP3), • makes better use of existing buildings, avoiding their demolition • expands the residential housing stock and appropriate workplaces; • uses materials and methods for development that are low carbon and long life • improves access to the Park and~~,~~ increases active travel within the Park ~~but reduces the need for avoidable travel~~, • encourages ~~complimentary~~ complementary uses • develops new infrastructure of benefit to communities and improves access to public transport; • contributes positively to the built environment and landscape character through use of high-quality design, appropriate landscaping and removal of unsightly development; • improves biodiversity by enhancing habitat and species or creates new priority habitat; • conserves or enhances the historical environment and cultural heritage and helps secure a sustainable future for assets at risk; • improves public access to, and enjoyment of, the National Park's Special Qualities; • reduces waste and greenhouse gas emissions through improved energy efficiency, development of renewable energy and quality design; • avoids areas at risk of flooding and is resilient and responsive to the impacts of climate change. • enhances water quality and conserves water resources • safeguards geomorphology and natural processes, such as river-floodplain interactions • avoids risks posed to new development by land instability by ensuring that, if present, risks are investigated and remediated as necessary • creates places that are safe through design and where crime, disorder, and the fear of crime, will not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion Development proposals will be deemed to be unsustainable if they would significantly: • reduce the health and well-being of local communities or; • reduce the supply of housing to meet the area's needs or;

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			• increase the supply of second homes/under occupied housing without demonstrating public benefit or; • reduce access to local services and community facilities or; • reduce the diversity, quality and local distinctiveness of the natural and cultural landscape, wildlife habitat or historical environment or; • reduce the strength and diversity of the local economy or; • reduce the quality of the air, soil, water or flow of rivers, watercourses and groundwater or; • reduce the special qualities of the National Park such as its areas of tranquillity or the darkness of its night skies.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM2	Policy CP3 – Spatial Strategy and Housing Target	Policy changes	**CP3 – Spatial Strategy and Housing Target** The housing supply will be expanded by a minimum average of 50 new dwellings per year (at least 750 new dwellings) between 2025 and 2040. New housing development will be located on sites allocated on the Policies Maps and through windfall development inside the housing development boundaries[32], drawn around each of the settlements listed in Table1, in accordance with Policy C1 (Housing in Towns and large Villages) and Appendix 4. Additional flexibility for new dwellings will be provided by the residential conversion of existing buildings in accordance with Policy AB2 (Conversion of Traditional Buildings - Acceptable Uses). Exceptions to these locations for new housing, will only be permitted in accordance with other Local Plan policies. Non-housing development will be focused within or on the edge of the settlements listed in Table 1, at a scale that is appropriate to their size, character and function. ~~New development will be focused on sites allocated on the Policies Map and suitable unallocated land within or adjacent to the settlements listed in Table 1. Development will be limited to a scale that is appropriate to settlement character and function.~~ Proposals for non-housing development that are not located within or adjacent to a settlement in Table 1 will need to demonstrate that: 1. the location is necessary for a land management function; or 2. the location is necessary for the provision of public utilities or infrastructure; or 3. the development is ancillary and appropriate to an existing use at the site; or 4. the location is appropriate in ~~relation~~ accordance with~~to~~ other Local Plan policies. All~~D~~ development should avoid locations that are at risk of flooding or are particularly vulnerable to storm damage (Policy CP4). ~~The housing supply will be expanded by an average target of 50 new dwellings per year (750 dwellings between 2025 and 2040). Most of this target will be met through the development of allocated sites on the edge of Local Service Centres and large villages (in Table 1) and through the completion of sites with existing planning permission.~~ ~~Additional flexibility for new dwellings will be provided by the development of infill plots in settlements and residential conversion of existing buildings in relation to Policies AB3, C1 and C2.~~ ~~New house building will only be permitted in locations outside settlements subject to evidence of local need for affordable housing in relation to Policy C3 or the exceptional needs of a rural based enterprise (Policy C4).~~ ~~Development of new housing for holiday uses will not be permitted unless in accordance with other policies.~~ To help grow the local economy, existing employment and business uses will be permitted to expand and new business will be allowed to develop within or on the edge of local service centres, large villages and on opportunity sites identified in Appendix 4 and on the Policies Map, subject to the requirements of Policy E1. To maintain footfall and viability, new retail and commercial development will be permitted in three primary retail high streets identified on the Policies Map in Hawes, Grassington and Sedbergh, subject to the requirements of Policy E4. To help conserve the historical landscape and utilise existing assets, the re-use of suitable traditional buildings will be permitted in accordance with Policy AB2 and AB3.

<table>
<tr><th>Mod ref</th><th>Policy</th><th>Type of change</th><th>Tracked changes</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>To conserve the qualities of tranquillity, wildness and dark skies and to make way for improved habitat diversity and nature recovery, areas of extensive open upland, protected wildlife sites and priority habitat are identified on the Policies Map. These will be protected from development or targeted for biodiversity ~~net gain~~enhancement and nature recovery measures in accordance with~~relation to~~ Policy L4, NE1 and CP8.

Areas of important open space within settlements are identified on the Policies Map. These will be protected from development that would erode the contribution they make to community recreation, settlement or historical character (Policy C9~~8~~).

Aggregate mineral working will only be permitted within the disturbed areas of existing quarries and subject to delivery of long-term environmental benefits, mitigation of impacts and reduced amounts of road haulage (Policy L1).

The Authority will work with its neighbours to ensure that the setting of the National Park and its special qualities are protected from development that would cause harm.

Footnote32 - See glossary definition</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Justification text changes</td><td>4.31 The intention is to deliver the target through a planned supply of allocated housing sites and existing land with planning permission. Building a modest number of new homes on suitable sites, in the places that people want to live and close to existing services should help retain existing households and attract new families to move into the area, over the next 20 years. The housing target is expressed in the policy as a minimum figure, however it is not unending. Evidence[38] supporting the Local Plan indicates that an average of just over 70 dwellings per annum could be achieved based on likely housing land supply, without causing significant harm. Policies throughout the Local Plan will guard against a quantum of housing growth that would significantly conflict with National Park purposes or other public interests.

4.32 The households that are intended to benefit directly are those that are currently inadequately housed, younger people that will form new households during the 2030's, households with children that do not yet know that they will be moving into the area and elderly households that wish to downsize and stay or move into the Park. All new planning permissions will be restricted to principal residency~~occupancy~~ only, to ensure that new homes are targeted at households that are going to live in the Park and will not simply feed demand for more second homes or holiday letting. In addition, some new housing will also be subject to local occupancy and affordable housing restrictions in order to target the housing needs of households that meet specific eligibility criteria. Specific policies, together with Appendices 7, 8 and 9 set out further detail, however a summary of housing type requirements according to development types is set out in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Summary of housing tenure requirements

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Policy & site type</th><th>Type of housing</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">C1 - Housing in Towns and large Villages

Proposals for new build, or the conversion of buildings worthy of retention, within housing development boundaries of towns and large villages</td><td>Allocated housing site</td><td rowspan="2">• All dwellings principal residency; and,

• 20%-50% of dwellings also provided as affordable housing depending on site site/location</td></tr>
<tr><td>Windfall developments of two or more dwellings</td></tr>
<tr><td>Single dwelling windfall developments</td><td>• All dwellings restricted to principal residency & local occupancy.</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes		
			C2 – New build housing in small settlements *Proposals for new build within housing development boundaries of small settlements*	Windfall developments of two or more dwellings	• All dwellings principal residency; and, • 20%-50% of dwellings also provided as affordable housing depending on site site/location
				Single dwelling windfall developments	• All dwellings restricted to principal residency & local occupancy.
			C3 - Rural Exception Sites *Proposals for new build, or the conversion of buildings worthy of retention, within or outside of housing development boundaries of towns and large villages*	Site where housing would not be permitted in accordance with other housing policies	• All dwellings principal residency; and, • All dwellings provided as affordable housing
			C4 – Rural Workers' Dwellings *Proposals for new build, or the conversion of buildings worthy of retention, within or outside of housing development boundaries of any settlement*	New dwellings, usually outside of existing settlements, located to meet the specific functional needs of an established rural land-based enterprise.	• All dwellings principal residency; and, • All dwellings restricted to occupation by persons employed in rural land-based occupation.
			C5 – Subdivision & replacement *Proposals to make better use of the existing housing stock through replacement or subdivision of an* existing dwelling with a lawful residential (C3 class) use.	Subdivisions of existing houses to produce net additional dwellings.	• All net additional dwellings restricted to principal residency & local occupancy.
				Replacement of existing dwellings where this would produce a more suitable form or accommodation	• Replacement with a single dwelling will be subject to the same restrictions as the original dwelling; • Replacement with multiple dwellings will mean net additional units will be restricted to principal residency & local occupancy.
			AB2 – Conversion of traditional buildings – acceptable uses *Proposals to convert a traditional building within an existing settlement, a group of farm buildings, or in a suitable roadside location*	Change of use of traditional buildings that fall outside of the exemptions listed below.	• All dwellings restricted to principal residency & local occupancy.
				Change of use of traditional buildings that form part of a rural land-based enterprise diversification scheme	• All dwellings principal residency & local occupancy; or • Short-stay holiday letting accommodation
				Change of use of listed buildings that would be appropriately conserved through conversion.	

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Reoccupation of former dwellings *(any location where justified by heritage significance and acceptable landscape impact)* • All dwellings principal residency (without local occupancy restriction); *or* • Short-stay holiday letting accommodation Footnote 38 - Yorkshire Dales National Park, Housing Land Availability Assessment, 2025

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM3	Policy CP4 – Flood Risk	Policy changes	**CP4 – Flood Risk** All new development should be located in areas identified as being at the lowest risk of flooding, from all sources, including surface water, sewers, reservoirs and the impact of climate change. Development that is proposed in an area identified as being at risk of flooding will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated, where applicable[44], that the following tests are met: 1. the development could not take place on a reasonably available alternative site with a lower probability of flooding ("The Sequential Test") ~~and/or~~; 2. the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk ("The Exceptions Test") ~~and/or~~; 3. the flood risks have been assessed and can be managed so that the development remains safe throughout its lifetime and will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, taking the vulnerability of its users and the likely effects of climate change into account (evidenced through a site-specific flood risk assessment). Development classified as 'highly vulnerable', 'more vulnerable' and 'less vulnerable'[45] will not be permitted within the functional flood plain for river flooding (Flood Zone 3b), under any circumstances. Development classified as 'highly vulnerable' will also not be permitted in Flood Zone 3a, under any circumstances[46] Development classified as 'essential infrastructure' and 'water compatible development' will only be permitted where the three policy tests above are met and where it is designed and constructed to: • remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; • result in no net loss of floodplain storage, including securing compensatory provision where relevant; and, • avoid impeding water flows in times of flood. Footnote 44 - All developments in flood risk areas will require at least one of these tests to be satisfied, but their applicability will vary according to the level and type of flood risk and the type of development being proposed. More information is available in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (JBA, 2022) that supports the Local Plan, but some key principles are: • All developments in flood risk areas will be required to be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment; • The sequential and exceptions tests (criteria 1&2~~(a) & (b~~) do not apply to minor developments including: householder developments, development that does not increase the size of buildings (including most changes of use) & non-residential extensions with a footprint of less than 250 square metres. This does not mean that such developments are automatically acceptable in flood risk terms – they will still require a site-specific flood risk assessment to demonstrate that criterion ~~(c)~~3 is satisfied. • The sequential test need not be applied where the identified flood risk relates only to surface water, provided a site-specific flood risk assessment has clearly demonstrated that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future risk for the lifetime of the development, without increasing flood risk elsewhere. • The exceptions test (criterion ~~(b)~~2) only applies in certain circumstances according to the level and type of flood risk and the type of development being proposed. Footnote 45 - See glossary for definition of these uses ~~**Highly vulnerable**; Police, fire and ambulance stations; telecommunications installations required to be operational during flooding, emergency dispersal points, basement dwellings, Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use, installations requiring hazardous substances consent.~~ ~~**More vulnerable**; hospitals, residential institutions, dwelling houses, student halls of residence, drinking establishments, nightclubs and hotels, non-residential health services, nurseries and educational establishments, landfill* and sites used for waste management, facilities for hazardous waste, sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~**Less vulnerable**; shops; financial, professional and other services; restaurants, cafes and hot food takeaways; offices; general industry, storage and distribution; non-residential institutions; assembly and leisure, agriculture and forestry, waste treatment, minerals working and processing, water treatment works which do not need to remain operational during times of flood, sewage treatment works, if adequate measures to control pollution and manage sewage during flooding events are in place, car parks~~ Footnote 46 - Policy tests (1~~a~~), (2~~b~~) and (3~~c~~) are not applicable in these circumstances – development is simply unacceptable in all circumstances unless the site can be demonstrated not to fall within Flood Zone 3b (or 3a & 3b in the case of highly vulnerable development).

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM4	Policy CP5 - Sustainable Drainage – Foul and Surface Water	Policy changes	**CP5 - Sustainable Drainage – Foul and Surface Water** **Waste water** All development proposals must make appropriate provision for foul and surface water management. To ensure suitable treatment and avoid contamination of water-courses, the Authority will require developers to separate ~~domestic~~ waste water flows from rain water drainage. Foul water ~~Wastewater~~ discharges from new development should wherever possible connect to public sewerage ~~water utility mains sewage~~ systems. Developers will need to demonstrate that the mains system has sufficient capacity to cope with the discharges. Should this not be the case, the developer will need to provide an alternative method. Where connection to a mains sewage system is not possible, treatment should be via a modern wastewater system approved by the Environment Agency. The National Park Authority may add conditions to a planning consent requiring the treatment facility to be serviced and maintained to ensure it remains fit for purpose during its operational life. **Surface water** ~~With the exception of minor developments~~[50] ~~A~~all proposals that will generate surface water run-off should be designed to maximise the retention of surface water on-site and minimise the volume, and rate of surface water discharge off-site. Proposals must accord with the surface water drainage hierarchy as follows: 1. maintain natural discharge processes (no change in run-off); 2. store additional run-off for later use; 3. adopt infiltration techniques in areas of suitable porosity; 4. store water in open water-features for gradual release to a watercourse; 5. store water in sealed water-features for gradual release to a watercourse; 6. discharge direct to a watercourse; 7. discharge direct to a surface water drain; 8. discharge direct to a combined sewer. Using the order of priority above, proposals on previously developed land will be expected to incorporate a reduction in surface water run-off rates to the greenfield rate, while development on greenfield sites will be expected to result in no net increase in surface water run-off rates, unless not technically feasible or viable. Where practicable, development will be expected to integrate Sustainable Drainage Systems with wildlife enhancement to create new green infrastructure and this should be explained in the Design and access statement submitted with the planning application. Approved development proposals will be expected to be supplemented by appropriate maintenance and management regimes for surface water drainage schemes. Where development sites constitute previously developed land there is a possibility of a pollution risk from disturbance. A contamination survey may therefore need to be a prerequisite prior to development. Surface water runoff from development should also be treated to remove pollutants in accordance with CIRIA 'The SuDS Manual (C753)' Chapter 4 & 26.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Water courses The Authority will not permit works to straighten or deepen water courses unless agreed by the Environment Agency or Lead Local Flood Authority as an unavoidable course of action to manage flood risk. Engineering works to re naturalise water courses will be permitted where they are agreed by the Environment Agency or Lead Local Flood Authority New development in proximity to water courses must: • be set back to provide access for flood management • Avoid the construction of culverts or buildings over watercourses unless agreed by the relevant flood Authority • Seek opportunities to remove existing culverts Watercourses within development sites should be safeguarded, restored and improved for the benefit of flood management, amenity and the natural environment. With the exception of artificial water supply channels, ~~A~~any culverted watercourses should be restored to open channels to restore a more natural stream environment. Applications must be accompanied by drainage management and maintenance plans, including a plan for the management and maintenance of any watercourse within the application site, or an adjacent watercourse where the application site is afforded riparian rights. **Water catchments** Development proposals on land used for public or private water supply catchment will be the subject of consultation with the relevant water undertaker. The first preference will be for proposals to be located away from land used for water supply purposes. Where proposals are located on catchment land used for public or private water supply, careful consideration should be given to the location of the proposed development and a risk assessment of the impact on water supply and ground water may be required together with recommended mitigation measures. **Nutrients** Within the Eden and Teesmouth & Cleveland Coast Catchments, development that would lead to respectively to phosphate or nitrogen discharges, including proposals for overnight accommodation, will be subject to Habitat Regulations Assessment to ensure that it will discharge neutrally and not further pollute the River Eden Special Area of Conservation. If other areas arise where Natural England advise that high nutrient loads are causing a problem to the health of rivers, proposals for new development may need to achieve nutrient neutrality either through onsite means such as additional appropriate treatment and filtering or through a financial or in-kind contribution to mitigation measures that aim to reduce run-off elsewhere. Deleted footnote: ~~The SUDS Manual Ciria, Minor developments include: householder developments, development that does not increase the size of buildings (including most changes of use) & non-residential extensions with a footprint of less than 250 square metres~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
		Justification text changes	4.68 Natural England has provided catchment specific nutrient budget calculators for each of the nutrient neutrality catchments, and these must be used by developers to calculate the amount of the relevant nutrient~~a spreadsheet for developers to calculate the amount of phosphorous~~ arising from a new housing scheme based on the capacity of the local wastewater treatment works[52]. For example, one dwelling with an average occupancy of 2.4 persons may be expected to discharge 1.22kg of phosphorous each year. To achieve neutrality, mitigation measures would be needed to offset this amount. A nutrient mitigation strategy, including information on the management and monitoring of the proposed mitigation measures, should be provided along with details of how they will be secured and funded in perpetuity.~~Natural England has stipulated however, that the mitigation measures need to be maintained for a minimum of 80 – 125 years to be effective~~. 4.69 By designing development alongside mitigation measures additional nutrient loads can be avoided. The Authority will be able to advise on potential offsetting schemes such as those linked to C~~c~~atchment S~~s~~ensitive F~~f~~arming[53] and habitat enhancement schemes linked to the Local Nature Recovery Plan. 4.70 ~~Natural England require that planning permission can only be given for certain developments in the Eden catchment where a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) demonstrates a neutral or beneficial impact on current nutrient levels. Mitigation measures forming part of a HRA must demonstrate no adverse effect 'beyond reasonable scientific doubt' and that the benefits of the measures must be 'certain at the time of the Assessment', before planning permission can be granted.~~ Any development, including all developments resulting in a net increase in overnight accommodation, that would result in an increased discharge of phosphorus into the River Eden SAC or nitrogen into the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar catchment should be considered for nutrient neutrality. Information to inform a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be required in line with Natural England's Nutrient Neutrality Principles (TIN186, NE 2022). Development proposals can only be considered 'nutrient neutral' where they can demonstrate that they will cause no overall increase in nutrient pollution. Where there will be a net increase in nutrients as a result of a development, mitigation measures will be required to ensure there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the Habitats site. 4.71 ~~Development proposals affecting other river catchments in the Local Plan area do not require HRA. It is however, preferred practice that developers demonstrate how their proposals will mitigate phosphorous and nitrate run-off to avoid future restrictions arising from river pollution. Potential mitigation measures are suggested in Appendix 10~~. Although development proposals affecting other river catchments may not require an HRA in relation to 'nutrient neutrality', phosphorus and nitrogen discharge, along with any other impacts relating to foul and surface water, should still be considered in relation to the Qualifying Features of any designated Habitats sites that could be impacted. Regardless of whether or not an HRA is required it is preferred practice that developers demonstrate how their proposals will mitigate phosphorous and nitrate run-off to avoid future restrictions arising from river pollution. Potential mitigation measures are suggested in Appendix 10 including measures that can be undertaken by water treatment companies and agricultural businesses, options for habitat improvement and potential credit schemes. 4.72 The Water Framework Directive protects surface water such as rivers, lakes, and groundwater. Its objective is to support sustainable water use and achieve, at least, good surface water quality and prevent pollution and deterioration, including from new development. River Basin Management Plans prepared by the Environment Agency describe the state of the water environment and set out the measures needed to achieve the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. The Local Plan has a role to play to ensure that new development will help deliver the objectives of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plans in a number of development issues around treatment, drainage and water resource management. Footnote 52 - https://www.gov.uk/guidance/using-the-nutrient-neutrality-calculators

