Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority **Item 12**

National Park Authority Meeting

24th June 2025

Yorkshire Dales Local Plan. Submission of documents to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (Regulation 22)

Purpose of the report

1. To request authority to submit the Local Plan for examination.

Recommendation

2. That the Authority:
    a. submit the Local Plan and its supporting documents listed in **Appendix 1** to the Planning Inspectorate for examination under Regulation 22 (The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012), and,
    b. delegate to the Director of Conservation and Community – in consultation with the Member Champion for Sustainable Development – to sign off any minor modifications for the consideration of the Local Plan Inspector.

Strategic Framework

3. The information and recommendation(s) contained in this report are consistent with the Authority's statutory purposes and its approved strategic planning framework.
    - Corporate Plan objective 24:
      "Work with neighbouring authorities to produce a single, updated Local Plan for the whole of the National Park by 2025, which will help achieve the vision and objectives in the National Park Management Plan".

Background

4. The Local Plan is an important consideration in shaping future development and use of land in the National Park. Site allocations and decisions on planning applications have the potential to improve the well-being of communities but also add tens of millions of pounds in new infrastructure and raised land values into the local economy. Since 2019 the Authority has undertaken seven separate public consultations on all aspects of the new Local Plan.

5. In accordance with legal regulations, the Authority published the full draft Local Plan in March and invited stakeholders to submit their formal representations. An Inspector will now undertake an independent examination of the Local Plan later this year and

ultimately decide whether it is sound, legally compliant and capable of being adopted and implemented.

6. The period for formal representations ended on the 6th May 2025. 63 organisations and individuals responded – collectively making approximately two hundred and fifty representations(see **Appendix 2**).

7. At this stage, the Authority cannot make any further changes to the Local Plan without undertaking additional public consultation (i.e. a repeat of the recent Regulation 19 'Publication' stage). In response to the formal representations received, the Authority can however suggest minor modifications to the Inspector that might influence subsequent post-examination changes.

8. If Members agree to submit the Plan for examination, officers will prepare a list of suggested minor pre-examination modifications, in consultation with the Member Champion for Sustainable Development.

Substantive issues

9. As expected, a number of substantive objections have emerged during the Publication stage. These are issues that the Inspector is likely to focus on during the examination. Representations relating to policy Issues are set out in **Appendix 3**. Representations about sites are summarised in **Appendix 4**.

10. Many of the issues raised about the housing sites, have already been considered by the Member Working Group and by the Authority. Some of the respondents consider the Plan to be unsound and that further amendments need to be made. Officers consider however that the Plan has complied with all the necessary legal procedures and can now be submitted for examination. The Inspector will be invited to make modifications if necessary, to improve the Plan's soundness. All the representations will now be submitted together with the Plan and its supporting documents.

11. Beyond the formal objections, the Inspector will also consider other matters around legal process, co-operation with neighbouring authorities and conformity with national policy.

Financial Implications

12. Submitting the Local Plan for examination will bring procedural costs that the Authority must bear. The main expense to the Authority will be the cost of the Local Plan Inspector (currently charged at £1k per day and estimated at £80,000 in total). A sum towards these costs was included in the budget approved at the Authority meeting in March 2025. **Appendix 5** sets out the approximate stages of the examination.

Legal Implications

13. Submission of the Local Plan is a statutory requirement. Although the work on the Plan is well advanced it is still subject to formal examination and post-examination modification by the Local Plan Inspector.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

14. A full Equality Impact Assessment has been published as part of the background documents supporting the Plan. It concluded that the Plan was "expected to have a positive impact on the nine characteristic groups. None of the policies are considered to have a negative impact on any specific characteristic group".

Climate Change

15. The Plan supports development that is necessary to sustain communities, support the local economy and deliver National Park purposes. New development will generate some additional carbon emissions, but the policies seek to minimise these and use new development to improve the resilience of the Yorkshire Dales to the impacts of climate change. The main development will be the proposed 750 new houses over the next 15 years. Based on current emissions figures, that would be expected to increase annual domestic emissions from 43.6kt CO_2e to 46.2kt – increasing total annual emissions within the National Park by 0.5%. In practice, this figure will be considerably lower because the new housing will be increasingly more energy efficient than the current stock. This scale of increase would not have any material impact on the National Park Management Plan ambition for the National Park to be net carbon negative by 2040 at the latest.

