

Date: 27th June 2023

Report: LOCAL PLAN ISSUES

Purpose of the report

1. To update Members on the development of the Local Plan, including a summary of the comments received in response to the public consultation on 'land for housing development'; setting up a housing working group to examine the options for allocated sites; and to determine the approach to rural exceptions sites for affordable housing.

RECOMMENDATION

2. That Members;
 - a) Note the main summary of consultation responses (**Annex A**);
 - b) Establish a housing sites working group of 4 or 5 members as set out in **Annex B**;
 - c) Approve the Inclusion of some flexibility - in the policy justification - to allow a small proportion of market housing on rural exceptions sites but only where all other avenues towards securing 100% affordable housing have been exhausted.

Strategic Planning 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 2022-23

Objective 29. *Work with neighbouring authorities to produce a single Local Plan for the whole of the National Park by 2023, which will help achieve the vision and objectives in the National Park Management Plan.*

Local Plan Consultation No6. 'Land for Housing Development'

4. Local Plan Consultation No.6 launched on 24th March 2023 and ran for 7 weeks. The Authority is seeking to explore how a proposed housing target of 850 new dwellings could be delivered by 2040, through a combination of allocated sites (capable of delivering 5 or more houses), together with smaller-scale 'windfall' housing developments (infilling and rounding off of settlements within a defined development boundary).
5. The consultation documents included a *Housing Land Availability Assessment (HLAA)* containing analysis of 139 sites put forward by landowners and planning officers. The

assessment concluded that 33 of those sites, sufficient for 600 houses, might have potential for allocation in the Local Plan.

6. A total of 793 responses were received from a range of groups including individuals, landowners, Parish Councils, Unitary Authorities, government bodies and a variety of special interest groups. This is a high rate of response for a Local Plan consultation but was predictable given that this is the stage where specific site options are published for comment.
7. Broadly supportive responses have been received from the two new housing authorities - North Yorkshire Council and Westmorland and Furness Council. However, there have been strong objections from some residents, particularly those who live near the largest potential sites in Embsay and Threshfield. Concern has been raised about the capacity of local services to cope with more people, the risks of creating more second homes and a worry that new housing will be too expensive. The main summary of the consultation response is attached at **Annex A**. A full summary, including details of comments about specific sites, has been published on the Local Plan webpage.

Process to consider housing site options

8. The next stage is to consider the list of available sites in more detail, taking account of the consultation responses and the infrastructure assessments by the utility providers and the two unitary authorities. This work will then be used to enable the Authority s to make the final decisions on which sites will go forward into the Publication version of the Local Plan later this year.
9. It is proposed to establish a Member Housing Sites Working Group to carry out the assessment and make recommendations back to the Authority. In line with the discussion at the Policy Development Forum (PDF) on 6 June, a recommended approach is set out in **Annex B**

Rural Exceptions Sites

10. During summer 2022 the Authority consulted widely on preferred policy options for the new Local Plan. Officers have been working through the detailed responses to help refine the policy wording and draft the detailed justification for each policy.
11. The March Authority meeting considered most of the remaining Local Plan policy matters. This included issues on biodiversity net gain, rural land based enterprises and the level of discount for 'First Homes' (a new form of affordable housing).
12. However, a further issue relates to whether the new Local Plan should permit a small proportion of open market (principal residency) housing on rural exceptions sites. In line with Members' initial steer at the recent PDF, a recommended approach is set out in **Annex C**.

Conclusion

13. The Local Plan has now concluded its scheduled informal consultation stages. Interest has been heightened with the recent publication of possible housing site options across the Park. There is a lot more work to do particularly around infrastructure planning and concluding the assessments of the potential sites including investigating a few new options. The next milestone will be the considerations of the Member Housing Sites Working Group, hopefully reporting their recommendations to the Authority in September. That will enable work to progress on a publication version of the Local Plan for formal consultation later this year.