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Footnote 53 - Catchment Sensitive Farming provides specialist environmental advice to farmers about soil management, nutrients, slurry, manure management, ammonia emissions reduction, water resources, natural flood management, local environmental priorities and grant schemes~~Catchment Sensitive Farming, Defra and YDNPA~~ Deleted footnote ~~A formal process to determine whether a proposal could cause harm to the integrity of an internationally protected site~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM5	Policy CP6 – Design	Policy changes	**CP6 – Design** The Authority will permit development proposals that deliver high quality design incorporating good visual appearance, low carbon emissions, resilient construction, accessibility for all, and that have regard to surrounding amenity and landscape/townscape character (Policy CP8). Design proposals must accord with the principles of sustainability (Policy CP1) and not conflict with the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park (Policy CP2) and its landscape character and visual amenity (Policy CP8). Detailed proposals should have regard to~~conform with~~ the requirements of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Design Guide and the principles of good design in Appendix 3. All new proposals should incorporate small scale biodiversity features into the design and construction of new development.
		Justification text changes	4.75 ~~Individual site development briefs will be prepared for the larger allocated housing sites, or sites that could affect local heritage or biodiversity assets, once the Local Plan has been formally adopted.~~ Development briefs will be prepared for all of the allocated sites. Their purpose will be to guide specific aspects of design and layout to ensure that new development will fit sympathetically into each site. They will specify the appropriate mix of units, density and the constraints and opportunities available to mitigate the impacts of development and improve the outcome. Appendix 5 contains a list of issues that the development briefs will address.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM6	Policy CP7 – Energy requirements	Policy changes	**CP7 – Energy requirements** Proposals for development ~~should demonstrate~~are encouraged to use of decentralised sources of renewable energy, including on-site generation. The Authority will support renewable and low carbon energy proposals where they provide predominantly for the needs of communities, businesses or households inside the National Park. Proposals will be permitted where their impacts are capable of being made acceptable ~~in relation~~having regard to the following considerations: • the scale, siting, design and effect on landscape character, (CP2 and CP8) including undertaking a Visual Impact Assessment on larger schemes and, • the amenities of sensitive neighbouring uses having regard to noise, dust, odour, shadow flicker, air quality and traffic movements; and • the wider environmental, economic, social and community benefits directly related to the proposal. Where renewable energy sources are not appropriate, low carbon energy sources should be used. There will be a presumption against proposals for large scale low carbon, renewable energy and energy storage development, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that they will be compatible with the Special Qualities of the National Park, its communities and its businesses. The Authority will permit the responsible retrofitting of energy efficiency measures in traditional solid-walled buildings where it will not compromise permeability, ventilation or structural stability and will avoid harm to the heritage significance of the building. Proposals for new micro-renewable systems within the setting of Heritage Assets will be supported where they demonstrate they are consistent with Local Plan policies relating to archaeology and built heritage and the energy hierarchy of firstly reducing energy demand in the building, secondly increasing energy efficiency, and finally looking to generate renewable energy. Housing proposals ~~should demonstrate~~are encouraged to include measures to maintain resilient heating and other emergency measures where regular or prolonged disruption to the electricity supply and communications could have a severe impact on householder wellbeing or safety.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM7	Policy CP8 – Landscape character	Policy changes	**CP8 – Landscape Character** New development proposals will need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty and the special character of the landscape of the National Park. In considering proposals for development, the Authority will ~~refer to~~ have regard to the area reports that form part of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Landscape Character Assessment 2020. The Authority will have regard to the following in assessing whether a proposal would conserve and enhance natural beauty and the special character of the landscape: • the degree to which the proposals would affect the key characteristics, landscape context and key natural, cultural and perceptual features of the landscape; • the design, layout and scale of proposals and their fit with the distinctive physical and natural character of the landscape in which they would be located; • the impact on cultural heritage and historic landscape character such as field barns, the pastoral landscape and industrial heritage; • the impact of development on settlement pattern and identity and the integrity of predominantly open and undeveloped land between settlements. • potential visual and perceptual effects on landscape character and visual amenity~~the visual and perceptual impact of development on landscape character and context,~~[70] ~~and the recreational landscape experience~~; The Authority will ~~permit~~ support measures that will enhance the landscape by restoring features that have been lost or by removing existing visual detractors, as part of new proposals for development. Footnote 70 - ~~visual quality and character, of the site, including openness or enclosure, skylines, and impact on sensitive views particularly from tourist attractions and national trails but also rights of way, open space and access areas. Private views will be considered to have less sensitivity than public viewpoints~~ effects on landscape character and visual amenity will take into account the sensitivity of the landscape or the view and the magnitude of effects likely as a result of the proposed development~~.~~

<table>
<tr><th>Mod ref</th><th>Policy</th><th>Type of change</th><th>Tracked changes</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">MM8</td><td rowspan="2">Policy CP9 – Biodiversity Net Gain</td><td>Policy changes</td><td>CP9 – Biodiversity conservation and enhancement <s>Net Gain</s>

All <s>Dd</s>evelopment <s>proposals</s> should ensure wildlife is conserved and should contribute towards nature recovery<s>. and enhance wildlife</s>. <s>The first priority is to protect I</s>irreplaceable habitat and existing wildlife sites should be protected in accordance with <s>. P</s>policies NE1 and NE2<s> provide this protection inside the National Park</s>.

All development will also be required to include on-site measures to support nature and biodiversity, proportionate to the scale of development. Such measures include bird nest and bat roost boxes, swift bricks and landscaping/green infrastructure designed to support biodiversity.

Development which is subject to statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements is encouraged to meet these requirements in the following order of priority:

1. First priority - by enhancing the biodiversity of part of the National Park’s defined ecological network;
2. Second priority - by enhancing the biodiversity of the development site itself where that is not part of the National Park’s defined ecological network;
3. Third priority - through the national biodiversity credit scheme.

<s>Development proposals will be required to contribute towards nature recovery by enhancing Biodiversity by at least 10% compared to the pre-development situation.</s>

<s>Proposals for new development will require a completed BNG calculation together with a biodiversity net gain plan or a payment in lieu of onsite habitat creation. The proposal must also secure management of the scheme for a minimum of 30 years.</s></td></tr>
<tr><td>Justification text changes</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th><s>Scale</s></th><th><s>Requirement</s></th></tr>
<tr><td><s>Conversion of a redundant building to form one or more dwellings</s></td><td rowspan="4"><s>Use the Small Sites Metric to demonstrate that implementation of the plan will raise biodiversity value by at least 10% above the pre-development situation</s>

<s>Submit a biodiversity net gain plan for enhancement within the application area or more suitable site (in ecological terms) elsewhere.</s></td></tr>
<tr><td><s>Residential development of 1- 9 new dwellings on a site less than 1ha (excludes self-build plots which are exempt)</s></td></tr>
<tr><td><s>Where the number of dwellings to be provided is not known and the site area is less than 0.5 hectares</s></td></tr>
<tr><td><s>Non-residential development where the site area is less than 0.5ha or has a floor-space less than 5000m^2</s></td></tr>
<tr><td><s>Residential development of 10 or more new dwellings or residential development on a site of 1ha or more.</s></td><td><s>Submit a completed Biodiversity Metric to demonstrate that implementation of the payment (or</s></td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~Non-residential development where the site area is 0.5ha or greater, or has a floor space of 5000m^2 or greater~~ ~~the net gain plan) will raise biodiversity value by at least 10% above the pre-development situation~~ ~~Commencement of development to be subject to enhancement in the following order of preference:~~ ~~5. Either, acceptance of a biodiversity net gain plan that will create or restore priority habitat within the Local Plan Ecological Network, on land within the ownership of the landowner, or~~ ~~6. acceptance of a biodiversity net gain plan to restore or create priority habitat within the wider network or~~ ~~7. acceptance of a biodiversity net gain plan detailing habitat improvements within the development site or,~~ ~~8. payment into the national biodiversity credit system~~
			~~In addition to the biodiversity net gain requirement, the National Park Authority will also continue to require small scale ecological features such as nesting bricks and bat boxes, to be incorporated into new development proposals, in relation to Policy CP6 and Appendix 3.~~
			Deleted footnote - ~~An excel spreadsheet that assigns a biodiversity score to the pre-development condition of a site (baseline). It then provides a biodiversity end value on the basis of habitat creation, as part of the development scheme. The objective is to score a minimum biodiversity uplift of 10%. Net gain can be achieved through the creation of new habitats; enhancing existing habitats; or managing existing habitats better. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-metric-calculate-the-biodiversity-net-gain-of-a-project-or-development~~ Deleted footnote - ~~currently estimated to be £42k per biodiversity unit~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM9	Policy CP10 – Major development	Policy changes	**CP10 – Major Development** Planning permission for major development will only be granted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest. Consideration of proposals for major development will include an assessment of all the following: • the need for development, including in terms of any national considerations; • the impact on the local economy of permitting or refusing it; • the cost of, and scope for, developing it outside the National Park, or meeting the need for it in some other way; • any detrimental effect on the environment, landscape character, recreational opportunities or the special qualities of the National Park and the extent to which those could be moderated; • ~~generation of carbon emissions and how these will be minimised.~~
		Justification text changes	**Aim** 4.139 ~~To steer~~ To ensure that development in the National Park is limited in scale and extent and is sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the National Park.~~national infrastructure and very large-scale development away from sites within or affecting the setting of the National Park, that would otherwise cause permanent harm to its protected landscape or other special qualities.~~ **Justification** 4.140 National policy states that permission for major development in National Parks should be refused other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest, taking account of its effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities; the need for the development (including in terms of any national considerations), its impact on the local economy; and the cost of/scope for developing it outside the National Park or meeting the need for it in some other way. ~~National planning policy presumes against the siting of very large-scale development within protected landscapes because of the permanent harm it is likely to cause to the national interest of conserving these places. Fortunately, it is also normally avoidable and therefore rare. With the exception of nationally significant infrastructure projects, the judgement whether a proposal invokes 'the test of 'major development' is made by the National Park Authority. The Authority will make that decision having regard to the scale of the proposal, its nature, its impact on setting, local precedent and ultimately a judgement on whether it would have a significantly adverse impact on National Park purposes and the special qualities of the area.~~ 4.141 In the context of this policy, whether a proposal is "major development" is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the National Park is designated. ~~Major development is defined here as development of more than local significance, which will also have a long-term harmful impact on the National Park because of its scale and form. Examples of major development that have been permitted since the 1950s within other national landscapes include water storage reservoirs, deep mines, power stations, dual carriageways, military training and firing areas and very high voltage overhead power lines. Major development will normally have a significantly harmful and non-reversible impact on natural beauty, wildlife, heritage, tranquillity, public access and transport movements, whether it is located inside or adjacent to a National Park. New roadbuilding and significant road widening are examples of major development where there is also a presumption in national policy against development inside National Parks.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~Certain types of development seem large compared with everyday planning applications but would not be considered to be 'major development' by the Authority in relation to the test in the National Planning Policy Framework. Examples of this within the Yorkshire Dales National Park include extensions in depth to quarries within already worked areas, allocated housing sites at a scale needed to meet the Local Plan housing objectives, locally needed infrastructure such as road safety, rail improvements, digital infrastructure, agricultural development or community scale renewable energy schemes. These developments, though potentially challenging and needing appropriate mitigation, should still be permissible in relation to Local Plan policies. Major development (that would clearly be permanently harmful to the Park's special qualities) is considered by the Authority to be generally larger in scale than these examples and would only be permitted inside the Park in exceptional circumstances. Proposals for Major Development would be subject to the most rigorous examination and would have to demonstrate that they are genuinely unavoidable for reasons of national interest that are judged to outweigh the protection of national landscapes.~~ ~~Consideration of a major development proposal would need to be informed by Environmental Assessment, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and a Habitats Regulations Assessment. A major infrastructure proposal that would likely cost many tens of millions of pounds would also be expected to include effective and permanent measures to minimise carbon emissions and be designed to a standard that would be resilient to the projected local impacts of climate change.~~ ~~Very large scale limestone quarrying is perhaps the obvious example of major development that has been permitted in the Yorkshire Dales National Park since its designation in 1954. The national need for aggregate minerals to undertake post war reconstruction was judged to outweigh the inevitable permanent scarring of the landscape. Large scale quarrying continues to this day in Ribblesdale and at one site near Grassington but the irreversible landscape damage was caused long ago. The National Park has avoided most other forms of major development because it is effectively bypassed by the strategic road, rail and utility networks and because it does not contain any large settlements, industrial processes or major sites for comprehensive development.~~ ~~Land outside the National Park which is important to its setting is also protected from major development. National planning policy requires that development within the setting of the National Park should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the landscape, cultural heritage and nature conservation.~~ Deleted footnote - ~~The National Policy Statement on National Networks and Defra Circular 2010~~ Deleted footnote - ~~footnote 67, National Planning Policy Framework, 2024~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM10	Policy AC1 – Infrastructure needed to support development	Policy changes	**AC1 – Infrastructure needed to support development** Subject to the spatial strategy CP3, new development will be permitted where adequate infrastructure already exists or where specific, appropriate and proportionate new infrastructure will be provided to service the scheme. Applications for new development that propose to make use of existing infrastructure will be required to demonstrate that adequate capacity will be available without prejudicing existing users. Permission will be refused where capacity is not adequate to meet the demand likely to be generated by the development,~~demand~~ unless the Authority considers that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm. Where additional or enhanced infrastructure is necessary to support new development, this must be provided as part of the development, or through a financial contribution sufficient to remedy the shortfall, or an alternative solution that is agreed by the Authority. In some cases, such as highway improvements or foul water treatment, it may be necessary to coordinate the timing of development with the timing of the delivery of the infrastructure improvement. Planning obligations will be used to secure infrastructure provision through a legal agreement under Section 106 of the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act or Section 278 of the 1980 Highways Act. All such agreements shall be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Financial contributions shall be formulated in accordance with the policies and advice of infrastructure providers. Applicants will need to provide evidence if they claim that an infrastructure requirement would threaten the financial viability of their development. If necessary, they should seek to identify alternatives that would overcome the infrastructure deficiency. Where there is a failure to make provision for infrastructure requirements, planning permission will only be permitted where the benefits of delivering the development clearly outweigh the harm caused. ~~All proposed dwellings located on allocated housing sites on the Policies Map will be required to connect to gigabit-capable broadband prior to occupancy.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM11	Policy AC2 - New and improved infrastructure	Policy changes	**AC2 – New and improved infrastructure** Proposals for new or improved infrastructure will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that their siting and appearance: • minimise harmful impact on visual amenity, including the character and appearance of the locality and the wider landscape character (Policies CP2 & CP8); and • will not result in significant adverse impacts upon features of ecological, archaeological, architectural or historical interest. Proposals and siting that would have an adverse ~~potential~~ visual or other impact will need to be justified on the balance of supporting environmental evidence. In weighing a scheme that has environmental impacts that cannot be fully mitigated, the Authority will also give weight to the public benefits that the new infrastructure would provide as well as its operational requirements and technical limitations. The landowner will be required to remove infrastructure, and the site will need to be restored to its former condition when no longer required for its approved purpose.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM12	Policy AC3 – Active Travel	Policy changes	**AC3 – ~~Active and~~ Sustainable Travel and Vehicle Movements** Development proposals that would generate significant movements of people will need to be supported by a travel plan. This will need to include~~demonstrate~~ measures to link to public transport and/or improve effective footpath and cycle networks and connections to nearby services, making these access for all, where appropriate. Developments that would have harmful impacts on existing footpaths, trails, access areas or public transport will need to demonstrate mitigating and compensating measures. Where opportunities are available, new development will be required to improve existing rights of way and extend access opportunities for the users of the development ~~the benefit of public health and wellbeing~~. All development proposals that will generate vehicle movements will be required to meet all the following; • ensure provision for safe and suitable access for all road users; • meet highway safety standards and not cause levels of additional traffic that would exceed the safe capacity of the local highway network or harm the environment; • make provision for appropriate access, parking and electric vehicle charging having regard to the local highway authority standards; • include a Transport Assessment where the Highway Authority advise significant movements of traffic are envisaged[75]; • include a Transport Assessment for large-scale proposals, to indicate methods to manage the scale of movement and avoid congestion; • provide a travel plan as a mitigation measure where large scale movements of traffic are envisaged[76]. Footnote 75 - Transport Assessments (or Transport Statements) consider the potential transport impacts of developments on transport infrastructure and services. Footnote 76 - Travel Plans are long-term management and monitoring strategies tailored to specific housing developments. They promote sustainable and active travel to reduce reliance on cars.
		Justification text changes	**Aim** 5.27 To promote active travel[77], health, ~~and~~ connectivity and highway safety. **Justification** Active and Sustainable Travel 5.28 Active and sustainable travel can benefit both the environment and improve people's health and well-being. The Local Plan Spatial Strategy (Policy CP3) directs the majority of new development into sustainable locations where day to day services such as schools, shops and social networks can be reached on foot, by cycle or by public transport. ~~Where development proposals would generate significant footfall and traffic movements, including residential development, employment uses or visitor facilities, they will need to improve links to public transport and contain measures to reduce the number and length of trips that need to be made by private vehicle. All new development should include measures to improve footpath and cycling connections. (See also Policy AC5 Vehicle Movements).~~ 5.29 Where development proposals would generate significant footfall and traffic movements, including residential development, employment uses or visitor facilities, they will need to improve links to public transport