Conclusion

16. The new Local Plan has had a long preparation and consultation phase, beginning in 2019. It is attempting to release more land for development than previous Plans and consequently has required more evidence and more scrutiny during its formulation stage.

17. It contains new policies that will support sustainable development and deliver specific economic, social and environmental objectives, shared by the Authority and its partners. Inevitably, elements of policy and procedural risk remain which will be challenged at the Local Plan examination in the Autumn. However, taking account of the formal representations received during the Spring, officers believe that the Plan's policies and proposals are still sound and defensible because they are proportionate to the needs of the area, are based on up-to-date evidence and are in general conformity with national policy.

Peter Stockton
Head of Sustainable Development
June 2025

Background Documents
Publication Local Plan, Policies Map and supporting documents, March 2025

Submission documents

The Authority's submission documents will include:

a. The Local Plan text *(as published for formal consultation in March 2025)*

b. The 'Policies Map' *(106 large scale maps of the Park and 120 detailed inset maps of each town and village, showing where various policies apply such as sites allocated for new housing)*

c. The list of formal representations received in May 2025 and a summary of the main issues raised.

d. The Sustainability Appraisal *(a legal requirement that demonstrates how the Plan's policies will perform against various environmental, social and economic indicators)*

e. The Habitats Regulation Assessment *(a legal requirement that demonstrates that the Plan's policies will not harm the integrity of internationally designated wildlife sites)*

f. A 'Statement of Common Ground' *(a signed agreement with neighbouring planning authorities and other agencies, recording the cooperation that has taken place during the Local Plan process and the agreed position on cross boundary planning and development matters)*

g. A 'Statement of Consultation' *(a summary of how the Authority has discharged its duty of community involvement, during the Local Plan process)*

h. A list of proposed modifications for the Inspector to consider

i. A library of background evidence and material supporting the Local Plan

List of responding organisations

Overview of Consultation Response

:

- 8 from public bodies,
- 2 from parish councils/forums
- 9 from interest groups / charitable trusts
- 1 from a housing association
- 2 from utility companies
- 20 from landowners or their agents
- 19 from individual residents
- 1 from a residents' group
- 1 from a visitor

The organisations, bodies and individuals that responded include:

Public/government bodies
Coal Authority
Cumbria Constabulary
Historic England
National Highways
Natural England
North Yorkshire Council
Westmorland and Furness Council
Environment Agency

Parish Council's/Forums
Airton Parish Meeting
Cracoe Parish Meeting

Interest Groups/Charitable Trusts
British Hedgehog Preservation Society
British Horse Society
Canal and Rivers Trust
Friends of the Lake District
Home Builders Federation
National Farmers Union
Sedbergh Community Swifts
Sedbergh Economic Partnership
Swifts Local Network: Swifts and Planning Group

Housing Association
Habinteg Housing Association

Utilities
National Gas Transmission
United Utilities

Landowners
13 landowners responded through agents in relation to sites in their ownership:

- Airton (AIR2) - via Windle Beech Winthrop
- Embsay (EMB1, EMB2), Bolton Abbey (BOL1) & Bolton Abbey Estate – via Rural Solutions
- Casterton (housing development boundary) – via Windle Beech Winthrop
- Grassington (GRA6) – via Steel Consulting
- Grassington (housing development boundary) - via Steel Consulting
- Long Preston (LON1) – via Rural Solutions
- Long Preston (LON2) - via Windle Beech Winthrop
- Long Preston (LON4, LON5) - via Windle Beech Winthrop
- Long Preston (LON7) - via Windle Beech Winthrop
- Sedbergh (former Baliol School site) – via Lambert Smith Hampton
- Stainforth (housing development boundary) - via Windle Beech Winthrop
- Threshfield (THR1, THR4, THR5, THR6, THR9) - via Windle Beech Winthrop
- Threshfield (THR8) – via Addison Planning

7 landowners responded directly regarding sites in their ownership:

- Airton (AIR1)
- Askrigg (housing development boundary)
- Hudswell (housing development boundary)
- Sedbergh (SED3 - three responses from joint landowners)
- Sedbergh (housing development boundary)

Individual residents
These 19 responses consisted of:

- 5 responses concerning housing site allocations in Carperby (CPY1), Hawes (HAW2), Grassington (GRA7) and Threshfield (THR4/THR5 – two responses);
- 5 responses concerning housing development boundaries and designated open spaces in Cracoe (three responses), Sedbusk & Starbotton;
- 1 response concerning the former Baliol School site in Sedbergh;
- 2 responses concerning the protection afforded to former railway lines (Wensleydale and Clapham-Lowgill)
- 6 responses concerning other policy issues relating to strategy, heritage, tourism and transport.