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			and contain measures to reduce the number and length of trips that need to be made by private vehicle. Where appropriate, having regard to the scale and type of development, proposals should include measures to improve footpath and cycling connections. 5.30 The National Park already has an excellent network of public rights of way which form an important resource for visitors and residents. New development should connect people to the existing network and increase active travel to local services. For development of 10 houses or more, or equivalent movement generating proposals, more wide-ranging improvements will be needed to the local path network. These will be needed to cope with the additional footfall and facilitate new opportunities for health and wellbeing for the additional residents living there, and their visitors. 5.31 Development proposals will need to include provision to enhance accessibility for active travel. For example, providing or paying for the replacement of stiles with gates will increase access for prams and people with disabilities whilst the provision of cycle racks, shelters and e-bike charging will help facilitate more cycle use. ~~All of~~ T~~t~~hese factors, and the needs of horse riders, should be considered at the outset of the design process to ensure they are fully incorporated into new development. 5.32 The Authority will check development proposals for any harmful impacts to existing users of footpaths, trails and public transport. These will need to be moderated as part of the design or else compensatory measures will need to be provided by the developer. In rare cases where this is not possible, harmful impact on the rights of way and access network may be used as a reason for refusal. Vehicle Movements 5.33 Even within the deeply rural context of the National Park where car ownership and usage is necessarily high, new development will still be expected to be located and designed to minimise the need to travel. Development will be required to fit within the capacity of the road network or provide improvements to it that will make it acceptable to the local highway authority. Opportunities to facilitate sustainable and active travel through walking, cycling, horse riding, wheeling and public transport should be identified and pursued in relation to this policy. Applicants for planning permission will be expected to describe how their proposals will fit with these requirements as part of their design and access statements. 5.34 North Yorkshire, Westmorland and Furness and Lancashire Councils are the authorities responsible for highways in the Local Plan area. All development proposals must accord with their guidelines and standards relating to access, parking and electric vehicle charging[78]. Vehicle parking issues related to new development will also be considered in relation to Policy AC1. 5.35 Where a development will generate significant amounts of traffic movement, a transport assessment will be required to help assess and mitigate any potential negative impacts. The assessment will be prepared and considered in accordance with the relevant policies and guidance provided by the local highway authority. Travel Plans 5.36 Travel Plans can help to identify opportunities for the effective promotion and delivery of sustainable transport linked to new development (for example public transport and active travel). The need for a Travel Plan will be established at an early stage in consultation with the local highway authority and through the preparation of development briefs for site allocations (Appendix 5). The impact of traffic generated from a new development will be considered cumulatively, taking account of all committed proposals in the area. The form, scope and outcomes sought will be agreed at the outset and the Travel Plan will be submitted as part of the planning application or pre application discussion.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Footnote 77 - Active travel is defined as a journey where all, or part of the trip has involved some form of physical activity. In rural areas and protected landscapes forms of active travel include walking, wheeling (wheelchair or active mobility aid), cycling and horse riding. ~~[4] Active travel is defined as a journey where all, or part of the trip has involved some form of physical activity. In rural areas and protected landscapes forms of active travel include walking, wheeling (wheelchair or active mobility aid), cycling and horse riding.Active travel is movement by people through *walking, cycling, wheeling or other physical exercise*. It is usually aimed at short journeys such as shopping, school or general health and wellbeing~~ Footnote 78 - Cumbria Development Design Guide, Cumbria County Council, January 2023 North Yorkshire highways guidance: https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-travel/roads-and-pavements/road-adoption

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM13	Policy AC4 – Development within railway corridors	Policy changes	**AC4 – Development within railway corridors** New railway infrastructure and new economic business and tourism uses will be permitted along the Settle/Carlisle railway corridor, where they enhance or are otherwise compatible with the railway stations, public access to railway services and sustainable travel. The demolition of historical railway related structures will not be permitted. A heritage impact assessment will be required to support applications and works to buildings and structures within and immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area (Policy AB1~~2~~). Existing facilities for rail users and existing compatible tourism and business uses will be safeguarded from change to other uses that do not need a location within the railway corridor. The route of the former Wensleydale railway from Redmire to Garsdale will be safeguarded from alternative development, for the purpose of eventual reuse as either a reinstated railway or a recreational route for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The former railway routes between Swinden Quarry-Threshfield and Clapham to Lowgill will be safeguarded for reuse as future recreational routes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
		Justification text changes	5.42 The Local Plan area contains a number of disused railway lines, including the track bed of the former Wensleydale Railway between Redmire and a junction with the Settle-Carlisle railway at Garsdale station. The line of the former trackbed has been safeguarded by planning policy since 2002 for possible full or partial reinstatement, because of the social, environmental and economic benefits that would bring. Safeguarding has meant using the Planning system to stop physical works to the former track bed that would prevent or significantly prejudice its future reinstatement as a railway line~~. Unfortunately, the most recent attempts to secure funding for a feasibility study were unsuccessful, and it is now considered that rail re-instatement is very unlikely during the Local Plan timeframe.~~ 5.43 The potential for the former trackbed to be redeveloped as a traffic free multi-user route between Hawes and Garsdale is therefore being explored. This would provide a substantial public benefit as a traffic free all abilities route for walking, family cycling, horse-riding and people with mobility issues. During 2022, public consultation demonstrated high levels of support for the health and economic benefits that such a route could bring to Wensleydale. ~~This led the National Park Authority to begin work on developing a proposal, pending reinstatement as a railway line~~. 5.44 The design of a recreational route would be to a specification that could be reversed and allow for reinstatement to railway use at some future date, without significant additional cost. The development of the recreational route would not then irreversibly prejudice the longer-term potential for reintroducing the railway use~~, if political and financial support were eventually forthcoming~~. 5.45 The track beds of the former Swindon Quarry to Threshfield and Clapham to Lowgill lines also offer potential as similar recreational routes. They will also be protected from alternative development that would prevent this long-term public recreation opportunity. Development on the protected line may be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the future recreational route would not be significantly prejudiced, for example where a suitable and deliverable diversion is identified.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM14	Policy AC5 – Vehicle movements	Policy changes	~~**AC5 – Vehicle movements**~~ ~~Development proposals that will generate vehicle movements will be required to meet all the following;~~ ~~ensure provision for safe and suitable access for all road users;~~ ~~meet highway safety standards and not cause levels of additional traffic that would exceed the safe capacity of the local highway network or harm the environment;~~ ~~make provision for appropriate access, parking and electric vehicle charging in conformity with the local highway authority standards;~~ ~~contain adequate provisions for connection to public transport, where the scale of movement would make that desirable;~~ ~~include a Transport Assessment where the Highway Authority advise significant movements of traffic are envisaged;~~ ~~include a Transport Assessment for large-scale proposals, to indicate methods to manage the scale of movement and avoid congestion;~~ ~~provide a travel plan as a mitigation measure where large scale movements of traffic are envisaged.~~
		Justification text changes	~~**Aim**~~ ~~To understand and plan for the consequences that new development will have for vehicle movement and to comply with Highway Authority safety and parking standards.~~ ~~**Justification**~~ ~~Even within the deeply rural context of the National Park where car ownership and usage is necessarily high, new development will still be expected to be located and designed to minimise the need to travel. Development will be required to fit within the capacity of the road network or provide improvements to it that will make it acceptable to the local highway authority. Opportunities to facilitate sustainable and active travel through walking, cycling, horse riding, wheeling and public transport should be identified and pursued in relation to Policy AC3 (Active travel). Applicants for planning permission will be expected to describe how their proposals will fit with these requirements as part of their design and access statements.~~ ~~North Yorkshire, Westmorland and Furness and Lancashire Councils are the authorities responsible for highways in the Local Plan area. All development proposals must accord with their guidelines and standards relating to access, parking and electric vehicle charging. Vehicle parking issues related to new development will also be considered in relation to Policy AC1.~~ ~~Where a development will generate significant amounts of traffic movement, a transport assessment will be required to help assess and mitigate any potential negative impacts. The assessment will be prepared and considered in accordance with the relevant policies and guidance provided by the local highway authority.~~ ~~Travel Plans can help to identify opportunities for the effective promotion and delivery of sustainable transport linked to new development (for example public transport and active travel). The need for a Travel Plan will be established at an early stage in consultation with the local highway authority. The impact of traffic generated from a new development will be considered cumulatively, taking account of all committed proposals in the area. The form, scope and outcomes sought will be agreed at the outset and the Travel Plan will be submitted as part of the planning application or pre-application discussion.~~ Deleted footnotes:~~Cumbria Development Design Guide, Cumbria County Council, January 2023 (highways)~~ ~~North Yorkshire highways guidance: https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-travel/roads-and-pavements/road-adoption~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM15	Policy AB1 - Heritage Assets	Policy changes	**AB1 - Heritage Assets** All development proposals that directly or indirectly affect a heritage asset will need to be accompanied by a proportionate assessment of the significance of the asset(s) and the impact of the proposal upon that significance. **Designated heritage assets** Development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset will be permitted provided they conserve or enhance its significance. Proposals that result in substantial harm to, or loss of, a scheduled monument, grade I or II* listed building, or grade I or II* registered park and garden, will only be permitted in wholly exceptional circumstances ~~and in consultation with Historic England~~. Proposals that result in substantial harm to, or loss of, a grade II listed building, grade II registered park and garden, or a structure that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of a conservation area, will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. Proposals likely to affect heritage assets with archaeological, or potential archaeological interest, should be supported by appropriate information that identifies the impacts on the heritage significance. Where a proposal results in substantial harm to, or loss of, a designated heritage asset it must be clearly justified, demonstrating that: a) there is no less harmful, viable option, and; b) the amount of harm has been reduced to the minimum possible, and; c) there are ~~other significant~~substantial public benefits that outweigh any harm caused. Provision must be made for full recording in advance of any substantial harm or loss. Proposals that result in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the public benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the harm to~~loss of~~ significance. The Authority will expect applicants to demonstrate that the harm is the minimum necessary to facilitate the proposal. **Undesignated heritage assets** Development proposals affecting undesignated heritage assets that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to designated assets, will be determined in accordance with the policy for designated ~~resources~~heritage assets. Development proposals affecting other undesignated heritage assets will be permitted where their significance will be conserved. Where harm or loss would result from a development proposal, applicants should set out appropriate measures to minimise and mitigate the impact ~~in line with good practice guidance~~.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM16	Policy AB2 – Conversion of Traditional Buildings – acceptable uses	Policy changes	Proposals for the change of use of ~~low intensity~~ traditional buildings[89] to high intensity residential, and employment uses[90] will only be permitted where: ~~i) the building is a heritage asset worth conserving and has not already been extensively modified and~~ ~~ii)~~i) the building is located~~ion is~~ within an existing settlement, a group of ~~farm~~ buildings, or in a suitable roadside location~~the building and its associated historic yard abuts a sealed metalled road maintainable by the Highway Authority, or a sealed metalled private road that connects to a road maintainable by the Highway Authority~~[91]. and ~~iii)~~ii) p~~P~~roposals for change of use to single or multiple~~a~~ dwellinghouses are occupied as ~~for~~ principal residences~~continuous occupation~~ and restricted ~~will be subject~~ to ~~a~~ local occupancy ~~restriction~~ (Appendix 8). As an exception to criteria (i) and (ii), the reoccupation of former dwellings[92] as principal residences (Appendix 9) without local occupancy restrictions, or as self-contained holiday letting units, will be permitted where: • the building is listed or of equivalent heritage significance to make it worthy of conservation, and; • the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the landscape in accordance with Policy CP8; As an exception to criterion (ii)~~Subject to complying with the above requirements~~, change of use to self-contained holiday letting will also ~~only~~ be permitted where: • i~~I~~t would appropriately conserve a listed building in accordance with Policy AB1 or, • i~~I~~t would support a rural land-based enterprise diversification scheme (Policy E2) and the holiday unit ~~can be~~is tied to the agricultural unit to prevent it being sold off separately.~~, and~~ Proposals for the change of use of traditional buildings to any form of visitor accommodation or holiday letting will only be permitted where the use: • ~~the use~~ will be capable of effective supervision and management to avoid noise and other disturbance, and; • ~~the use~~ is restricted to short stay holiday accommodation only, so that it is not occupied by the same individual for more than 28 days in any calendar year. ~~Subject to complying with the above requirements, change of use to self-contained holiday letting will only be permitted where:~~ ~~• It would appropriately conserve a listed building in relation to Policy AB1 or,~~ ~~• It would support a farm or rural estate business diversification scheme (Policy E2) and the holiday unit can be tied to the agricultural unit to prevent it being sold off separately, and~~ ~~• the use will be capable of effective supervision and management to avoid noise and other disturbance, and~~ ~~• the use is restricted to a maximum of 28 days' short stay letting by individual households~~ ~~The reoccupation of redundant former permanently occupied houses and flats will be permitted where the building is listed or of equivalent heritage significance worthy of conservation, unless the landscape impact would be too harmful.~~ ~~Proposals will be subject to a principal residency restriction. .~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Proposals for the change of use of isolated traditional buildings to low -intensity uses[93] will be permitted provided they do not result in material alteration to the ~~character of the~~ exterior of the building or material harm to the landscape setting~~or material harm to the landscape~~.- Curtilage development and new or improved access or parking will not be permitted where it would be intrusive. . Footnote 89 - See glossary definition.~~Buildings constructed in accordance with long-standing practices or customs such as solid-wall masonry and hand-crafted carpentry. In the Yorkshire Dales, they are mainly built from natural locally sourced stone and timber, although some imported prefabricated or mass-manufactured materials have also been used. In terms of their design details, traditional buildings can include both vernacular and polite elements, the latter being influenced by national fashions. Traditional buildings perform very differently to modern constructions, allowing moisture movement inside the fabric, hence their requirement for 'breathable' materials. Most traditional buildings in the National Park are likely to be heritage assets, unless they have been extensively modified over time to the point where they no longer have any significance~~. Footnote 90 - ~~For the purposes of this policy, higher intensity uses will be principal occupancy dwellings, ancillary living accommodation, live-work units, group visitor accommodation (bunkhouse barns and holiday lets) and intensive employment uses (such as retail, offices, restaurants/cafes).~~See Table 3 Footnote 91 - For the purposes of this policy, a suitable roadside location will be one where the building and its associated historic yard abuts a sealed metalled road maintainable by the Highway Authority, or a sealed metalled private road that connects to a road maintainable by the Highway Authority.- Roads must have had a sealed metalled surface prior to 1st July 2014. Footnote 92 - For the purposes of this policy a former dwelling is a redundant house or flat that was previously permanently occupied for a use falling with Class C3 of The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) Deleted footnote ~~See Appendix 9~~ Footnote 93 - ~~For the purposes of this policy, lower intensity uses are low-key employment/business uses (such as light industrial, commercial storage and workshops without outside storage or significant vehicular journey generation), barn pods, camping barns, equestrian and agricultural uses.~~See Table 3
		Justification text changes	**Aim** 6.11 To conserve the contribution that traditional buildings make to the special qualities of the National Park, alternative uses will be permitted where the building and its setting are able to accommodate the intensity of the new use without harm to other Local Plan objectives. **Justification** 6.12 Traditional buildings form an important part of the architectural and historical fabric of the National Park, and reveal much about its social, cultural and economic history. Changed farming practices, closure of churches and chapels and some school buildings mean that many traditional buildings have outlived their original purpose. The planning system has the ability to facilitate change to new uses where this will help conserve their heritage significance. Making new use of existing buildings is also a sustainable use of materials and a form of low carbon development. Care is needed however to ensure that new uses are only permitted in locations that have adequate capacity for it and that poor quality development will not undermine the character that makes these buildings valuable for shared cultural heritage. 6.13 This is a conservation-orientated policy aimed at securing the long-term future of traditional buildings in a manner that conserves their intrinsic value. Introducing a new use into a traditional building – one for which it wasn't originally designed – will result in a permanent change to its character and appearance. In architectural,

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			historical and landscape terms, this change will almost always result in some degree of harm, although that will vary according to the building's significance, location, and the intensity of the proposed new use. The degree of harm needs to be weighed against the benefits offered by the new use. The policy and this justification provide a framework for these judgements to be made. 6.14 Development proposals for the change of use of traditional buildings need to be fully informed and start with an assessment of the building's significance and other attributes in accordance with AB1. Development proposals must have regard to key contextual and design issues such as impact on the Park's dark skies. In granting permission permitted development rights may be removed by condition, to retain control over future changes, which might otherwise be harmful to the historic character of the building or its setting. 6.15 The Authority has produced a design guide and a Traditional Farm Buildings Toolkit to help with this assessment. Although aimed at traditional farm buildings, the Toolkit should also assist applicants looking to adapt other types of traditional buildings for new uses. 6.16 Policy AB2 provides scope for a range of different uses to be considered and establishes a clear distinction between high~~er~~ and low~~er~~ intensity uses. It seeks to direct more intensive uses, such as residential occupancy, into locations that are more accessible to infrastructure and existing services. Table 3~~2~~ illustrates the range of different uses and their varying intensities in relation to Policy AB2. 6.17 The most intensive uses will not be appropriate in buildings that are isolated in the landscape. Isolated field barns for example are considered incapable of absorbing the visual impacts associated with intensive domestic occupation. They do not have the visual capacity to accommodate the physical alterations, the new infrastructure or the degree of movements associated with the most intensive types of use. Isolated and prominent locations will normally only be capable of low-intensity uses within the National Park landscape. The Traditional Farm Buildings Toolkit provides further guidance on a range of other solutions for these more remote buildings. 6.18 Proposals for domestic use will be required to be tied to the occupancy criteria set out in Appendix 8~~5~~ to ensure they contribute towards local housing needs.~~-~~ In cases where a conversion of a traditional building would result in the creation of more than one dwelling, instead of the local occupancy restriction the Authority will be willing to consider a mix of principal residency and affordable tenures, in line with the requirements of Policy C1, where this would produce a more appropriate mix of housing types. ~~An exception will be made for farm and rural estate diversification proposals where these would be tied to the landholding to prevent them from building sold as a separate unit.~~ 6.19 An exception to the local occupancy restriction will be made for farm and rural estate diversification proposals, where short-stay holiday letting will be allowed, provided thes~~e~~ accommodation would be tied to the landholding to prevent it~~them~~ from being~~uilding~~ sold as a separate unit. A similar exception will also be made for listed buildings, where a short-stay holiday letting accommodation use would allow them to be appropriately conserved. 6.20 In the Dales there are examples of former homes where residential use has ceased or been abandoned. A number of these are listed buildings, or are otherwise worthy of conservation because of their archaeological, historical, architectural or landscape interest. Reoccupying these former dwellings where they constitute valuable heritage assets may represent the most beneficial and viable way to conserve the building. Great care is needed however to ensure that the re-use retains the building's significance and Policy AB4 will be key to avoid rebuilding where structures are in a ruinous state.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes

6.21 The policy on former dwellings represents an exception to the normal presumption against introducing intensive new uses into isolated locations in the Park. A number of these buildings are remote from roads or even private tracks, but by virtue of the fact they were originally designed as dwellings and are often particularly worthy of conservation – including a number that appear on the Authority's 'Buildings at Risk' register – it is considered necessary to introduce an additional degree of flexibility. Former dwellings will therefore be treated differently from other conversions and appropriate schemes will be permitted subject to principal residency~~occupancy~~ (without local occupancy restrictions), or short stay holiday letting accommodation~~only~~.

6.22 If there is any doubt whether a building has had a former use as a dwelling for the majority of its life or is of sufficient heritage value to make it worthy of conservation through re use, the Authority will require supporting evidence.