Residents Group
Threshfield Village Development Concern Group (responding through Freeths LLP) regarding planned housing growth in Threshfield, including sites THR4 & THR5.

Visitor
One visitor raising concerns about future housing development in Dent.

Planning Policy issues raised during Regulation 19

Policy / Section	Summary of representations
CP1 Sustainable Development	• Include reference to land instability (eg previous coal mining) Include reference to River Basin Management Plans or the Water Environment Regulations 2017
CP2 National Park Purposes	Reference to the duty to further the purposes should be made in this policy, not just the supporting text.
CP3 Spatial Strategy and Housing Target	• The number of homes to be delivered on allocated sites is below the Local Plan target. More sites would better contribute to the target. • The housing target of 50dpa would be significantly increased by adopting the new Standard Methodology. • The evidence has now changed around the target of 50 dpa. It is no longer needed. • To meet the aim of reversing depopulation all sites together with infill are needed. • This policy needs reference to flooding
CP4 Flood Risk	• Request to update the strategic flood risk assessment • There are details in the policy wording, referenced footnotes or justified text that conflict directly with national planning policy or introduce ambiguity that weakens the intended approach
CP5 Sustainable Drainage – Foul and Surface Water	Amend wording for greater clarify.
CP6 Design	• Include reference to crime and disorder through appropriate design of new developments. • The design guide is not being tested to the same standards as the Local Plan policies, • National gas transmission network can be a constraint to development. The network enters the National Park near Thorlby and Embsay. • Development briefs for housing should be prepared as part of the Local Plan, to provide certainty
CP7 Energy requirements	• Requirement for development to demonstrate use of decentralised sources of renewable energy, including on-site generation, may not be necessary with transition to low carbon generation across the National Grid. • Micro-renewables need to conserve the setting of heritage assets. Balance to be struck between energy efficiency and heritage significance in traditional buildings
CP8 Landscape Character	• Policy is weaker than supporting text and should be reworded. • Recreational landscape experience should not be singled out and residential receptors do not have lower sensitivity.
CP9 Biodiversity Net Gain	strengthen this policy

CP10 Major Development	An improved understanding of major development will strengthen this policy and provide better clarity for consultees, developers and applicants
AC1 Infrastructure needed to support development	• Development can only be required to mitigate its own impact and cannot be required to address existing deficiencies in infrastructure or services. • Inclusion of digital infrastructure is not always in the control of developers. Policy duplicates parts of Building Regulations.
AC2 New and improved infrastructure	add reference to low carbon transition.
AC3 Active and Sustainable Travel	• YDNPA has failed to listen/respond to concerns about a lack of public transport • Reference to active travel does not acknowledge horse riding
AC4 Development within railway corridors	• There is insufficient evidence to justify the protection of Clapham to Low Gill former railway route. The evidence that has been produced is outdated and there are other reasonable alternatives. • YDNPA has allowed itself to be persuaded that there are alternative uses for the former Wensleydale Railway, other than reinstatement of the railway itself.
AC5 Vehicle movements	Lack of consideration of car parking and electric vehicle charging infrastructure in Sedbergh
AB1 Heritage Assets	Minor amendments to text
AB2 Conversion of Traditional Buildings and acceptable uses	• More barns could be converted to safeguard heritage. • Policy needs reference to flood risk
AB4 Demolition and alteration of Traditional Farm Buildings	needs reference to flood risk
C1 Housing in Towns and large Villages	• unclear whether all homes will be principal occupancy or local occupancy? • Plan should provide for a range of deliverable and developable sites to provide competition and flexibility for more homes. • The housing mix is overly restrictive. • The viability assessment does not fully evidence requirements for affordable housing. • geographical imbalance in the spread of potential housing growth. Craven District being significantly over-represented • 50% affordable housing is not viable • All new build dwellings must be constructed to M4(2) accessible and adaptability standards.' • reconsider Orton and Newbiggin sites because of new flood risk data (March 2025)
C2 Housing in Small Settlements	Concern that local occupancy and principal residence restrictions will prejudice delivery and future financing.
C4 Rural workers' housing	The limit on dwelling size should be the same as that in Class Q of the GPDO 2015 (i.e. 150m2), not 120m2