Table 3~~2~~ - General guide to use, intensity and likely acceptable locations for adaptation of traditional buildings within the Yorkshire Dales National Park

Proposed use	**Intensity of use**	**Permissible location and design restrictions**
Dwellinghouse (residential dwelling for continuous occupation) Ancillary living accommodation in conjunction with a dwellinghouse Live/work units Self-contained short stay holiday let (permitted exceptions only i.e. farm/rural estate diversification or conservation of a listed building/former dwelling) Bunkhouse barn (not self-contained) More intensive employment uses – retail, offices, restaurants/cafes, industrial and distribution	HIGH INTENSITY	Within settlements, farmsteads and other building groups; or Buildings that abut a sealed metalled road maintainable by the highway authority, or a sealed metalled private road that connects to a road maintainable by the highway authority. These locations should be capable of being served by a: • curtilage which has minimal visual impact; • vehicular access not requiring significant improvements or new access tracks.
Low key business use e.g. ~~light industrial and~~ workshops & storage facilities without outside storage or significant vehicular journey generation.~~, commercial storage facilities~~ Camping barn (basic bothy accommodation/'stone tent') short stay only, (not self-contained) Equestrian & stabling Agricultural or Estates use – livestock, storage etc.	LOW INTENSITY	As above, plus more isolated locations where the proposed use does not result in material alterations to the exterior of the building or material harm to the landscape setting. Curtilage development and new or improved access or parking will not be permitted where it would be intrusive.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM17	Policy AB3 - Conversion of traditional buildings - treatment	Policy changes	**AB3 – Conversion of Traditional Buildings – Building treatment** Proposals for the conversion of traditional buildings to new uses, the reoccupation of former dwellings or the subsequent adaptation of existing converted buildings, will be permitted where they have regard to~~conform with~~ the Design Guide and: • the building is capable of conversion requiring no more than minor structural work, the extent of which would not compromise its historic interest or character. Where necessary the proposal will need to be evidenced by a competent structural survey. • the building has the physical capacity to accommodate the new use or adaptation without any more than minor extension or alteration. All ancillary storage and services are accommodated in existing buildings rather than through the provision of new additional buildings, unless that would be a better conservation outcome; • the proposal is accompanied by a professional heritage assessment that identifies significant features of the structure which should be retained in the design; • Conversion should not apply to modern additions but where possible evidence of historical phasing, which form part of the heritage asset such as long term agricultural uses, should be retained in the conversion scheme to conserve its history of reuse. Significant features which cannot be retained should be recorded to a suitable level; • alterations to the exterior of the building, and the creation of any new curtilage, highway access, access roads and other associated storage and infrastructure, are the minimum necessary and are sensitive to the traditional character and appearance of the building, and the immediate or wider landscape setting; • the new use does not displace an existing use to the extent that it gives rise to the need to provide new compensatory buildings; • construction materials and methods are consistent with, or complementary, to local building traditions and any historically or architecturally important features are retained in the conversion, and the building subjected to recording prior to conversion;

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM18	Policy C1 – Housing in towns and large villages	Policy changes	**C1 – Housing in Towns and large Villages** New housing sites to contribute towards the Local Plan target of 750 dwellings (Policy CP3 Spatial Strategy) are allocated on the Policies Map in local service centres and large villages. A list of the allocated sites is included in Appendix 4. In addition, flexibility for new dwellings will be permitted on suitable infill and gap sites and through the change of use of buildings worthy of retention within the housing development boundaries of local service centres and large villages, identified on the Policies Map. All new housing in the National Park will be of high quality design in accordance ~~conformity~~ with policy CP6 (Design). All~~For proposals of more than one dwelling,~~ new housing will be restricted to principal residency in perpetuity[97]. For single plot developments or change of use, new housing will also be restricted to local occupancy~~housing needs only~~. All housing sites will be required to meet a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare, unless the Authority considers that a lower density is necessary to: a) provide a safe access or, b) respond to~~conform with~~ highway capacity or, c) fit into the landscape or, d) conserve the character of the settlement or, e) fit the physical characteristics of the site. The size, type and tenure of new housing must have regard to~~conform with~~ the recommendations of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment or other more recent evidence of overall need[98]. All sites of more than 5 units must constitute at least ~~45~~50% one or two bedroom dwellings, to meet the needs of elderly and other smaller households, unless specific evidence is provided which justifies an alternative mix. New homes will need to comply with the nationally described space standards set out in para 7.31. Affordable homes[100] must be delivered on site as part of all housing schemes of more than one dwelling, in accordance with the following proportions: **~~Site size~~ Number of dwellings proposed** / **South east value area Percentage of affordable housing required** / **North and west value area Percentage of affordable housing required** 1 dwelling / Local occupancy only / Local occupancy only 2-5 dwellings / 40% affordable / 20% affordable 6-9 dwellings / 50% affordable / 25% affordable 10 or more dwellings / 50% affordable / 30% affordable Affordable housing must be visually indistinct from open market housing and should enjoy the same amenities. The Authority will require a payment in lieu of on-site affordable housing where viability considerations prevent the delivery of affordable housing on site. All new build dwellings must be constructed to M4(2) accessible and adaptability standards. Footnote 97 - A home that is the only or main residence of a single household (not a holiday property or second home for short term occupation). Evidence of principal residency~~occupancy~~ may be determined by place of work, electoral role registration, school attendance, registration at a local GP clinic. See Appendix 9

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Footnote 99 - Including the most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the area; local housing needs surveys conducted by Rural Housing Enablers and community housing groups; housing registers and other evidence produced by the local housing authority; or other robust market intelligence. Footnote 100 - Affordable housing will be subject to the restrictions set out in Appendix 7. Affordable housing is ~~D~~defined in the Local Plan Glossary of terms
		Justification text changes	**Housing Sites** 7.8 The housing target will be met from the allocation of new sites in towns and large villages and from the existing supply of land with uncompleted planning permission. The advantage of allocating new sites is: 1. to cross subsidise and enable the delivery of affordable homes; 2. to provide certainty about where new development will take place. Allocation is tantamount to the grant of outline planning permission; 3. to deliver a range of homes of different sizes with modern amenities in locations that have services; 4. to align the provision of infrastructure such as waste, water treatment and road improvement with the construction of new housing. 7.9 The allocated sites have been chosen following a process of detailed site assessment and public consultation. Unsurprisingly, the landscape of the National Park has plenty of natural and heritage constraints which limit its capacity for building. Each site has been assessed in terms of its landscape sensitivity, resilience to flood risk, accessibility to the highway, and absence of significant constraints such as landform, heritage or habitat. The availability of sites has been confirmed (as far as possible) by the willingness of their landowners to develop or sell them for house building, during the Plan period. All allocated sites are located within the larger, more accessible towns and villages with services. 7.10 It will be seen that the distribution of sites is rather uneven across the Local Plan area. Grassington and Threshfield have the largest number of new allocations followed by Sedbergh and then Hawes. Wensleydale and Swaledale have yielded fewer and smaller sites than anticipated because of constraints around landform, landscape and flood risk and because fewer options were put forward by landowners. The shortfall of planned sites in the north of the Park will mean that it is more dependent on rural exceptions sites for affordable housing and on infill and small rounding off sites for market homes. 7.11 Appendix 4 contains details of the allocated sites and provides an indicative figure for the number of dwellings likely to be delivered on each. Development briefs will be prepared for allocated housing sites (Appendix 4) and, where these are adopted by the Authority, development proposals must have regard to them. These will include measures to reduce impacts and maximise opportunities. Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) have been undertaken for sites likely to affect designated heritage assets in their vicinity. To avoid or minimise harm to the historic environment, development proposals should have regard to the recommendations of the HIA. or agree other suitable mitigation measures with the Authority. 7.12 In addition to the allocated sites, the Local Plan will also continue to permit unplanned or 'windfall' plots on infill and gap sites within the housing development boundaries drawn around all the settlements in Policy CP3 (Spatial strategy). Additional opportunities will also continue to emerge from the change of use of existing buildings (such as barn conversions), the subdivision of large dwellings into smaller homes and through the construction of housing for farm workers.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes

7.13 The unplanned nature of future 'windfall' sites mean that they are not part of the 'available supply' at the start of the Plan period, but they will nevertheless contribute towards the annual target once they have been permitted and completed. Infill plots and barn conversions also provide plenty of opportunities for self-build homes, albeit targeted at the local occupancy criteria in Appendix 8.

7.14 A Housing Land Availability Assessment has been produced to support the development of the Local Plan. This provides details of the main sources of housing land supply that will contribute to the Local Plan's housing target of a minimum of 50 dwellings per annum. It also provides a breakdown of predicted delivery of housing, according to the main sources of supply, divided up into broad 5-year periods. This allows an indicative trajectory to be produced that shows the expected rate of housing delivery over the 15-year Local Plan period, as set out in Table 5 below:

Table 5 – Trajectory of housing delivery (completions)

	2025/26 – 2029/30	2030/31 – 2034/35	2035/36 – 2039/40	Total
Extant planning permissions	122	143	35	300
New site allocations	54	165	165	384
Future windfall supply	62	173	187	422
Total	**238**	**481**	**387**	**1106**

Housing needs

7.15 Government planning policy is specific that national landscapes are not suitable locations for unrestricted house building. Government guidance advises National Park Authorities to focus on providing sites for affordable housing for local needs. In ~~conformity~~ accordance with national policy the Authority has avoided releasing large scale sites exclusively for open market housing and instead restricts occupancy in a number of ways. ~~Development briefs will be prepared to guide the appropriate development of the allocated sites. These will include measures to reduce impacts and maximise opportunities.~~

Principal Residency

7.16 Throughout the preparation of the Local Plan the National Park Authority has received widespread concern about the very high levels of unoccupied property across the National Park and the need to ensure that new housing is effectively targeted at public benefit. The Authority therefore decided to modify its housing policy.

7.17 All new housing development will be restricted to ~~will be targeted at~~ principal residency ~~or local occupancy only~~. This is because the National Park already has exceptionally high levels of under occupied stock. In 2021, 2,822 dwellings were vacant or otherwise not permanently occupied and used for holiday letting or second home use. This accounted for 22% of all dwellings in the National Park compared to the empty homes average for England of only 6%.

7.18 Introducing a Local Plan requirement that all new housing must be permanently occupied has a number of objectives;

- to help stem population decline, support the local economy and support local services
- to enable new households to live in the National Park
- to ensure that new homes will be permanently occupied and therefore help to sustain the community rather than risk further under-occupancy.~~, is intended to optimise the use of available sites, assist~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~community sustainability, support the local economy and improve the opportunities for people who work in the Park to also live there~~. 7.19 Principal residency dwellings are market homes with a modest restriction requiring that they must be the sole or main residence of the household living there. Since this is only a small restriction on the use of the property it therefore only has a small effect on valuation and sales, estimated to be about a 5% reduction on price compared to a wholly unfettered market home. ~~It is estimated that a principal residency clause will reduce open market valuation by only 5%, so~~ As a result, it shouldn't cause problems for mortgage lenders or owners wishing to sell quickly. Principal residency restrictions~~clauses~~ will apply to all new housing permitted and, for some developments, additional local occupancy and affordable housing restrictions will also apply, as set out below and in Table 2 (Policy CP3). ~~on sites larger than single units.~~ 7.20 The principal residency restriction will be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement between the applicant and the National Park Authority which will be tied to the planning permission (Appendix 9). ~~planning condition attached to the approval notice~~. The condition requires that the dwelling must be occupied at all times as a main residence. It will not restrict the price or ownership of the property but it may have a small incidental effect on resale value. They will be monitored by the Authority. Occupiers will be required to keep proof that they are satisfying the principal residence requirements and will be obliged to provide this information if the Authority requests it. Proof of permanent occupancy might include evidence that households appear on the local electoral register, are registered at a local healthcare practice or have children registered at a local school. *Local occupancy* 7.21 On single plot sites and conversion schemes ~~existing policy on~~ local occupancy restrictions will apply. These restrictions require that the property is both a principal residence, but also that occupants satisfy a number of more specific criteria. ~~will continue to target households that have an economic or social need to live in the Park. In accordable with national planning policy and the Local Plan housing objectives, new self-build plots and other single plot or single unit residential conversion schemes, permitted under policies C1, C2, C5 and AB3,~~ Occupancy of these dwellings will be targeted at existing residents of the Park forming new households, or households that need to live inside the National Park to be nearer to their place of work, or households with other local needs for more appropriate housing within the area. 7.22 Planning permissions for ~~new single plot~~these dwellings ~~in the National Park~~ are tied by a legal restriction to benefit local housing needs~~, as far as practical~~. Local o~~O~~ccupancy restrictions also have the additional benefit to the local housing market of reducing re sale value of new individual properties by perhaps 20%, helping make new homes slightly more accessible for qualifying households. 7.23 The purpose of targeting single plot developments at local occupancy~~needs~~ is to gradually build up a stock of housing across the Local Plan area, that will be more accessible to households that need to live or work in the area. This is of social and economic benefit to local communities and will help their sustainability. The occupancy restriction is justified by the lack of alternative housing options within such a deeply rural area and by the exceptionally high demand to purchase homes for holiday and retirement use.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			7.24 Tighter borrowing restrictions have however, caused problems for mortgage lenders, developers and some home buyers because of the length of time local occupancy restrictions can add to house sales. Developers have cited the restrictions as a constraint on house building in the National Park. The Authority has responded by widening out the criteria to increase the range of qualifying households and by restricting it to single plot permissions. The criteria now include home working, self-employed part time work, caring, and households that have a child at a school inside the Park. This should mean a faster turnover of occupancy-restricted properties and, therefore, more attractive mortgage lending for the benefit of local households. 7.25 In the event that there is insufficient demand from these categories then after a marketing period of 6 months, the Authority will permit a local occupancy restricted property to be permanently occupied by a household resident anywhere within the local Authority Housing area. Following local government reorganisation, the housing authority areas have now extended out from the former Districts to the whole of North Yorkshire or Westmorland and Furness. -Occupancy would however have to revert back into the National Park on subsequent re sale. The Authority will also make the new, more flexible occupancy agreements available to owners of existing local occupancy tied properties. The downside of this greater flexibility however is that it will tend to widen competition and therefore increase the price of local occupancy homes. 7.26 The criteria for local occupancy are set out in Appendix 8. The Local Plan has added more flexibility to include the self-employed, households that work from home, households with children at a school inside the Park, households that work within 3 miles of the National Park boundary and households undertaking caring work inside the Park. 7.27 Proposals to create new dwellings for holiday accommodation will only be permitted in specific policy circumstances, such as farm or rural estate diversification linked to land management. *Affordable housing* ~~**and viability**~~ 7.28 The affordability of housing is a major threat to the sustainability of communities. Average house prices in the National Park are higher than the English average and much higher than the regional average for Yorkshire and the North West of England. In 2024 the affordability ratio of house prices to average earnings in the Park was a factor of eight. Consequently, the Local Plan area has a large shortfall of affordable housing. In 2024, 611 households were on the housing register for property in the National Park, and the estimated annual need was 157 affordable homes. 7.29 Affordable housing is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework as housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market. It includes housing for social rent, affordable rent, first homes, discount market homes and shared ownership schemes. Government grants may be available towards the cost of providing affordable housing. 7.30 Policy C1 allocates new sites to meet the housing target and enable cross subsidy of affordable homes to support community sustainability. Allocated sites alone are however unlikely to deliver sufficient affordable housing because they are not evenly spread across the Park and because some will inevitably encounter difficulties in their release. The former Richmondshire and Eden areas in particular, have a lack of suitable or available sites for allocation. The Authority has therefore retained its long established rural exceptions policy (Policy C3) which has previously been able to release small unallocated sites for affordable housing. 7.31 Affordable housing permitted under this policy and Policy C3 (Rural exceptions sites) will be targeted at appropriate qualifying households. A household's need for affordable housing will be determined by a Registered Provider and/or the local Housing Authority with regard to local incomes and local house prices.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Permission for affordable housing will include provision for the units to remain at an affordable rent or price that is accessible to future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled into alternative affordable provision in the locality. Additional detail can be found in Appendix 7. **Viability** 7.32 The Authority has undertaken a financial viability assessment to determine the proportions of affordable housing that are deliverable on the allocated sites, taking into account build costs, policy requirements, developer profit and likely sale values. It concluded that a contribution to affordable housing is viable on sites as small as two dwellings. The study identifies two main 'value areas' within the National Park. Mid Wensleydale, Coverdale, Wharfedale and Airedale fall into the higher value area. The rest of the Park is identified as having lower average house values. In the high value area there is sufficient headroom for schemes of 6 or more dwellings to provide 50% affordable housing. In the rest of the National Park, sites should generally have viability for 30% affordable homes on sites of more than 10 units, and 25% (or 20%) on sites smaller than that. In the high value area, sites of 2 to 6 units have viability for 40% affordable housing. 7.33 Affordable housing will be expected to be built on site rather than through a financial contribution. A payment in lieu (based on the cost of providing an affordable unit) may be acceptable in circumstances where on-site delivery is not possible, such as a very small site or where there are other demonstrable viability issues. 7.34 The affordable housing is expected to be provided through a partnership between the developer and a registered provider, such as a Housing Association or Community Housing Group, that will be responsible for its future management. The National Park Authority will rely on the local housing authority to advise on need, tenure, size and type of housing required. All new affordable housing must be occupied on a principal residency basis but will also be subject to additional restrictions that require occupants to be in affordable housing need and to satisfy local connection requirements (Appendix 7). ~~If specific site viability issues prevent the delivery of affordable dwellings in the proportions required by the Policy, opportunities for Homes England funding should be explored. The affordable homes will be tied to households with a connection to the area, unless that would prevent financial assistance from Government funding sources.~~ 7.35 Affordable housing will be expected to be visually indistinguishable within the design and layout of a site, and benefit from the same amenities as open market housing. The affordable homes will be tied to households with a connection to the area, unless that would prevent financial assistance from Government funding sources (Appendix 7). ~~Proposals which would deliver well below the policy requirement are likely to be rejected, since the primary reason for allocating sites in a national landscape area, is to deliver affordable homes to support community sustainability.~~ 7.36 The Authority has investigated the viability of the larger allocated sites to determine that they are deliverable against the policy requirement. If a developer maintains that there is a barrier to delivery, then the Authority will require that to be demonstrated through the submission of a robust and professional site viability appraisal. This would need to show that the price of land reflects its current use value, plus a moderate uplift that will provide an incentive to the landowner. The Authority will expect land valuations to take into account Local Plan policy requirements, such as the required proportion of affordable housing, and any predictable abnormal site costs such as excessive earth moving. 7.37 In accordance with national planning policy, viability assessments should be made publicly available and use industry standard inputs. Submitted viability evidence should also have regard to the Local Plan's Economic

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Viability Study and should clearly explain any divergence from the inputs and assumptions used in that study. Submitted evidence should analyse a range of scenarios for different mixes of tenures, types, sizes and densities of housing, in an attempt to identify deliverable alternatives. They should also explore whether alternative delivery mechanisms could be explored, for example to secure Homes England or other public subsidy, or substituting on-site provision with a commuted sum for off-site provision. The Authority reserves the right to independently test and verify the conclusions of any viability evidence submitted, at the applicant's expense. 7.38 Where submitted viability evidence is found to be robust, the Authority will use it to inform a negotiation on an alternative appropriate housing mix. The weight given to the viability evidence will be a matter for the decision maker and the Authority is not bound to accept a mix of housing that is viable yet falls short of policy requirements and, in doing so, fails to further Local Plan objectives (paragraph 3.3). Proposals which would deliver well below the policy requirement are likely to be rejected, since the primary reason for allocating sites in a national landscape area, is to deliver affordable homes to support community sustainability. Where a lower proportion of affordable housing is acceptable to the Authority, a ~~clawback~~ review mechanism will be included in the Section 106 Agreement to secure a higher proportion of affordable housing, in the event that market conditions improve before the completion of development. 7.39 First Homes are a Government discounted market housing product. Where the Authority agree that First Homes can form part of an affordable scheme, the discount will be fixed at 30% below open market valuation. Purchasers should have a combined annual household income not exceeding £80,000 and must have a local connection to the area. They must have a mortgage to fund a minimum of 50% of the discounted price. First Homes are regarded by national policy as a form of affordable housing and will be registered to ensure the discount is passed on at each subsequent title transfer. The first sale must be at a price no higher than £250,000. *<Policy justification continues hereafter>* Deleted footnote: ~~Housing proposals for multi-unit developments will not be restricted to local occupancy but will have to provide a proportion of affordable housing and will be restricted to Principal Residency (Policy C1)~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM19	Policy C2 – Housing in small settlements	Policy changes	**C2 – New build ~~H~~housing in Small Settlements** New build ~~i~~nfill housing plots to meet local needs will be permitted on suitable sites within the housing development boundaries of the small settlements identified in Policy CP3 (Spatial Strategy). Single plot permissions will be restricted to local occupancy as defined in Appendix 8. Development of more than one new build dwelling will be subject to a principal~~permanent~~ residency ~~condition~~ restriction and a proportion of affordable housing in accordance with~~relation to~~ Policy C1. All plots will be required to meet a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare and comply with the nationally described space standards in accordance with Policy C1.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM20	Policy C3 – Rural Exceptions Sites	Policy changes	**C3 – Rural Exception Sites** ~~The Authority will permit an exception to be made to~~As an exception to Policy CP3 (Spatial Strategy) and Policy C1 (Housing in Towns and large Villages) proposals for the development of sites (or the conversion of suitable buildings) within or on the edge of local service centres and large villages, ~~to~~for 100% affordable housing~~, within or on the edge of local service centres and large villages~~, will be permitted provided all the following criteria are met: i) the size, type, tenure and number of units to be provided will be informed by robust and up to date evidence of local need for affordable housing, as advised by the local housing authority; ii) all dwellings must remain affordable in perpetuity for~~to~~ rent or purchase at a price that is accessible to those in need; iii) a Section 106 legal agreement will be required to ensure restriction of occupancy in perpetuity, to households with a local connection to the area as set out in Appendix 7~~8~~; iv) proposals comply with other policies and guidance in the Local Plan, including impact on the form and character of the settlement, design, layout, energy, siting, biodiversity and flood risk. Where it is demonstrated that a rural exceptions site, that would otherwise deliver an essential element of affordable housing, would not be viable for 100% affordable units, (including accessing Government grant aid), the Authority will consider allowing a single visually indistinct market home (with a principal residency restriction), for every nine affordable dwellings, to make up the deficit and assist delivery.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM21	Policy C4 – Rural workers dwellings	Policy changes	**C4 – Rural Workers' Dwellings~~Housing~~** Outside housing development boundaries new build residential accommodation for a rural land- based enterprise will only be permitted where all the following are met; i) it can be demonstrated that the functional needs of agriculture, or some other established essential rural land-based enterprise, requires that a full time worker must live at the location proposed, ii) it can be demonstrated that there are no opportunities for providing the accommodation by using other dwellings within the control of the applicants, or by the extension or conversion of an existing suitable building, or by the acceptable sub-division or extension of an existing dwelling, iii) the enterprise that the dwelling will serve must not have been instrumental in disposing of any residential property in the preceding three years, that would have satisfied the need now identified, iv) the dwelling will be located within or adjoining an existing group of buildings to minimise its impact on the landscape, v) to maintain it within a size and value that will be accessible to future rural land based uses, the dwelling will be limited to an internal floor area of 120m2, unless otherwise justified by evidence supporting the planning application, that a larger size is essential to the needs of the established rural enterprise or agricultural unit, vi) If the proposal is for a new rural enterprise or if the long term financial viability of the enterprise cannot be demonstrated, then the need should be met by a temporary solution, such as the siting of a residential caravan or similar in a suitable location, for a three-year period, vii) restrictions requiring that the property and any existing dwelling serving the enterprise, cannot be occupied other than by a worker evidenced through the specific needs requirements, or subsequent workers in a rural land based business, and cannot be sold separately from the enterprise. If a dwelling permitted under this policy becomes unoccupied and no suitable occupant is forthcoming after the property has been advertised in accordance with the National Park Authority's advertising procedure[118], the Authority will consider varying the restriction to that of local occupancy described in Appendix 8. Footnote 118 - see advertising procedure under policy C8 – para 7.111~~02~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM22	Policy C5 – Shared housing	Policy changes	**C5 – Shared housing, Sub-division, residential Annexes and Replacement dwellings** **Shared housing** The change of use of buildings in established residential uses to multiple shared household occupancy, will be permitted subject to the following: a) the building has capacity having regard to space and construction constraints; b) the proposal would respond sensitively to the character and appearance of the building and its locality; c) there is adequate management and separation from neighbouring residential property to avoid noise and other disturbance; d) there is appropriate car parking provision to serve the proposed use;~~The change of use of suitable large buildings and under used upper floors above high streets, to multiple shared household occupancy, will be permitted subject to, appropriate car parking and adequate management and separation from neighbouring residential property, to avoid noise and other disturbance.~~ **Subdivision** The sub-division of an existing dwellinghouse to form two or more smaller dwellings will be permitted provided all of the following criteria are met: 1. the dwelling and its curtilage has sufficient capacity for additional residential use including parking, amenity space, service provision and the consideration of noise and lighting impacts. 2. the net additional dwelling(s) created are restricted to local occupancy only (Appendix 8). **Residential annexes** The conversion of existing outbuildings into residential annexes (non-holiday uses), will be permitted subject to a restriction tying them to an existing residential property, in order to prevent separate sale. New build annexed accommodation, and the extension of outbuildings for additional accommodation tied to the main dwelling, will be permitted where there is capacity and the use would not unduly harm neighbouring residential property. **Replacement dwellings** Permission to replace an existing irreparable dwelling with a new house, will be acceptable subject to all of the following criteria being met: 1. the residential use of the dwelling to be replaced has not been abandoned, 2. it is demonstrated that the repair of the existing building is not sustainable or economically viable and there will be no avoidable loss of a building of architectural or historical interest, 3. replacement will be on the same site as the original, 4. The replacement dwelling will not exceed a limit of 20% larger than the cubic content of the existing dwelling (including all ancillary buildings)

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			5. The design will comply with policy CP6 (Design) and facilitate overall significant low carbon and low energy improvements; Where permission for a replacement dwelling is granted, future extensions will be controlled by the removal of permitted development rights. Where replacement would lead to two or more smaller dwellings the net additional dwelling(s) created will be restricted to local occupancy (Appendix 8). In the event of a change in the national definition of a dwelling house, the Authority will apply planning measures to manage the loss of existing dwelling stock to non-permanent residential uses, such as holiday occupancy.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM23	Policy C7 – Accommodation for Elderly and Vulnerable Adults	Policy changes	**C7 – Accommodation for Elderly or Vulnerable Adults** Development proposals that will provide modern high quality accommodation for elderly or vulnerable persons will be permitted through the following: • Adaptations and extensions to the existing housing stock where they meet the requirements of Policy CP64 • The development of appropriately designed and accessible homes (built to M4(2) or M4(3) standard) which widen the future mix of suitable housing for elderly and vulnerable adults on allocated, windfall or rural exceptions sites in accordance with policies C1, C2 and C3. • Extra care and residential care facilities, will be permitted within or on the edge of towns and large villages as an exception to spatial policy CP3, where all of the following requirements are met: a. they will meet identified care needs for elderly or vulnerable persons as advised by the local adult social care Authority, b. they are targeted at local needs from within the Local Plan or adjacent area c. They are appropriately located and designed in accordance~~conformity~~ with other Local Plan policies

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM24	Policy C9 – Important open space	Policy changes	**C9 – Important Open Space** Within areas designated on the policies map as important open space, development proposals will only be permitted where they will not result in the loss of, or significantly harm, their qualities or functions. For spaces important ~~designated~~ because of their sporting or recreational value, any loss of, or significant harm to their qualities and functions will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the space is no longer needed, or a suitably located replacement of at least equivalent standard is secured.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM25	Policy E1 – Business Development Sites	Policy changes	**E1 – Business Development Sites** Proposals for the development of land and buildings that create new jobs, support existing jobs and increase spending in the Park and on its edge, will be permitted in locations that: • would sensitively expand existing employment and business buildings, floor space or their intensity of use, or, • are allocated for employment and business opportunity in accordance with the mixture of uses identified in Appendix 4, or • constitute brownfield sites or other suitable small sites within or on the edge of local service centres and large villages for new employment buildings and uses (see also Policy E3 Re-use of existing buildings and Brownfield Land) Development will only be permitted where: • There is capacity to do so using appropriate mitigation in terms of materials and landscape planting, without adverse impacts on the local landscape, heritage, flood risk, biodiversity or dark skies, and • Supporting infrastructure is available or can be delivered as part of the proposal, and • The site can be safely accessed from the existing road network, and sustainable travel options are considered alongside public transport and active travel connections and • There is no unacceptable harm in terms of noise, activity or traffic congestion on the immediate neighbourhood, either individually or cumulatively with other development.
		Justification text changes	8.11 The Local Plan allocates~~contains~~ four~~three~~ ~~medium size~~ development sites that already have access and some services, near to local service centres. The biggest site is at Threshfield Quarry near Grassington (9~~5~~ hectares), which would require significant investment, but remains suitable for a range of uses. The other sites are Linton Camp (5 hectares), Giggleswick Quarry (3 hectares) and Toll Bar (0.5 hectares) ~~the former Baliol School (2 hectares)~~ on the edge of the Park's largest town of Sedbergh. The Authority may permit a small element of residential development at Threshfield and Giggleswick Quarries ~~on these sites~~ if that would be essential to delivery or would fund significantly beneficial environmental remediation. In addition to the development of land for employment and business uses, Policy E1 also supports the expansion and redevelopment of existing businesses, through additional floor space, new buildings or increased intensity of use.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM26	Policy E2 – Rural land-based enterprises	Policy changes	**E2 - Rural Land Based Enterprises** The development of rural land-based enterprises and their diversification, will be permitted where; • it will not harm existing land management that is already delivering National Park Management Plan objectives; and, • its scale and impact is appropriate and will not harm local environmental quality; and, • new buildings and structures would be carefully sited within existing building groups or are screened by landscape planting and coloured to minimise their impact. A condition will be placed on their approval to require their dismantling and removal when no longer needed for their purpose. Additional justification will be required for the proposed siting of isolated buildings, structures and hard surfacing.; and, • where appropriate, proposals take the opportunity to enhance the existing situation, through nature friendly design, reduced lighting impacts, biodiversity enhancement or remodelling of a site to improve its landscape impact and environmental performance. New buildings for farm diversification will be permitted where they are of an appropriate scale in the landscape and it can be demonstrated that the conversion or re-use of a suitable existing building cannot accommodate the proposed activity in accordance with other Local Plan policies. Proposals for new buildings, major infrastructure or facilities needed to support significant increases in stocking levels that might otherwise risk harm to the landscape or other special qualities of the Park, will not be permitted, unless they are justified by a business case that provides evidence of the need for the proposal. Mitigating measures will also be required to neutralise the effects on nature, water, landscape, dark skies, the highway network and neighbouring amenity. Where new diversification uses and businesses that are specific to the land management practices of a holding are appropriate, these will be tied to the land if it is considered that their separate sale could be harmful to the long-term management of the holding or the qualities of the National Park. D~~New d~~evelopment that ~~will~~ is necessary to enable an existing farm operation to meet environmental, animal welfare or safety regulations, or to deliver nature friendly farming, low carbon agriculture or wider nature recovery, in harmony with the National Park Management Plan, is encouraged. ~~will be permitted, subject to consideration of impact on the landscape and the quality of the environment.~~ ~~New development that will help farming and other rural land based enterprises to further transition towards the goal of food production in harmony with nature recovery, carbon capture or delivery of other shared objectives in the National Park Management Plan, will be permitted.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~Diversification of existing land-based enterprises that will help with the viability of the primary business, will be permitted where they will also clearly deliver nature friendly farming or low-carbon agriculture or wider nature recovery on the land holding. Development will be permitted where it will not be harmful to existing land management that is already delivering National Park Management Plan objectives and where its scale is appropriate and will not harm local environmental quality.~~ ~~New buildings for farm diversification will be permitted where they are of an appropriate scale in the landscape and it can be demonstrated that the conversion or re-use of a suitable existing building cannot accommodate the proposed activity in accordance with other Local Plan policies.~~ ~~Where new diversification uses and businesses that are specific to the land management practices of a holding are appropriate, these will be tied to the land if it is considered that their separate sale could be harmful to the long term management of the holding or the qualities of the National Park.~~ ~~Proposals for large new buildings, major infrastructure or facilities needed to support significant increases in stocking levels that might otherwise risk harm to the landscape or other special qualities of the Park, will not be permitted, unless they are justified by a business case that provides evidence of the need for the proposal. Mitigating measures will also be required to neutralise the effects on nature, water, landscape, dark skies, the highway network and neighbouring amenity.~~ ~~Large new buildings and structures will only be permitted if they are carefully sited within existing building groups or are screened by landscape planting and coloured to minimise their impact. A condition will be placed on their approval to require their dismantling and removal when no longer needed for their purpose. Additional justification will be required for the proposed siting of isolated buildings, structures and hard surfacing.~~ ~~All proposals should take the opportunity to enhance the existing situation, through nature friendly design, reduced lighting impacts, biodiversity net gain or remodelling of a site to improve its landscape impact and environmental performance.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM27	Policy E3 – Re-use of existing buildings and brownfield land	Policy changes	**E3 – Re-use of existing buildings and Brownfield Land** The re-use of traditional buildings for new business and employment purposes will be permitted in accordance with~~relation to~~ Policy AB~~3~~2 (Conversion of traditional buildings ~~-and~~ acceptable uses) [132]. The re-use of brownfield land and the change of use of modern buildings, including farm buildings, to new non-residential business and employment uses will be permitted where all of the following are satisfied: a) The building or brownfield site is no longer needed for its current use and will not displace the use harmfully elsewhere or conflict with an existing use, b) The building or brownfield site is located in a settlement or is unobtrusively located in the landscape where a new use will not perpetuate an existing landscape detractor; and any modifications to its appearance and curtilage are acceptable in terms of their impact on the surroundings and on residential amenity, c) The building is of sufficient size to contain the new use without external storage appearing harmful, d) New uses, buildings and structures will need to be compatible with surrounding land uses and have the environmental capacity to accept the proposed intensity of use, if necessary with restriction of lighting, traffic movements, noise, emissions and operational hours. e) The new uses are compatible with neighbouring uses, the capacity of the local road network and will have an appropriate access off the highway. ~~e)~~f) The location is suitable having regard to the nature of the use and vehicle movements it will generate. Proposals for brownfield sites and the reuse of modern buildings will be weighed favourably where they are located in sustainable locations within walking distance of existing shops and services or their new uses will be serviced by public transport. Development that would generate visitor movements in isolated locations will need to be scrutinised carefully in order to avoid congestion or harm to the character of quieter areas of the National Park. Footnote 132: ~~Traditional buildings are buildings constructed in accordance with long-standing practices or customs such as solid-wall masonry and hand-crafted carpentry. In the Yorkshire Dales, they are mainly built from natural locally sourced stone and timber, although some imported prefabricated or mass-manufactured materials have also been used. In terms of their design details, traditional buildings can include both vernacular and polite elements, the latter being influenced by national fashions. Traditional buildings perform very differently to modern construction, allowing moisture movement inside the fabric, hence their requirement for 'breathable' materials.~~See glossary for definition of traditional buildings

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM28	Policy E4 – High street and retail uses	Policy changes	**E4 – High Street and Retail uses** High street service frontages are identified on the policies map for Sedbergh, Hawes and Grassington. New uses falling within Class E (Commercial, Business and Service), Class C1 (Hotels) and Class F1 (Learning) and Class F2 (local Community) of the Use Classes order, will be permitted on ground and upper floors within the high street service frontage subject to consideration of any detrimental impacts on public access to key retail products. Subject to the above, other uses such as residential, may be permitted on upper floors where these would not harm the vitality and viability of the high street to provide services to residents and visitors. In order to maintain footfall and the function of the high street as the primary focus for services for residents and visitors~~residential and visitor services~~, the development of new or expanded shops, cafes, restaurants and pubs, (Use class: E (a), (b), will be subject to a sequential locational test: The order of preference will be: 1. sites within the high street; 2. sites within 100m of the high street; 3. sites away from the high street where sites meeting criteria (1) or (2) are not available or not expected to become available within 6 months. Small scale rural offices, farm diversification schemes, village shops selling goods predominantly for local consumption and visitor facilities that would not have a detrimental impact on the high street, will be exempt from this test. Applications for commercial services (Class E) larger than 250m^2 (gross internal area) outside of the high street, will require assessment of their impact on: • existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and • town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. Where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on the town centre, it will be refused.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM29	Policy E5 – Safeguarding employment and tourism uses	Policy changes	**E5 – Safeguarding existing employment and tourism uses** ~~Existing employment and tourism uses~~Land and buildings currently or last used for employment or tourism uses will be safeguarded to avoid the unjustified loss of jobs, buildings, sites and services. Development that would result in the loss of land and buildings currently or last used for employment or tourism uses~~Changes of use from existing employment and tourism uses to non-employment or non-tourism uses~~ will only be permitted where: • there would be no unacceptable impact on local employment or the availability of land and premises for alternative business uses, and; • there is no demand for alternative employment uses. In cases where the loss could be locally significant, lack of demand would need to be proven by a marketing study and evidence demonstrating that the current economic use is no longer viable and; • the new use would be compatible with existing neighbouring uses; and • the loss of a tourism use would not have a detrimental impact on the local economy or the delivery of National Park purposes. To encourage future enterprise, new business uses (less than three years old) will be permitted to revert to their former use (e.g. housing).