C5 Shared housing, Sub-division, Residential Annexes and Replacement dwellings	include consideration of flood risk
C6 Residential Caravans, Gypsy and Traveller needs	more reference to flood risk
E1 Business Development Sites	Residential development (Use Class C3) is an acceptable use at Baliol which otherwise relies too heavily on employment-led development despite no evidence for this in Sedbergh.
E2 Rural Land-based Enterprises	The aim of Policy E2 (para 9.15) contradicts para 88 section a) of the NPPF.
E6 Rural Estate Plans	• provide more flexibility in this policy • Policy would enable Whole Estate Plans to function as neighbourhood plans for an area without having gone through the same level of formal consultation, oversight and scrutiny. • A number of questions remain about the scope and process involved in Whole Estate Plans. The Local Plan itself is a more appropriate vehicle for delivering development, as in the case of Bolton Abbey.
E9 Campsites	• Lack of a definition of campervans and mobile homes could create difficulties in interpreting and implementing policy. • A more restrictive approach to new campsites should be taken.
E10 Touring Caravan Sites	• Lack of a definition of campervans and mobile homes could create difficulties in interpreting and implementing policy • A more restrictive approach to new touring sites should be taken. • Additional criterion relating to landscape impact and planting is required.
E12 Visitor infrastructure	• Local Plan does not specify the type of horse-riding infrastructure it would like to see developed. • Details of active travel network not available and C2C braided route not referenced.
E13 Visitor facilities	Second bullet point in the second section should refer to the furthering of the purposes, not just ‘delivery of’ and should refer to ‘in line with the Sandford Principle’ ,not merely having regard to it.
E14 Bolton Abbey	provide more flexibility in the policy
L1 Crushed rock quarrying	• Request that policy is amended to ensure the impact on the water environment is assessed and appropriately mitigated • more reference to flood risk.
L2 Building Stone	Requests policy is amended to ensure the impact on the water environment is assessed and appropriately mitigated.
L6 Dark Night Skies	Policy will not be effective and needs rewording.

NE1 Protecting Wildlife Sites, Species and Networks	• Presence of hedgehogs logged across Yorkshire Dales yet they are not mentioned in the Local Plan • Policy does not consider Swifts, a requirement in para 187 of NPPF. • Urban edge effects can occur in proximity to protected sites (eg. cats, dust, tipping, recreational pressure) • add text about biosecurity • Policy wording does not provide enough detail to address uncertainties of impacts highlighted in HRA. It is not clear that the HRA recommendations have been implemented
NE2 Protecting irreplaceable habitat, trees, hedgerows and walls	• Policy provides insufficient protections for hedgerows and trees. • Requirement to replace felled trees on a 3 to 1 ratio could undermine viability and efficient use of land.
Appendix 4 Allocated housing and employment sites	• Having the list of housing allocations (and associated details) as an Appendix and not part of any policy is ineffective. • The distribution of allocated housing sites is weighted across the Plan area in an unsound fashion • Local Plan does not contain any site-specific criteria to guide development and no timeframe indicated for when development briefs will be prepared. Development briefs should be reviewed and published alongside the Local Plan, or alternatively a set of criteria presented as for the employment allocations. Unclear which housing sites listed in Appendix 4 would be classed as large and thereby require a development brief. • Site briefs for housing and employment should address the issues and matters outlined
Appendix 8 Local occupancy housing	• The criteria excludes households that live in the National Park but do not work there from qualifying as 'local occupants' unless they have some sort of special circumstance. If there is a reason why, this should be made clear.
General	• the environmental focus of the vision is inadequate with a key omission around managing water resources and improving water quality. • YDNPA has not heard or responded constructively to residents feedback which supported a lower quantity of development. • The Local Plan has not been positively prepared because of a lack of local consultation and engagement. • Recommended policy wording to implement the tighter standard for water efficiency • The YDNP was once more active in promoting and protecting public transport, but that has changed since it became an independent body in 1997. It is time this changed and there are a number of ways this might happen.

Habitats Regulations Assessment	• Further assessment required of impacts on air quality (road traffic emissions) from plan-led housing and visitor growth, including in-combination effects. • HRA fails to consider potential in-combination impacts from increased nutrients in the River Eden SAC and the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar

Site-specific issues raised during Regulation 19,

Abbreviations used:

AHS = Allocated housing site (a site specifically identified by the Local Plan as being suitable for housing development)
HDB = Housing development boundary (a boundary around settlements, within which infill housing plots may be permitted)
ABS = Allocated employment site (a site specifically identified by the Local Plan as being suitable for employment development)
IOS = Important open space (land specifically protected against development)
HIA = Heritage Impact Assessment (an assessment of the impact housing sites will have upon heritage assets)

Site	Proposed status	Representation
Airton		
AIR1, Land at Hallgarth, Airton	AHS	• Parish meeting object to increased site area due to lack of need, encroachment into open space and highways concerns; • Historic England endorse the conclusions of the HIA but require that the Local Plan policy specifically directs that development proposals implement the recommendations of the HIA.
Hallgarth field (remaining land outside of AIR1)	IOS	• Landowner objection to failure to allocate an extension to AIR1 to take in larger area of Hallgarth field to deliver more housing and public open space; • Landowner objects to designation of land as IOS which is seen as inconsistent and not meeting the relevant criteria.
AIR2, Land off Back Lane, Airton	Rejected AHS/ Excluded from HDB	• Landowner objects to failure to include as AHS and failure to include site in HDB, noting that highways issues are not a valid reason for rejecting the site and that it would deliver needed housing. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address.
Askrigg		
Walled garden north of West End House, Askrigg	Excluded from HDB	• Landowner objects to exclusion of this land from the HDB because it has always been a domestic garden associated with The Greets and, before that, Askrigg Old Hall. The omission is seen as a barrier to the ambition of restoring the land as garden. The land could never feasibly be developed.
Bolton Abbey		

BOL1, Land west of Mitford Cottages, Bolton Abbey	AHS	• Landowner supports site allocation; • Historic England endorse the conclusions of the HIA but require that the Local Plan policy specifically directs that development proposals implement the recommendations of the HIA.
Carperby		
CPY1, Land at East End Farm, Carperby	AHS	• Two respondents point out that site in process of being refurbished for alternative use and so will not be available for development, but the adjoining croft (previously rejected as an AHS) may be available. • Historic England require that this site is informed by a HIA.
Casterton		
Land south of Newlands	Excluded from HDB	• Landowner objects to exclusion of paddock from HDB seeing it as part and parcel of the property's curtilage that should be treated in the same way as other properties in the village.
Cracoe		
CRA3, Land off Fell Lane/Back Lane, Cracoe ('Jean's Field)	Included in HDB Not designated as IOS	• Parish meeting and three other respondents object to inclusion of land in HDB and failure to designate the croft and some verges as IOS. Also, objections to wider inconsistencies in designation of IOS in the village and misrepresentation of previous comments submitted.
Dent		
n/a	n/a	• One respondent objects to identified housing sites[1] in Dent due to a lack of need and impact on the character of the village.
Embsay		
EMB1, Land at Holly Tree Farm	Rejected AHS/ Excluded from HDB	• Landowner objects to decision not to allocate site on grounds that it will not displace a farm business and highways issues can be overcome. Updated design and highways information provided indicating site can deliver c9 houses. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address.
EMB2, Land north of Brackenley Lane, Embsay	Rejected AHS	• Landowner objects to decision not to allocate site on grounds that highways issues can be overcome and that cumulative growth in the village is not a valid reason for rejecting the site. Development would deliver a range of benefits. Updated design and highways

[1] No sites have been identified in Dent – two sites included in the adopted Local Plan are excluded from the Reg 19 version of the emerging Local Plan.

		information provided indicating site can deliver c25-50 houses. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address.
Grassington		
GRA6, Land off Garrs End Lane, Grassington	Rejected AHS	• Landowner objects to decision not to allocate site, noting that it could be delivered with the benefit of infrastructure provided to serve GRA7 within easy reach of local services.
GRA7, Land off Moody Sty Lane, Grassington	AHS	• One respondent objects to the site based on impact on highway safety and local character
Land at Garrs End Laithe, Grassington	Excluded from HDB	• Landowner seeks inclusion within HDB of a croft associated with a recently completed barn conversion.
Hawes		
HAW2, Land off Burtersett Road, Hawes	AHS	• One respondent objects to inclusion of land within Local Plan and feels previous objections, particularly around landscape sensitivity, have not been properly considered or responded to.
Hudswell		
Hudswell (west end)	Included in HDB	• One respondent supports extension to HDB at this end of the village.
Long Preston		
LON1, Land rear of Hartley Green, Long Preston	Rejected AHS	• Landowner objects to rejection of site due to provision of additional information and evidence to overcome concerns about highway access, flood risk and impact on settlement. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address.
LON2, Land off Main Street, Long Preston	Rejected AHS	• Landowner objects to rejection of site due to parallels with another AHS in the village (LON8) and good access which the veteran tree would not prevent. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address. Promoted alongside adjoining land (LON7) that could be developed in conjunction.
LON4, Land off Hoyle Hill, Long Preston	Rejected AHS	• Landowner objects to rejection of site, deeming landscape impact to be acceptable and access issues capable of being overcome. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address.