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM30	Policy E6 – Rural Estate Plans	Policy changes	**E6 – Rural Estate Plans** The National Park Authority will endorse Rural Estate Plans[135] which accord with the objectives (paragraph 3.3) of this Plan and the ambitions of the National Park Management Plan[136] and which are informed by appropriate stakeholder consultation. Rural Estate Plans endorsed by the Authority will be a material consideration in the determination of proposals for the development of land and buildings covered by the Rural Estate Plan. ~~The development of land and buildings for new employment and economic uses will be permitted where they would conform with a Whole Estate Plan agreed by the National Park Authority, and in conformity with the Local Plan and National Park Management Plan.~~ Footnote 135 - A document supported by evidence and prepared by individual land-owning estates. They set out the assets of the estate and describe their plans for the future. A Rural Estate Plan will have also been subject to engagement with consultees and wider stakeholders. Footnote 136 - [1] The vision and ambitions of the adopted National Park Management Plan 2025-30 (page 8), or any subsequently adopted version of the Management Plan. Deleted footnote - ~~A document supported by evidence and prepared by individual land-owning estates. They set out the assets of the estate and describe their plans for the future. A Whole Estate Plan will have also been subject to engagement with consultees and wider stakeholders.~~
		Justification text changes	*Aim* 8.70 To extend the options for sustainable diversification of the rural economy and enable greater opportunity for rural estates to plan their medium and long term development needs within their land holdings. *Justification* 8.71 The Authority has been advised that there are 26 rural estates currently located in the National Park and a total of 31 with land inside. Rural land estates, across the Local Plan area have an important role to play in the conservation of the landscape and the development of a sustainable rural economy. 8.72 Rural~~Whole~~ Estate Plans can be used by landowners to set out their long-term development objectives. The Authority ~~is minded to trial an approach that~~ will endorse ~~give weight to~~ Estate Plans which are ~~in making planning decisions where they have been prepared~~ in accordance~~conformity~~ with the objectives of the Local Plan and National Park Management Plan and which have been informed by ~~subject to~~ consultation with statutory bodies and the public. The objective is to plan for and then support suitable opportunities for beneficial rural development. The Authority will produce and consult stakeholders on guidance regarding the preparation, submission and consideration of Rural Estate Plans, to ensure that they form a robust basis for decision making. 8.73 Rural estate plans that are endorsed by the National Park Authority will be given weight as a material consideration in decision making. They may include proposals for development on sites outside towns and villages where this would deliver Local Plan or National Park Management Plan objectives. This may incorporate a range of uses including employment, visitor uses, affordable housing, staff accommodation or other forms of housing, in accordance with the needs identified in the Local Plan and where that would facilitate multiple benefits for National Park objectives.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~Policy CP3 (Spatial Strategy) recognises that Whole Estate Plans may be able to deliver aspects of National Park purposes and economic development that justify growth outside of settlements. Their scope could extend to visitor development, land management, employment, business uses and housing. Estate development can help deliver aspects of land management and public enjoyment that will deliver objectives set out in the National Park Management Plan.~~ ~~It is recognised that Estate Plans are optional and would be produced by the estate to fit their specific circumstances. To give them weight as an additional material planning consideration they would need to be in conformity with the Local Plan and National Park Management Plan.~~ ~~Like supplementary planning documents, Rural Estate Plans should be prepared using an appropriate evidence base and be exposed to public and stakeholder consultation.~~ ~~Where they propose new housing outside a housing development boundary, they should deliver exclusively affordable housing for local needs unless they are part of an allocated site on the Policies Map. Consideration would need to be given to potential impacts on infrastructure and services, including contributions towards improvements.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM31	Policy E7 – Home working	Policy changes	~~**E7 – Home Working**~~ ~~The Authority will permit home-working to include employment uses such as office, health, food and craft work within residential dwellings, subject to all of the following:~~ • ~~the use would be ancillary to the main use as a residential dwelling, or;~~ • ~~the residential dwelling has capacity for the use without causing detrimental impacts on neighbouring uses or residential amenity;~~ • ~~the use would not generate a harmful additional level of vehicle movements to and from the dwelling house.~~ ~~Domestic extensions, annexes and the development of garden rooms for home working will be permitted subject to consideration of all the following:~~ • ~~size and scale;~~ • ~~Vehicle movements and provision of adequate car parking;~~ • ~~emissions of noise, light, smell, fumes, vibration;~~ • ~~requirement for additional infrastructure (such as overhead lines, road widening);~~ • ~~demand on public services such as waste collection or waste water discharge;~~ • ~~Hours or operation;~~ • ~~Neighbour amenity considerations.~~ ~~Mitigation measures may be necessary to enable permission, these may include, but are not limited to:~~ • ~~effective management and specification of operating times;~~ • ~~limiting the number of client visits;~~ • ~~the amount of rooms to be used;~~ • ~~the reversibility of development.~~ ~~If the building does not have capacity to accommodate the proposed use within a residential context, permission may be refused.~~
		Justification text changes	~~**Aim**~~ ~~To support home working as part of a modern mixed economy.~~ ~~**Justification**~~ ~~The shape of modern work has evolved over recent years supported by advances in digital connectivity. The Covid-19 pandemic accelerated the move towards home and blended working for many people.~~ ~~The Yorkshire Dales National Park has the potential to further capitalise on these sustainable trends by using the quality of its natural and managed assets, to attract more households to live and work in the Park. This policy seeks to support new and flexible working practices which can benefit local communities and the rural~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~economy through increased employment, reduced commuting and more convenient working, shopping and living.~~ ~~Homes with modern amenities that are comfortable to live in and affordable to heat can also make attractive working environments. The Local Plan allocates new sites and makes provision for a wider range of new homes including affordable housing. This together with the development of modern co working space could prove attractive to younger households looking to stay, move into or return to the Park to live.~~ ~~Planning permission is not normally needed to convert a room in a dwelling to an office or craft workshop, as long as the use remains subordinate to the buildings main use as a dwelling. Where planning permission is required for an extension, an ancillary building or an intensification of a use, then the Authority will be supportive in principle, subject to safeguarding neighbouring residential amenity and mitigating any other harmful impacts.~~ ~~Where the employment use would grow to a level of activity that would exceed the capacity of a residential area, road network or environment to contain it, then the Authority will encourage relocation to a more suitable site, including beyond the Local Plan area if appropriate.~~ ~~Supporting the continued growth of modern working practices will require good quality communication infrastructure. Significant improvements have been made to broadband and mobile telecommunication in recent years, however there is still more to be done. The National Park Management Plan and the Local Plan support the development of new infrastructure subject to certain caveats (policy AC1 and AC2).~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM32	Policy E8 – Live work	Policy changes	**E8 – ~~New Build~~ Live/Work Units** New build live/work units and the change of use of dwellings to live/work units will be permitted within~~inside~~ housing development boundaries where the scheme: • would not cause detrimental impacts on neighbouring uses or~~. Only uses compatible with~~ residential amenity; and,~~ will be permitted.~~ • would not generate a harmful additional level of vehicle movements; and, • would not lead to harmful emissions, impact on the landscape or excessive demand on public services such as waste collection or waste water discharge; and, • is designed such that it could be readily converted to, or back to, a dwelling. Measures to limit adverse impacts of the scheme may be required such as controls over the nature of the business which can be carried out, operating times and the number of visitors/vehicle movements. New build live/work for rent, and the conversion of traditional buildings to live/work units~~uses,~~ will be permitted on previously developed land~~former employment sites where~~: • ~~the current/last use is no longer viable~~ or ~~, and~~ • the building/site has been vacant for three years; and~~, and~~ • the residential use will be ancillary to the business use and is occupied by at least one person working full-time in the business; and,~~a residential use is otherwise sustainable.~~ • the location and building is suitable as a place to live. ~~Any p~~Proposals for live/work units outside of housing development boundaries and previously developed land will only be permitted where~~need to be~~ supported by a ~~viable~~ business plan which demonstrates ~~includes evidence of~~the need for a business unit with ancillary living accommodation~~,~~ in that location and that the business is likely to be viable. ~~All proposals for live/work development will also need to meet the following criteria:~~ ~~the residential use will be ancillary to the business use;~~ ~~the occupancy of the living area will be restricted to a person working full-time in the business.~~
		Justification text changes	*Aim* 8.74 To permit opportunities for mixed employment and residential living~~the sustainable development of mixed employment and residential use~~. *Justification* 8.75 The shape of modern work has evolved over recent years supported by advances in digital connectivity. The Covid-19 pandemic accelerated the move towards home and blended working for many people. 8.76 The Yorkshire Dales National Park has the potential to further capitalise on these sustainable trends by using the quality of its natural and managed assets, to attract more households to live and work in the Park. This policy seeks to support new and flexible working practices which can benefit local communities and the rural economy through increased employment, reduced commuting and more convenient working, shopping and living.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			8.77 Homes with modern amenities that are comfortable to live in and affordable to heat can also make attractive working environments. The Local Plan allocates new sites and makes provision for a wider range of new homes including affordable housing. This together with the development of modern co working space could prove attractive to younger households looking to stay, move into or return to the Park to live. 8.78 Planning permission is not normally needed to convert a room in a dwelling to an office or craft workshop, as long as the use remains ancillary to the buildings main use as a dwelling. Where planning permission is required for an extension, or ancillary building to enable home working, the Authority will be supportive in principle subject to the building retaining its main use as a dwelling and safeguarding neighbouring residential amenity and mitigating any other harmful impacts. 8.79 Whilst home working adaptations can meet most of the demand for modern lifestyle working, there may also be opportunity to develop rather more bespoke buildings for shared residential/business space, perhaps maximising the qualities of the National Park as a place to live and work. 8.80 Purpose designed live/work units have the potential to attract new low-impact, high-quality and skilled jobs, develop stronger business networks and entrepreneurship, support construction of local occupancy housing and reduce carbon emissions from commuting. 8.81 There are a range of low impact uses that would be compatible with the rural context of the Yorkshire Dales. These include workshops, light manufacturing, food processing, professional services, visitor services, creative services and internet sales. 8.82 To date live work development has not been successful in the Park. It probably needs a more managed approach through the construction and promotion of rental units rather than through speculative development for sale, perhaps with a more specialist focus or theme. There may be particular opportunities for the rural estates to consider this form of development, perhaps as part of their Estate Plans. 8.83 Experience suggests that the policy is more likely to be successful when targeted at purpose-designed, new build premises that do not look like conventional houses and are located within existing or allocated business sites. The allocated business sites in Sedbergh, Threshfield and Giggleswick have potential scope for live work development (See Policy E1 and Appendix 4) together with previously developed land where new residential uses would also be suitable. The National Park Design Guide also contains supplementary advice for live/work proposals. 8.84 In areas where the demand for housing is high, there is a risk that live/work schemes could lose their work element over time. To try to ensure that live/work units achieve their objective of a mixed-use and to avoid them being diluted to predominantly residential, a number of criteria will be required as part of the permission. For example, the residential element will be required to be subservient to the main business use. 8.85 The residential part will be required to be occupied after the implementation of the business, in order to avoid invalidating the permission. Sole residential use will only be permitted in the event of retirement or business failure, and then only after five years of business operation. The use would revert back to a mixed live/work use on re-occupancy. To confirm that the business use is continuing, the legal agreement will require the occupier to submit annual approved business accounts to the National Park Authority.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			8.86 In considering the detailed design and layout, developers will be required to demonstrate a functional separation between the domestic space and the work area, unless this would prejudice the viability of the employment function. 8.87 The conversion of traditional buildings to live / work uses is dealt with by Policy AB2. 8.88 Supporting the continued growth of modern working practices will require good quality communication infrastructure. Significant improvements have been made to broadband and mobile telecommunication in recent years, however there is still more to be done. The National Park Management Plan and the Local Plan support the development of new infrastructure subject to certain caveats (policy AC1 and AC2).

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM33	Policy E9 - Campsites	Policy changes	**E9 – Camping and Touring Caravan sSites** Camping and camper van sites New sites for camping or extended campsites for tents and camper vans[138], or the extension of existing sites, and the development of associated buildings or facilities, will be permitted where provided all the following: development will enhance an existing campsite in terms of screening, reduced density and the improved amenity of staying visitors, in the case of a newly proposed campsite, the scale, or form and density of development will fit into the character and appearance of the local landscape. If and where necessary, a suitable planting scheme will be required to be provided to safeguard the landscape, Touring caravan and motor home sites The development of new or extended sites and associated buildings or facilities for touring caravans and motor homes[139] will only be permitted where the proposed pitches are already well screened in the landscape at the time of application. General requirements The following will apply in all circumstances to camping, camper van, touring caravan and motor home development: • Pitches will be restricted to short stay holiday accommodation only; • The intensity of use is appropriate for the location and in terms of the infrastructure available, including water supply, waste collection, waste water treatment and discharge, vehicle parking and access for emergency services; • Adequate access arrangements exist and there would be no Traffic movements will not be unduly disruptive traffic movements which would exceed highway capacity or and access arrangements will not be harmful to the local landscape, and neighbouring uses or impact on the rights of way network; • The site is capable of effective management without the construction of a new dwelling; • The scheme will comply with the relevant lighting standards set out in Policy L6 (Ddark Sskies), avoiding any net increase in light pollution and where possible securing a net reduction; • Any recreational disturbance to designated habitats and species will be avoided or can be mitigated.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			• ~~Proposals in flood risk areas that are otherwise acceptable are subject to will be required to produce emergency evacuation plans~~ • ~~Proposals that are otherwise acceptable in flood risk areas will be required to produce emergency evacuation plans~~. • Proposals will need to demonstrate that they have incorporated designs, layouts and technologies that will minimise~~deliver~~ environmental impacts~~benefits~~, such as energy saving measures, the use of renewable energy, the provision of recycling facilities and improved biodiversity; • Caravan, camper van and motor home storage will not be permitted other than in specific screened areas, to be agreed by the Authority. Footnote 138 - A motor vehicle designed or adapted for simple human habitation, for the purpose of recreational travel, that does not exceed 6m in length. Footnote 139 - purpose-built motor vehicle designed to serve as self-contained living quarters for recreational travel comprising sleeping space, washing and kitchen facilities.
		Justification text changes	*Aim* 8.74 To increase the opportunity for affordable overnight stays in the National Park by improving existing campsites and supporting new facilities for tents and camper vans. Also to support the provision of touring caravan and motor home pitches on appropriate and screened sites. *Justification* Campsites 8.75 Camping can be an inexpensive and sustainable way of enjoying the National Park. Having good quality campsites can help improve the National Park's overall tourism offer, making it accessible to a wider range of people and groups taking part in activities, reducing daily vehicle movements and supporting the local economy. The National Park Management Plan includes objectives to increase the number of overnight stays by visitors and to make the National Park more accessible to a diverse range of groups. This includes younger people and the disadvantaged. A good way to do this is to widen and then retain the range of budget accommodation, including camping. 8.76 Under permitted development rights, land can be used as a temporary campsite (tents, campervans and mobile homes) for no more than 50 pitches for up to 60 days in any calendar year without the need to make an application for planning permission. Operators do however have to notify the Authority in writing beforehand. Sites are not permitted on scheduled monuments, listed buildings or land protected because of its special scientific interest. Policy E9 will however, permit the development of new or the extension of existing campsites in appropriate locations for periods much longer than 60 days. 8.77 Campsites can often provide opportunities for farm or rural estate diversification. Farms and rural estates usually contain groups of buildings which could host site facilities and against which tents can be sited to reduce their visual impact in the wider landscape. Where existing buildings are not available or suitable for re-use, Policy E9 will be used to consider the construction of appropriate new buildings.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			8.78 The Authority and its partners have a Management Plan objective to improve the quality and variety of the tourism offer in the National Park by encouraging more overnight stays and extending the season into the quieter months. One way to do this is to raise the standard of visitor accommodation including camping. The Authority will support development that offers campsite users the following amenities: • locations within walking distance of local services such as shops, pubs and activities, yet with sufficient separation from residential areas, to avoid disturbance; • sheltered, well drained, flood-free pitches that offer a degree of privacy to users; • adequate parking; • good quality facilities e.g. washrooms; • environmentally sustainable designs and layouts that also provide for an enhanced visitor experience and contact with nature; • small, quiet, simple sites that are accessible to the National Park's best natural resources; • good access to public transport, rights of way, long distance routes and areas with capacity for more public access. 8.79 Whilst the policy supports new or extended campsites, there are also a range of challenges that need to be considered. If permitted development rights for camping start to have detrimental impacts on the qualities of the National Park, then the Authority can suspend them in certain locations by implementing an Article 4 Direction. 8.80 New sites should avoid prominent locations in very open areas and should not be so large that they detract from the character of the landscape. The impact of recreational disturbance on designated habitats and species is also an important consideration and one that potentially invokes reference to the Sandford Principle (see Policy CP2 – National Park Purposes) 8.81 If management of impacts is not possible through conditions or mitigating measures, then development may not be permissible. Other sensitivities will include potential light and noise pollution and road congestion, particularly in areas of the Park that have qualities of tranquillity. An effective way to manage some of those impacts would be through restrictions on the number of permissible pitches within the more sensitive areas identified in the Authority's visitor management strategy. All proposals must be able to demonstrate that they can be managed effectively in order to prevent disturbance and safeguard the enjoyment of their users and the amenity of nearby residents. 8.82 Although a Management Plan objective is to explore the opportunity for growing the National Park tourism economy in the quieter months, there will be areas with particular sensitivities in terms of ineffective winter screening or ecological or archaeological sensitivity, where seasonal restrictions on use will be necessary. Other areas will have capacity for year-round use and high-quality camp sites near to services can enable visitors to enjoy the Park through more of the year and bring benefits to the local economy into the shoulder months and beyond. 8.83 Unauthorised use of land by camper vans can be an issue in the Park particularly where it leads to problems of waste disposal or noise disturbance. Sites that can accommodate a mixture of camper vans and tents will therefore be permitted where they would not be harmful in the landscape.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			Touring Caravans and Motorhomes 8.84 Touring caravans and motorhomes have a long association of visitor use within the National Park but are only a relatively small part of the accommodation market. There are 26 touring sites in the National Park providing 690 pitches, sometimes including space for camper vans and tents. 8.85 They are a flexible and transient form of accommodation with demand tending to be linked to good weather. The last 10 years has seen the gradual loss of some touring caravan / motorhome pitches, and with it the loss of some of the more casual opportunities for the public to enjoy the National Park. 8.86 This policy will allow new pitches in locations that are well-screened. Although there is a Management Plan objective to increase year round accommodation in the Park, there are areas with particular sensitivities where seasonal restrictions will be necessary. 8.87 New touring pitches will need to be screened at the point of implementation. This is because the appearance of white rectangular touring caravans and motorhomes tends to make them more prominent in the landscape than tents or smaller camper vans. They also tend to have a bigger footprint and a much more significant impact on the road network. 8.88 The Authority will consider proposals and investigate mitigation measures that will enable the improvement and extension of existing sites. The Authority also considers that there is scope for the development of some new sites where the landscape and other impacts would be acceptable. 8.89 Land within walking distance of the Local Service Centres (Policy CP3) are likely to be the most beneficial sites in terms of access to visitor facilities and increased spending in the local economy. However, there is also scope for small touring caravan / motorhome sites (of around 5 pitches), perhaps mixed with some camping, in some of the quieter areas of the National Park. 8.105 There is sometimes an issue with touring pitches being used for the storage of caravans. This has an impact on the landscape equivalent to static caravans but without benefits to the local economy. The Authority will require a condition that no caravan shall occupy any pitch for more than 28 days per calendar year. The Authority will also work with site operators to designate suitable storage areas, where there is landscape capacity to do so.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM34	Policy E10 – Touring caravan sites	Policy changes	~~**E10 – Touring Caravan Sites**~~ ~~Development of land for new or extended sites for touring caravans and motor homes will be permitted subject to all the following:~~ ~~• The pitches being well screened in the landscape at the time of application,~~ ~~• The scale and intensity of use is appropriate for the location and in terms of the infrastructure available, including water supply, waste collection, waste water treatment and discharge,~~ ~~• Adequate access arrangements and no disruptive traffic movements which would be harmful to the local landscape and neighbouring uses or impact on the rights of way network;~~ ~~• pitches will be restricted to short stay holiday occupancy only,~~ ~~• The site is capable of effective management without the construction of a new dwelling;~~ ~~• The scheme will comply with the relevant lighting standards set out in Policy L6 (dark skies), avoiding any net increase in light pollution and where possible securing a net reduction;~~ ~~• the highway can accommodate the additional traffic~~ ~~Any recreational disturbance to designated habitats and species will be avoided or can be mitigated,~~ ~~Proposals will need to demonstrate that they have incorporated designs, layouts and technologies that will deliver environmental benefits, such as energy saving measures, the use of renewable energy, the provision of recycling facilities and improved biodiversity.~~ ~~Caravan storage will not be permitted other than in specific screened areas to be agreed with the Authority.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM34		Justification text changes	~~Aim~~ ~~To support the provision of touring caravan and motor home pitches on appropriate and screened sites.~~ ~~Justification~~ ~~Touring caravans and motorhomes have a long association of visitor use within the National Park but are only a relatively small part of the accommodation market. There are 26 touring sites in the National Park providing 690 pitches, sometimes including space for camper vans and tents.~~ ~~They are a flexible and transient form of accommodation with demand tending to be linked to good weather. The last 10 years has seen the gradual loss of some touring caravan / motorhome pitches, and with it the loss of some of the more casual opportunities for the public to enjoy the National Park.~~ ~~This policy will allow new pitches in locations that are well-screened. Although there is a Management Plan objective to increase year round accommodation in the Park, there are areas with particular sensitivities where seasonal restrictions will be necessary.~~ ~~New touring pitches will need to be screened at the point of implementation. This is because the appearance of white rectangular touring caravans and motorhomes tends to make them more prominent in the landscape than tents or smaller camper vans. They also tend to have a bigger footprint and a much more significant impact on the road network.~~ ~~The Authority will consider proposals and investigate mitigation measures that will enable the improvement and extension of existing sites. The Authority also considers that there is scope for the development of some new sites where the landscape and other impacts would be acceptable.~~ ~~Land within walking distance of the Local Service Centres (Policy CP3) are likely to be the most beneficial sites in terms of access to visitor facilities and increased spending in the local economy. However, there is also scope for small touring caravan / motorhome sites (of around 5 pitches), perhaps mixed with some camping, in some of the quieter areas of the National Park.~~ ~~There is sometimes an issue with touring pitches being used for the storage of caravans. This has an impact on the landscape equivalent to static caravans but without benefits to the local economy. The Authority will require a condition that no caravan shall occupy any pitch for more than 28 days per calendar year. The Authority will also work with site operators to designate suitable storage areas, where there is landscape capacity to do so.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM35	Policy E11 – Sustainable visitor accommodation	Policy changes	**E11 – Non-permanent~~Sustainable~~ Self-catering Visitor Accommodation** The development of non-permanent (reversible) self-catering visitor accommodation will be permitted subject to all the following criteria; • sites are well screened at the time of application and subsequently, to the extent that development will not cause adverse impact to the landscape; • The accommodation does not constitute a caravan(s); • The accommodation is for short-term holiday letting only; • Units are restricted to a maximum size of 21m^2 • The intensity of use is appropriate for the location and the infrastructure is available including water supply, waste collection, waste water treatment and discharge; • access arrangements would be adequate and traffic movements would not be disruptive or harmful to the highway network, local landscape, neighbouring uses or rights of way network; • The site is capable of effective management without the construction of a new dwelling; • The scheme will comply with the relevant lighting standards set out in Policy L6 (dark skies), avoiding any net increase in light pollution and where possible securing a net reduction; • Any recreational disturbance to woodland, designated habitats and species will be avoided or can be mitigated in accordance with~~relation to~~ NE1 Proposals will need to demonstrate that they have incorporated designs, layouts and technologies that will deliver environmental benefits, such as energy saving measures, the use of renewable energy, the provision of recycling facilities and improved biodiversity. New sites for static caravans will not be permitted because of their likely detrimental impact on the landscape qualities of the National Park. The Authority will however consider extensions or re-modelling of existing caravan and chalet sites where they are already well screened or would improve the visual impact of the site within the surrounding landscape. New development and layouts will be permitted where they would improve existing sites through reducing the massing and site density to the benefit of the amenity of staying visitors. Additional units will be restricted to holiday use and short-term letting only. The Authority will permit the replacement of static caravans with other forms of reversible self-catering visitor accommodation of equivalent size where those would have a less intrusive impact on the landscape.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM36	Policy E12 – Visitor infrastructure	Policy changes	**E12 – Visitor infrastructure** The Authority will permit new visitor infrastructure that will directly help visitors to understand and enjoy the special qualities of the National Park subject to accordingconformity with other Local Plan policies. The Authority will also permit development or uses that otherwise utilise the area's natural resources in a sustainable way and in line with the Sandford Principle and which have regard to the National Park visitor management strategy 'Special Qualities, Special Experiences 2019'. Development that cannot be adequately managed and which risks creating significant disturbance to the qualities of the Park, including areas of tranquillity, dark skies or the enjoyment of other users, will not be permitted.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM37	Policy E14 – Bolton Abbey	Policy changes	**E14 - Bolton Abbey Core Visitor Area** The following mix of development and uses will be supported in the~~at~~ Bolton Abbey Core Visitor Area identified on the Policies Map, subject to consideration of their scale, design quality, location, interrelationships and cumulative impact upon the historical environment, landscape, wildlife habitat, dark skies and water resources: • new housing which accords with policies elsewhere in the Local Plan • indoor visitor facilities; • new visitor accommodation; • new cycling and walking routes; • enhancement of open spaces; • new staff accommodation. Detailed development proposals should be subject to the following, where appropriate to the type, form and scale of the proposal: • a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment • an active travel plan for movement within the site, and • sustainable travel connections with its visitor markets.~~Detailed development proposals will need to be subject to a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and an active travel plan for movement within the site, and sustainable travel connections with its visitor markets.~~ Visitor facilities that would also provide overall benefits to local communities will be considered favourably.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM38	Policy E15 - Staff Accommodation	Policy changes	**E15 - Staff Accommodation** Outside of the housing development boundaries of settlements listed in Policy CP3, the development of new staff accommodation linked to an existing business will only be permitted where all of the following are met: 1. It can be adequately demonstrated that; a. the operational needs of the business require workers to live at the proposed location, b. there are no opportunities for providing the accommodation by developing alternative land or converting, sub-dividing or extending existing buildings within the control of the applicant (see also C5 & AB~~23~~) c. reasonable alternatives such as purchasing existing housing for sale in the locality or providing staff transport are not a viable option 2. The proposed accommodation will be located within or adjoining an existing building or group of buildings, within easy walking distance of the employment site 3. The scale of development and the size of the proposed units are commensurate to the needs of the business. This should be supported by evidence as part of the planning application. Development permitted under this policy will be tied to the business through a Section 106 legal agreement to prevent it being sold separately. The legal agreement will specify that occupiers are employees of the business.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM39	Policy L1 – Crushed rock quarrying	Policy changes	**L1 – Crushed Rock Quarrying** The development of new crushed rock quarries or the extension of existing crushed rock quarries into areas of undisturbed land, will not be permitted, other than in the exceptional circumstances set out in CP10 (Major Development Test). *<policy continues unchanged hereafter>*
		Justification changes	9.9 Unlike the development of a wholly new quarry or the major expansion of an existing quarry into undeveloped ground, ~~the Authority does not regard~~ extensions~~,~~ in time, extraction area or depth, within existing worked ground, ~~to constitute major development in relation to Policy CP10~~are less likely to result in significant impacts. Current extraction is predominantly well below the visible part of the quarry, so the remaining impact on the landscape is now limited and localised.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM40	Policy L2 – Building stone	Policy changes	**L2 – Building Stone** Proposals for the small scale quarrying of building stone or roofing slate will be permitted subject to appropriate assessment and mitigation of environmental, infrastructure and amenity issues concerning: • landscape screening and planting • agreement of a biodiversity enhancement scheme in accordance~~conformity~~ with CP9 • safe highway access and suitable road capacity • compliance with Water Environment Regulations • agreement of an appropriate method of working having regard to working hours, noise and blasting, • light emissions that are compatible with the dark skies policy L6 • agreement of a suitable restoration scheme. The quarry developer will be expected to provide infrastructure and finance to deliver this if necessary