LON5, Land off Tranmere Court, Long Preston	AHS	• Landowner supports allocation of site but requests an increase in capacity from 12 dwellings to 16; • United Utilities point out constraints associated with public sewer that could impact on the site in the event of exceedance. Wording provided to ensure adequate mitigation against these risks.
LON7, Land off Main Street, Long Preston	Rejected AHS	• Landowners object to rejection of site due to parallels with another AHS in the village (LON8) and good access which the veteran tree would not prevent. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address. Promoted alongside adjoining land (LON2) that could be developed in conjunction.
Newbiggin on Lune		
NLU2	AHS	• United Utilities point out constraints associated with public sewer and sewage pumping station that could impact on the site in the event of exceedance and requires adequate offsetting for amenity reasons. Wording provided to ensure adequate mitigation against these risks; • Environment Agency highlights changes to flood risk modelling published in March 2025 that increase the level of flood risk to the site and require further consideration through a Stage 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
Orton		
ORT1	AHS	• Historic England endorse the conclusions of the HIA but require that the Local Plan policy specifically directs that development proposals implement the recommendations of the HIA; • Environment Agency highlights changes to flood risk modelling published in March 2025 that increase the level of flood risk to the site and require further consideration through a Stage 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
Sedbergh		
Former Baliol School site	ABS	• Sedbergh Economic Partnership and one other respondent express support for flexibility in the uses the site accommodates, including residential; • Landowner objects to allocation for business purposes as unjustified and undeliverable and instead seeks allocation for housing or a mixture of uses including housing, as well as inclusion in the HDB. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address.

Land adjoining Toll Bar workshop units	Not identified as ABS	• Sedbergh Economic Partnership seeks additional employment land allocations in the town, including an extension to the Toll Bar site; • The landowner of the Baliol site has identified this as a more logical location for business development than the Baliol site due to proximity to similar uses and accessibility and the west end of town. The Dawson's (Station Yard) site is also identified.
SED2	AHS	• One respondent objects to site due to low-cost housing will not fit into this site of historic interest. Considers site will either not be developed or will only benefit Sedbergh School; • Historic England endorse the conclusions of the HIA but require that the Local Plan policy specifically directs that development proposals implement the recommendations of the HIA.
SED3	Rejected AHS	• Joint landowners object to site not being allocated. They consider that the site would not have a harmful landscape impact, would extend the recently completed housing development adjacent and that flood risks are not as bad as suggested. The site would provide much needed housing for the town. • Sedbergh Economic Partnership supports more ambitious housing growth in the town and considers that rejected sites, such as SED3, should be reconsidered.
SED9	AHS	• Sedbergh Economic Partnership considers that this site should not be identified in the Local Plan as it already has planning permission for 7 houses.
SED16	AHS	• Historic England endorse the conclusions of the HIA but require that the Local Plan policy specifically directs that development proposals implement the recommendations of the HIA.
Land north and west of Joss Lane/Winfield Drive, Sedbergh	Excluded from HDB	• Landowner objects to the exclusion of this land from the HDB as there are already developments in this area.
Sedbusk		
Verge in front of Dacre/Sargill Cottage and Sunny Holme, Sedbusk	Not designated as IOS	• One respondent considers that this land is treated as village green and so should be protected as IOS.
Starbotton		