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM41	Policy L3 – Re-working mineral waste	Policy changes	**L3 – Re-working Mineral Waste** Proposals for the reworking of mineral waste will not be permitted where: • the land has been satisfactorily restored; or • the deposit has become assimilated, or is characteristic of, the local landscape or forms part of an agreed after-use scheme, unless it is justified by a need for the mineral which cannot reasonably be met by alternative methods."; or • the land has archaeological or ecological value in accordance with policies AB1 and NE1.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM42	Policy L6 – Dark night skies	Policy changes	**L6 – Dark Night Skies** Development proposals will only be permitted where they maintain or enhance the special quality of the Yorkshire Dales Dark Sky Reserve. External lighting will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it is essential for safety reasons. In these circumstances any adverse impacts shall be mitigated and all lighting shall ~~meet or exceed~~have regard to the standards set out in the Authority's lighting guidelines.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM43	Policy NE1 – Protecting wildlife sites, species and networks	Policy changes	**NE1 – Protecting Wildlife Sites, Species and Networks** The ecological network: across the National Park will be protected as follows; 1. Development proposals that would adversely affect Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas or Ramsar Sites will be refused permission except where the three derogation tests are met~~re are imperative reasons of overriding public interest~~[155], 2. Development proposals that would adversely affect Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Limestone Pavement Orders or populations and supporting habitat of legally protected species, or priority habitat outside of a SSSI but identified as part of a core area in the ecological network, will only be permitted in defined 'exceptional circumstances' and where compensatory measures are agreed. For the exceptional circumstances test to be met, applicants must be able to demonstrate that there is no less harmful option available, having regard in order of preference to: a. avoiding adverse impacts altogether; b. minimising adverse impacts and mitigating the residual impact; c. implementing compensatory measures to protect the overall coherence of the network of sites, where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, 3. Development proposals that would adversely affect Local Wildlife Sites, Regionally Important Geological Sites, populations of priority species (non-protected), or priority habitat of non-functional size that is isolated from the main ecological network, will only be permitted if the benefits clearly outweigh the harm: 4. Development that would affect protective buffer zones around core areas or stepping stones or land corridors, will need to be considered in relation to its potential harmful effects on wildlife habitats and species. With designated sites in 1 above, a Habitats Regulations Assessment is required where there is potential for development proposals to cause a likely significant adverse effect. ~~Where an assessment concludes that there would be a significant effect (or the assessment is inconclusive) planning permission will be refused~~ Development will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated, with appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures, that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the site (or the assessment is inconclusive), unless there are Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest not to do so. In those cases, proposals will be referred to the Secretary of State. Development proposals that affect protected wildlife sites will be required to provide sufficient relevant information so that an informed decision can be made. The level of information required will be proportionate to the hierarchy of sites, habitats and species above and the scale of the likely adverse impacts. Agreed measures for the mitigation or compensation of adverse effects under this policy will be secured by a planning condition or Section 106 agreement. Biodiversity ~~net gain~~enhancement requirements under Policy CP9~~3~~ will be additional to these measures. Footnote 155 - As set out in Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive – see Habitats Directive: guidance on the application of article 6(4): i) Alternative solutions, ii) imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI) and iii) compensatory measures & Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Habitats Regulations Assessments~~In this context 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' would permit an exemption for essential public health and safety purposes or unavoidable infrastructure of long term national importance~~.
		Justification text changes	

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM43			8.12 The applicant will be expected to provide sufficient information to enable the Authority to consider the application fully, including common forms of disturbance such as creation of dust, increased recreational pressure, cat predation and the use of recreational vehicles. 8.12.1 The requirement for a Habitats Regulations Assessment for any development proposal within 400m of a Habitats site will be considered in terms of whether the development has the potential to cause urban edge effects[157]. For the North Pennine Moors SPA and South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA this distance will be extended to 2.4km to ensure that impacts due to cat predation are considered. 8.12.2 The requirement for a Habitats Regulations Assessment for any development proposal within 4km of the North Pennine Moors SPA and South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA will be considered in terms of potential impacts to mobile species associated with these SPAs (such as golden plover), including the use of functionally linked land. 8.12.3 The requirement for a Habitats Regulations Assessment for development proposals which have the potential to generate traffic movements within 200m of a Habitats site will be considered to ensure they will not have an adverse effect on sensitive qualifying features due to air pollution impacts, notably nitrogen deposition. 8.12.4 Where an impact to a Habitats site from a specific proposal, such as an increase in traffic caused by a housing allocation, has been screened out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Local Plan, further assessment for this specific impact should not be required at a project level. 8.13 ~~The Authority will also scrutinise the impacts of the proposal on land that is functionally linked to the designation.~~ The onus will be on the applicant to demonstrate that a proposal would not have adverse effects. If this cannot be proven, planning permission will only be given in exceptional circumstances where 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' can be shown to apply. Natural England will be a key adviser in this process. Footnote 157 - Urban edge effects include: fly tipping; dumping of garden waste and resultant introduction of invasive/ alien plants; offroad vehicles leading to erosion; disturbance to (conservation) grazing livestock; increased incidence of wildfire; and predation from urban scavengers.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM44	Policy NE2 - Protecting irreplaceable habitat, trees, hedgerows and walls	Policy changes	**NE2 - Protecting irreplaceable habitat, trees, hedgerows and walls** Development proposals should protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance irreplaceable habitat and the pattern of distinctive features such as hedges, walls and trees. Development that would result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitat such as ancient woodland, ancient trees, veteran trees, woodlands of significant age, blanket bog and limestone pavement, will be refused permission unless there are wholly exceptional reasons that demonstrate to the Authority that the loss would be clearly outweighed by the public benefit development would bring, and that the trees or habitat: • are in poor health; or • have lost their intrinsic value for wildlife, amenity or cultural significance; or • are likely to cause harm or damage to the structural integrity of new buildings or structures and that this cannot be remedied by other reasonable means; or • removal would enhance the survival or growth of other protected trees or hedgerows. Works to protected trees will only be granted consent where these would: • Not adversely affect the appearance of the tree and the contribution it makes to amenity. • Improve the health and/or amenity value of the tree. Where the felling of a protected tree is permitted, three replacement trees will be required. Planting must take place in a location and a time agreed with the Authority and include appropriate species that has regard to ~~conforms with~~ Natural England and Forestry Commission guidance. If the Authority considers that the loss of any other tree, woodland, hedgerow, grassland or drystone wall that are of landscape, nature conservation or historical value, is unavoidable (supported by evidence), it will require a scheme of replacement or mitigation that will compensate for the loss. Development in close proximity to existing healthy trees and woodland will only be permitted if: • adequate space has been left around the trees to prevent future loss or damage; and • the developer has specified how the trees will be protected in the course of development and how they will be managed and maintained in the future. Where trees are present on a development site the Authority will require a detailed Arboriculture Impact Assessment (AIA), Arboriculture Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) that has regard ~~conform~~ to the current British Standard or arboriculture best practice, to be submitted with a planning application
		Justification text changes	10.29 Semi-natural ancient woodland, established woodland, upland woods, wet woods and scrub woodland are identified as having a high biodiversity importance in the Local Nature Recovery Plan and may be irreplaceable. In most cases, development should be sited to retain valuable trees and woodland and to incorporate them within a landscaping scheme. The option of replacement should only be considered in exceptional circumstances such as national infrastructure projects. The policy requires compensatory planting for the loss of protected trees which may be on or off site according to the specific constraints and opportunities that exist in relation to the development.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM45	Glossary	Glossary changes	**Affordable housing** Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. There is a full definition in the National Planning Policy Framework. Affordable housing must be occupied on a principal residency basis, in addition to eligibility requirements relating to being in affordable housing need and having a local connection (Appendix 7). **Local needs (housing)** Housing that is targeted at households that have a need to live in the area for reasons of work, to provide more suitable accommodation for their households and in pursuit of economic and social well-being objectives. The housing is restricted to specific forms of occupancy by a legal agreement. Other than specific exceptions contained in Policy AB2 (Conversion of Traditional Buildings – Acceptable Uses), all housing will be restricted to principal residency, and some may also be restricted to local occupancy or affordable housing requirements. **Local occupancy restriction** A legal agreement which restricts who is able to occupy a property. The restriction is intended ~~to prevent the property being used as a second or holiday home and helps~~ to provide housing to meet local needs and to maintain a resident population in the area. Restricting the market for the property also has the effect of reducing its value by perhaps 20-30%. Local occupancy agreements also include a clause restricting the occupancy of the property to principal residency and thereby prevent use as a second or holiday home. The legal agreement does ~~do~~ not restrict ownership. **Principal residency~~occupancy~~** A home that is the only or main residence of a single household (not a holiday property or second home for short term occupation). All new housing will be the subject of a principal residency restriction, with some dwellings also subject to additional local occupancy and affordable housing restrictions. Evidence of principal residency~~occupancy~~ may be determined by place of work, electoral role registration, school attendance or registration at a local GP clinic.
			Traditional buildings Buildings constructed in accordance with long-standing practices or customs such as solid-wall masonry and hand-crafted carpentry. In the Yorkshire Dales, they are mainly built from natural locally sourced stone and timber, although some imported prefabricated or mass-manufactured materials have also been used. In terms of their design details, traditional buildings can include both vernacular and polite elements, the latter being influenced by national fashions. Traditional buildings perform very differently to modern constructions, allowing moisture movement inside the fabric, hence their requirement for 'breathable' materials. Most traditional buildings in the National Park are likely to be heritage assets worthy of conservation, unless they have been extensively modified over time to the point where they no longer have any significance. ~~Buildings constructed in accordance with long-standing practices or customs such as solid-wall masonry and hand-crafted carpentry. In the Yorkshire Dales, they are mainly built from natural locally sourced stone and timber, although some imported pre-fabricated or mass-manufactured materials have also been used. In terms of their design details, traditional buildings can include both vernacular and polite elements, the latter being influenced by national fashions.~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM46	Appendix 2 – Policies to be replaced	Appendix changes	Existing Local Plan Documents that will be replaced on adoption of the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan 2025-2040 The following policies will, upon adoption of the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan 2025-40, cease to form part of the development plan for the Yorkshire Dales National Park. • Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted December 2016. • Eden Local Plan 2014-32, adopted by the Authority on the 18th December 2018 • South Lakeland Core Strategy 2010 • South Lakeland Land Allocations Development Plan Document 2013 • South Lakeland Community Infrastructure Levy 2015 • South Lakeland Local Plan (selected policies) 1997 • Lancaster Local Plan 2004 • Lancaster Core Strategy 2008 • Lancaster Development Management Plan 2014 • Lancashire Minerals & Waste Local Plan Core Strategy (2009) Part 1, Part 2 and key diagram • Cumbria Minerals & Waste Local Plan 2015-2030

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM47	Appendix 4 – Allocated sites	Appendix changes	**Local Plan allocated housing sites**

Site reference	Site address (see Local Plan inset Maps)	Indicative capacity (dwellings) [164]
AIR1	Land at Hallgarth, Airton	5
BOL1	Land west of Mitford Cottages, Bolton Abbey	6
CPY1	Land at East End Farm, Carperby	6
GRA5	Land south east of Aynham Close, Grassington	25
GRA7	Land north of Moody Sty Lane, Grassington	21
HAW1	Land south and west of Woodburn, Burtersett Road, Hawes	6
HAW2	Land south of Northgate House, Burtersett Road, Hawes	16
HAW3	Land east of Northgate House, Burtersett Road, Hawes	6
HAW4	Land at Kirkbrides Way, Hawes	10
HOR6	Land west of B6479 opposite Rowe Garth, Horton-in-Ribblesdale	11
LON5	Land rear of Moorfields & Guy's Cottages, Long Preston	12
LON8	Land between Nos 36 and 38 Main Street, Long Preston	10
NAT2	Land opposite Fell View Garage, Nateby	7
NLU1	Land west of Ash Dene, Newbiggin-on-Lune	9
~~NLU2~~	~~Land at The Warehouse, Newbiggin-on-Lune~~	~~7~~
~~ORT1~~	~~Land east of Ashfield Court, Orton~~	~~8~~
SED2	Land south of Station Road and east of Busk Lane, Sedbergh	25
SED4	Land at former Baliol School, Cautley Road, Sedbergh	30
SED9	Land at Kings Yard, Bainbridge Road, Sedbergh	7
SED15	Land west of Guldrey Fold, Sedbergh	25
SED16	Land north of Medical Centre, Sedbergh	12
THR4	Land north of Upper Wharfedale School, Threshfield	60
THR5	Land north of the B6265, opposite Woodlands View, Threshfield	15
THR8	Land east of the B6160, Threshfield	60
Total		~~**369**~~ **384**

Footnote 164 - This is an indicative figure derived from the initial assessment of capacity undertaken as part of the Housing Land Availability Assessment (2025). The actual capacity of each site will be informed by the preparation of development briefs and the pre-application and planning application stages, having regard to the standard minimum density figure set out in Policy C1 and the particular development constraints and opportunities for each site. This may result in a smaller or larger number of dwellings, however the true capacity for development is not expected to diverge significantly from the figure given here.