Back Lane, Starbotton	Excluded from HDB	• One respondent, who owns some of the land involved, considers that there are a number of ruinous buildings that might be brought back into use through inclusion in the HDB, making the area more attractive.
Stainforth		
Land west of Carr Holme, Stainforth (STA.b)	Excluded from HDB	• Landowner objects to exclusion of site from HDB since it has not been properly assessed for landscape impact, access could be gained over the wide verge without an unacceptable impact and development could fit around the sloping nature of the site. Also raises issues with a wider under-provision of housing land that this site could help address
Threshfield		
THR1 & THR9	Rejected AHS	• Landowner objects to rejection of these adjoining sites because the landscape impact could be mitigated and the potential to access the land through THR4/5 could be achieved to enable needed housing to be delivered. Landowner considers that these sites (along with THR6) should be allocated in preference to THR4/5
THR4 & THR5	AHS	• Landowner supports the allocation of these sites if the preferred ones (THR1/9 & THR6) are not. Landowner does however object to not allocating the whole of the field within which THR4 is situated and points towards a significant shift in the landscape sensitivity rating of the site and the negative impact on farming operations over undeveloped portions of the fields. • The Threshfield Village Development Concern Group (representing over 135 households) has objected to development of the sites due to detrimental and irreversible impacts on the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park. It also points to wider concerns about the proportion of housing being planned in the village and justification for the Local Plan's housing target. Two other respondents have responded independently to express similar concerns.
Verge on Station Road	Not designated as IOS	• One respondent has objected to the exclusion of part of the verge from the IOS designation along Station Road, which would provide access into site THR4/5 on a dangerous bend at an important entrance to the Dales.
THR6	Rejected AHS	• Landowner objects to rejection of these adjoining sites because the landscape impact could be mitigated, and development would complement existing development along Skirethorns Lane. Landowner considers that this site (along with THR1/9) should be allocated in preference to THR4/5

THR8	AHS	• One respondent has objected to this site, seeing it as isolated and premature when better options exist, as well as being prejudicial to highway safety. • The landowner has supported the allocation but has provided a draft layout to demonstrate that a development of 91 houses could be delivered on the site, as well as details of how a safe access can be formed.
Other areas		
Clapham-Lowgill disused railway	Railway line protected as recreational routes	• Respondent suggests should be deleted as insufficient evidence to justify the protection of this route.
Wensleydale Railway	Railway line protected as either recreational route or reinstated railway	• One respondent has stated that YDNPA has allowed itself to be persuaded by the possibility of recreational use of the line when reinstatement of the railway would deliver significant benefits.
Other allocated housing sites (to be determined) affected by changes in flood risk modelling	AHS	• Environment Agency highlights potential for changes to flood risk modelling published in March 2025 that increase the level of flood risk to other sites (beyond NLU2 and ORT1 flagged above) and that might require further consideration through a Stage 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Examination Process

Pre examination

a. Following receipt of the submission documents, the Planning Inspectorate will appoint an Inspector to examine the 'soundness' of the Local Plan. *(in this context 'soundness' means founded on evidence, research, facts and participation).*

b. The Inspector will Identify any missing documents or evidence and work with Officers to address those. The Inspector will communicate with the Authority, via a 'Programme Officer' based at the Bainbridge office.

c. The Inspector will decide which issues are fundamental to the soundness of the Plan

d. The Inspector will frontload the examination by requesting Officers to answer various written questions. If it appears to the Inspector that there are clear soundness issues at this early stage, the examination may be paused or suspended.

Hearing sessions

e. The Inspector will organise hearing sessions *(inquisitorial round table discussions led by the Inspector).*

f. The inspector will notify objectors and officers 6 weeks in advance of the hearings

g. The inspector will send written questions and request answers from objectors and officers, 2-3 weeks before the hearings.

h. The hearings will last between 2 and 10 days, depending on the Inspector's consideration of the complexity of the Local Plan. Policy matters will be considered first and site issues second.

Post hearing

i. On the instruction of the Inspector, officers will draft modifications to the Local Plan and carry out a sustainability appraisal of them. The Modifications will then be made available for 6 weeks of public consultation.

j. The Inspector will consider the response to the consultation and then draft a report of examination. This will be a short document with clear conclusions. The report will be Peer reviewed within the Planning Inspectorate. Officers will also 'fact-check' the draft report.

k. The Report will hopefully find the Plan to be sound, subject to inevitable modifications, and possibly a requirement for review within a timeframe of less than 5 years. Adoption is anticipated during winter 2026. The Authority can then start to use the Plan with confidence, to shape development on the allocated sites and generally inform decisions on planning applications. The new Plan will supersede all the currently adopted Local Plans in the National Park.

BLANK PAGE