Important notes regarding allocated housing sites:

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			SED4 – Land at former Baliol School, Sedbergh Development of this site must have regard to a development brief produced for the whole of the allocated area, embracing both ownerships. The site is allocated for development with a requirement that the original Baliol House constructed in the late 19th Century will be retained and converted as part of the development. Only demolition of the mid-late 20th Century extensions to the original building will be permitted. Development of the upper part of the site, immediately west and north of Baliol House, will need to be subservient in scale to ensure that the setting of the house is conserved. Development of the lower part of the site should conserve the existing tree-lined frontage and frame key viewpoints of Baliol House. The creation of a new access road through the lower part of the site should be tree-lined and connect into the established access road linking the upper and lower parts. The sloping land in between the upper and lower sections should be retained as an undeveloped buffer and a new access should not cut through this area. THR4/5 - Land north and west of Upper Wharfedale School, Threshfield THR8 - Land east of the B6160, Threshfield Access to sites THR4 and THR5 will only be from Station Road (B6265). Access to site THR8 will only be from the Burnsall Road (B6160). The Policies Map demarcates a 'housing footprint' for these two sites (shaded pink). This is the area within which residential buildings and gardens can be constructed. Additional land outside of the housing footprint area is likely to be required for ancillary purposes, such as for landscaping, public open space, drainage, habitat creation and, in the case of THR8, access/link roads connecting the developable areas to the highway and to one another. For this reason, the overall housing site allocation (hatched) embraces a broader area that extends beyond the housing footprint. The construction of residential buildings and gardens on land outside of the housing footprint will not be permitted and, other than where access roads are required to connect the housing footprint to the highway (THR8 only), the land will be managed as natural and semi-natural land comprising areas of open space interspersed with planting, walkways and water features. The areas outside of the housing footprint will be reserved to help assimilate development into the landscape, provide sustainable drainage and satisfy biodiversity net gain requirements. They will be secured as part of the planning permission for development, including maintenance arrangements to ensure retention and management in perpetuity. For this reason, it is essential that the Policies Map includes them within the overall housing site allocation, even though they cannot be developed for housing, as they are intrinsically linked to the delivery of the housing footprint. Development briefs will be produced to provide a more detailed guidance on the development of each site. **Allocated opportunity sites for new employment uses** ~~**Baliol School, Sedbergh**~~ ~~1.938~~ ~~Class E – Commercial, business and service Class B8 storage and distribution Class F1 – Learning and non-residential institutions F2 Local community C1 – Hotels C2 – Residential institutions Live work (rental) Other uses not classified~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~• The largest remaining opportunity site for employment and future economic uses in Sedbergh. Site is already serviced with a road access, electricity, water and drainage.~~ ~~• A brownfield site of a former school, ancillary buildings, 8 residences (5 dwellings & 3 flats) and grounds. Main building (original house) located centrally in the site (1660sqm) incorporating 3 flats. A separate classroom block (610sqm),~~ ~~• Potential for a combination of re-use of worthwhile structures and replacement of more modern structures with new build. Overall balance between developed and undeveloped areas to remain broadly the same as existing;~~ ~~• Unlisted Tudor revival house has architectural and historic interest, and should be retained and reused. The house has clear potential for residential conversion which will help conserve the heritage asset. Scope to enhance character and appearance of the original building by removing/improving the 1960s-80s rear extensions.~~ ~~• Complex of traditional buildings housing the gym and Pinetrees/Low Field Cottages also worthy of retention. Classroom block should be replaced with a higher quality building.~~ ~~• Any proposed new housing would have to be justified on the basis of enabling development to improve the viability for its planned future use as a moderate sized serviced site for new employment and business uses.~~ ~~• Potential for mixed uses such as extra care residential use;~~ ~~• The area of land immediately north of the A638, which was formerly a sports pitch, to be the subject of archaeological geophysical survey. Postulated Roman Road between Sedbergh & Kirkby Stephen;~~ ~~• Site is located adjacent to a residential area so amenity issues have been considered in the list of potential uses and would also need to be considered again as part of any application;~~ ~~• More intensive use of the site likely to require significant access improvements at junction with A683, alongside a Transport Statement;~~ ~~• Tree Preservation Order (F100314) affects south east corner of site and Red Squirrel Buffer area will affect choice of any planting;~~ ~~• Consider sustainable travel options, public transport and active travel links from this site~~ ~~• Right of way along Thorns Lane gives potential to incorporate pedestrian links;~~ ~~• Require designs that will make provision for wildlife connections and enhancement of biodiversity within the site and the adjacent Ecological network;~~ ~~• Policy requirement to ensure no net increase in surface water run off rates from undeveloped areas of the site,~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM48	Appendix 7 – Affordable housing	Appendix changes	Affordable Housing ~~Affordable housing is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework as housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market. It includes housing for social rent, affordable rent, first homes, discount market homes and shared ownership schemes. Government grants may be available towards the cost of providing affordable housing.~~ ~~Policy C1 allocates new sites to meet the housing target and enable cross subsidy of affordable homes to support community sustainability. Allocated sites alone are however unlikely to deliver sufficient affordable housing because they are not evenly spread across the Park and because some will inevitably encounter difficulties in their release. The former Richmondshire and Eden areas in particular, have a lack of suitable or available sites for allocation. The Authority has therefore retained its long established rural exceptions policy(C3) which has previously been able to release small unallocated sites for affordable housing.~~ **Live, work and sustainable community connections** ~~A key objective of the affordable housing policy is to target appropriate qualifying households. A household's need for affordable housing will be determined by a Registered Provider and/or the local Housing Authority with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Permission for affordable housing will include provision for the units to remain at an affordable rent or price that is accessible to future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled into alternative affordable provision in the locality.~~ The scarcity of developable sites within the highly constrained National Park landscape means that new affordable housing should normally be targeted at households that need to live in the area to work or because their need for housing is arising there for one of the following reasons: • Households in need of affordable housing that are resident in the National Park for the preceding three years; or, • Households in need of affordable housing with children at a school inside the National Park or on its edge; or, • A household in need of affordable housing that contains someone that is in or is taking up employment (a contract length of not less than 12 months, and for a minimum of 16 hours a week) or caring responsibilities inside the National Park; or, • A household in need of affordable housing that is returning to the National Park having lived there for at least 10 years previously. All affordable homes must also be the primary residence of the renting or purchasing household. **Priority for affordable housing** Affordable housing that is tied to the connection criteria above, should be offered in the first instance to households that have a connection to the Parish within which the need has been identified or else a wider group of Parishes, as agreed by the National Park Authority. If no eligible occupier can be found from within the Parish (or group of Parishes) then those who meet the local connection criteria in the remainder of the National Park and an area within 3 miles of the National Park boundary will be eligible. If no one from the remainder of the National Park and an area within 3 miles of the National Park boundary is forthcoming, then the third priority area would become valid, embracing the whole housing authority areas (North Yorkshire, Westmorland and Furness and~~or~~ Lancaster).

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes

The length of time to market a property before moving outwards to the next geographic area will be determined at the point of permission.

Government funding

On rural exceptions sites, government funding will often be available to help with the delivery of affordable homes targeted at local needs (policy C3).

Government funding will generally not be available on allocated sites in Local Plans where affordable housing is otherwise expected to be cross subsidised by market homes, (principal residency~~occupancy~~ only) (see Appendix 9~~10~~).

If viability issues prevent the delivery of policy compliant levels of affordable housing, there may be scope for Government grant to be applied. Government has however stipulated that in such cases it will expect some flexibility including dropping the local connection requirement for shared ownership affordable housing.

The Authority will reject schemes that would deliver well below the policy target for affordable housing, because one of the primary objectives of allocating new housing sites in the National Park is the delivery of more affordable homes.

Commuted sums

A Local Plan objective is to deliver affordable housing on new development sites. The policy expectation is that affordable housing should be provided on site, however the percentages set out in Policy C1 will often result in decimal requirements. Where this situation occurs, the on-site requirement will be determined by rounding down the decimal figure to the whole number. The residual decimal affordable housing requirement will then need to be met through a financial contribution in lieu of on-site delivery. ~~On very small sites where it might not be feasible to get any on site delivery, the Authority may accept a financial contribution instead.~~ Commuted sums will be payable to the National Park Authority and it will determine how they will be committed. A priority will be to use commuted sums ~~This will be used~~ to fund affordable housing provision~~solutions~~ on other sites. The Authority will use the same calculation that North Yorkshire Council use in its adopted Craven Local Plan (2012-2032). The financial contribution will be equivalent to the market housing value, minus affordable housing transfer value.

This is an example for a 6 dwelling scheme within the higher value area of the National Park:

Policy Requirement	50% affordable housing on sites within the high value area	50% X 6 dwellings = 3 affordable dwellings
Affordable Housing need	e.g. Housing Market Assessment indicates need for 2 person dwellings (70sqm)	3 X 70sqm = 210m2
Affordable housing transfer value of scheme	the price a registered provider will pay to a developer for affordable units for sale and rent. value currently £1k per m2	210m2 X £1,000 = £210,000
Market value	Open market value of an equivalent 70sqm 2 bed home, say £200,000	3 X £200,000 = £600,000
Commuted sum payable by developer	Cash sum due = market value minus transfer value	£600,000 – £210,000 = **£390,000**

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM49	Appendix 8 - Local occupancy	Appendix changes	Local Occupancy Housing ~~In accordable with national planning policy and the Local Plan housing objectives, new self-build plots and other single plot or single unit residential conversion schemes, permitted under policies C1, C2, C5 and AB3, will be targeted at existing residents of the Park forming new households, or households that need to live inside the National Park to be nearer to their place of work, or households with other local needs for more appropriate housing within the area.~~ ~~Planning permission for new single plot dwellings in the National Park are tied by a legal restriction to benefit local housing needs, as far as practical. Local Occupancy restrictions also have the additional benefit to the local housing market of reducing re sale value of new individual properties by perhaps 20%, helping make new homes slightly more accessible for qualifying households.~~ ~~The purpose of targeting single plot developments at local needs is to gradually build up a stock of housing across the Local Plan area, that will be more accessible to households that need to live or work in the area. This is of social and economic benefit to local communities and will help their sustainability. The occupancy restriction is justified by the lack of alternative housing options within such a deeply rural area and by the exceptionally high demand to purchase homes for holiday and retirement use.~~ ~~Tighter borrowing restrictions have however, caused problems for mortgage lenders, developers and some home buyers because of the length of time local occupancy restrictions can add to house sales. Developers have cited the restrictions as a constraint on house building in the National Park. The Authority has responded by widening out the criteria to increase the range of qualifying households and by restricting it to single plot permissions. The criteria now include home working, self-employed part time work, caring, and households that have a child at a school inside the Park.~~ ~~This should mean a faster turnover of occupancy restricted properties and, therefore, more attractive mortgage lending for the benefit of local households. In the event that there is insufficient demand from these categories then after a marketing period of 6 months, the Authority will permit a local occupancy restricted property to be permanently occupied by a household resident anywhere within the local Authority Housing area. Following local government reorganisation, the housing authority areas have now extended out from the former Districts to the whole of North Yorkshire or Westmorland and Furness.~~ ~~Occupancy would however have to revert back into the National Park on subsequent re sale. The Authority will also make the new, more flexible occupancy agreements available to owners of existing local occupancy tied properties. The downside of this greater flexibility however is that it will tend to widen competition and therefore increase the price of local occupancy homes.~~ The qualifying criteria for a household occupying a dwelling subject to a local occupancy restriction are: I. Existing resident(s) of the National Park establishing a separate household, purchasing a property for the first time, moving to a more manageable home because of elderly or health needs or requiring more space for a growing family; or, II. A head of household who is or whose partner is in or is taking up permanent employment (minimum 16 hours) within the National Park or within 3 miles of the National Park boundary. Where a person is employed in a business that operates in multiple locations, their employment activities should take place predominantly within the National Park or 3 miles of its boundary, or, III. A household moving to work in an already established business inside the National Park, or,

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			IV. A head of household who is or whose partner is or is going to be working full time in an established business from home within the National Park, or, V. A household that has a child at a school within the National Park or a parish split by the park boundary, or, VI. Householders currently living permanently in a dwelling which is either shared but not self-contained, overcrowded, or is otherwise unsatisfactory by environmental health standards and which is within the National Park (or in another part of a parish split by the National Park boundary) or, VII. Elderly or disabled persons requiring sheltered or otherwise more suitable accommodation who already live permanently within the National Park (or in another part of a parish split by the National Park boundary or, VIII. Persons having to leave tied accommodation within the National Park (or in another part of a parish split by the National Park boundary) or, IX. Former residents of the National Park (or of another part of a parish split by the National Park boundary) whose case is accepted in writing by the Authority as having a need to return to the National Park or, X. Persons caring for residents of the National Park. **Notes** • Occupation will be as a sole or main residence and not as a holiday home, second home or short-term holiday let. • If after a period of 6 months a qualifying household is not forthcoming, then the area of search will be widened by substituting 'National Park' with 'area of the National Park and constituent local housing authority area'. • The categories set out in criteria i) and vi, iv), vii), viii) will apply only to persons who have resided permanently in the National Park for the preceding 3 years. Category ix) will apply to households~~residents~~ that~~who~~ have previously resided in the National Park for a minimum of 10 years. • Prospective households will have their attention drawn to the occupancy restriction and in particular its effect on the valuation of their property (approx. 20% reduction) and the potential delay that the occupancy restriction may cause to its subsequent sale or re-occupancy. • All local occupancy restrictions will be secured through a Section 106 agreement. The Authority's legal costs of preparing household occupancy agreements will be met by the applicant. • The Authority will encourage existing occupancy restricted dwellings to upgrade to these newer, more flexible criteria.

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
MM50	Appendix 9 - Principal residency	Appendix changes	Principal Residency ~~Throughout the preparation of the Local Plan the National Park Authority has received widespread concern about the very high levels of unoccupied property across the National Park and the need to ensure that new housing is effectively targeted at public benefit. The Authority therefore decided to modify its housing policy and require that all new dwellings permitted on sites of more than one house should be restricted to principal occupancy only.~~ ~~The restriction will be applied via a condition attached to the planning consent notice. The condition requires that the dwelling must be occupied at all times as a main residence. It will not restrict the price or ownership of the property but it may have a small incidental effect on resale value (see below).~~ ~~The principal occupancy condition has a number of objectives;~~ ~~to help stem population decline, support the local economy and support local services~~ ~~to enable new households to live in the National Park~~ ~~to ensure that new homes will be permanently occupied and therefore help to sustain the community rather than risk further under-occupancy. There is already a plentiful supply of sporadically occupied dwellings used for second home or holiday letting purposes across the Park. (22% of the housing supply in 2021.~~ **Principal residency~~occupancy~~ ~~condition~~requirement** ~~Principal occupancy dwellings are market homes with a modest restriction that they must be the principal residence of the household living there. Since this is only a small restriction on the use of the property it therefore only has a small effect on valuation and sales, estimated to be about a 5% reduction on price compared to a wholly unfettered market home.~~ The Principal residency~~occupancy~~ requirement will be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement between the applicant and the National Park Authority~~planning condition~~ attached to all new housing planning permissions~~. on sites larger than 1 dwelling. Sites of one dwelling will be targeted at local occupancy, which is a narrower form of restriction (see Appendix 8)~~. The principal residency~~occupancy~~ ~~condition~~ requirement will have the following wording to the effect that: *The dwelling shall be the only or principal home of the main occupant and it shall be occupied by the main occupant for at least 80% of the calendar year if the main occupant resides in more than one property. The dwelling shall be occupied under Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2020 and shall not be used for any other purpose including any other use in Class C of the Schedule (or in any subsequent modification).* *The occupant shall supply to the National Park Authority (within 14 days of the National Park Authority's request to do so) such information as the National Park Authority may reasonably require in order to determine compliance with this requirement. For the avoidance of doubt the dwelling shall not be occupied as a second home or as a unit of holiday letting accommodation.* ~~**The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied otherwise than by a person as his or her only or principal home. The occupant shall supply to the National Park Authority (within 14 days of the National Park Authority's request to do so) such information as the National Park Authority may reasonably**~~

Mod ref	Policy	Type of change	Tracked changes
			~~require in order to determine compliance with this condition. For the avoidance of doubt the dwelling shall not be occupied as a second home or as a unit of holiday letting accommodation.~~ ~~Following the grant of planning permission and the completion of the dwelling, occupying households will be required to keep proof that they are meeting the terms of the condition. Acceptable evidence will be in the form of inclusion on the local electoral register, attendance of children at a local school and registration with a local General Health Practice. Non-compliance is likely to lead to enforcement proceedings.~~ Households occupying dwellings that are subject to a principal residency restriction will be required to keep proof that they are meeting the terms of the restriction. To ascertain compliance with the principal residency restriction the Authority may ask for details of one or more of the following: (a) In respect of members of the household: • General Practitioner and Dentist registration • School(s) attended by children • Place(s) of work • Electoral registration (b) In respect of the property itself and other residential properties owned/occupied by members of the household: • Council Tax registration • Rate of Stamp Duty paid on purchase of the property • Utility Bills (c) Any other evidence which can be provided to demonstrate that at least one household member spends at least 80% of the calendar year residing at the property. Non-compliance with the principal residency restriction is likely to lead to enforcement proceedings.