Peter Stockton

Head of Sustainable Development

12th June 2023

Yorkshire Dales Local Plan: Consultation No. 6 – Land for housing development Main summary of consultation

Background

Consultation No.6 launched on 24th March 2023 and ran for 7 weeks. The consultation sought to explore how a proposed housing target of 850 dwellings could be delivered up to 2040, through a combination of allocated housing development sites (capable of delivering 5 or more houses), together with smaller-scale ‘windfall’ housing developments (infilling and ‘rounding off’ of settlements within a defined development boundary).

The consultation sought responses to four questions:

Q1. Are the potential housing development sites that have been identified appropriate for development? If not, why not?

Q2. Are there any alternative sites that should be considered for housing development?

Q3. Are the housing development boundaries shown on the accompanying maps appropriate? If not, what changes are needed and why?

Q4. Are the important open spaces identified on the accompanying maps appropriate? If not, what changes are needed and why?

Consultation respondents

A total of 793 individual responses were received. Respondents consisted of the following groups (a full list of respondent groups is provided in the Appendix):

| Group | Number of respondents |
|--|-----------------------|
| Residents or likely residents ¹ | 662 |
| Residents’ groups | 2 |
| Parish bodies | 20 |
| Landowners ² | 55 |
| Government bodies ³ | 5 |
| Unitary Authority | 2 |
| Unitary Authority Councillor | 1 |
| Other interest groups | 20 |
| Non-resident individuals ⁴ | 26 |
| Total | 793 |

¹ Made up of 554 confirmed residents and 108 other respondents that did not confirm residency but where the nature of the representation made indicated residency within the National Park.

² Including agents representing landowners

³ Non-departmental public bodies

⁴ Typically, visitors to the area, former residents, or those that chose to remain anonymous

While many responses were concerned with a single issue, others covered a range of issues. This means that some responses raise multiple separate substantive representations. Responses have therefore been analysed and divided into representations that have been recorded and categorised separately.

Nature of response

Almost two thirds of representations made were objections that sought a change to the Local Plan.

| Nature of response | Proportion of representations |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Object / change sought | 64% |
| Observation | 20% |
| Support / no objection | 16% |

Response by theme

Representations made, according to the four main questions posed by the consultation, are as follows:

| Theme | Proportion of representations |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Potential housing site allocations (Q1) | 48% |
| Alternative housing site allocations (Q2) | 14% |
| Housing development boundaries (Q3) | 9% |
| Important open space (Q4) | 10% |
| Policy approach & other issues | 19% |

Each of these categories are presented in more detail in the following sections.

Potential housing site allocations (Q1)

This issue accounted for nearly half of all representations.

Representations recorded in this category are those where a specific site is referenced in objections and where the nature of comments relate principally to site-specific matters.

Representations regarding the broader principle of housing, or comments relating to a whole settlement or sub area (without reference to a specific site) are accounted for separately under 'policy approach' in the final section of this report.

The bulk of representations made in response to Question 1 recorded an objection against a potential site allocation:

| Subject | Proportion of representations |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Objection to potential site allocation | 77% |
| Observation about potential site allocation | 13% |
| Support or qualified support for a potential site allocation | 8% |
| Landowner making representations in support of potential site allocation | 2% |

Out of 793 respondents in total, 542 expressed an objection against one or more of the 33 potential site allocations.

Out of 33 sites included in the list of potential allocations, 27 recorded some level of objection. Support for any of the proposed site allocations was very limited in comparison.

A full breakdown of respondents commenting on sites (objection/observation/ support) is contained in the table below.

The most significant level of objection to individual sites was in Embsay, with both sites (EMB2 & EMB3) receiving a similar level of objection.

This was followed by Threshfield (THR1 & THR4), again with a similar amount of opposition to both.

| Site | Number of respondents | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| | Objection ⁵ | Observation | Support ⁶ |
| Airton (AIR1) | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Austwick (AUS1) | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Barbon (BAR1) | 10 | 3 | 3 |
| Barbon (BAR2) | 8 | 4 | 3 |
| Bolton Abbey (BOL1) | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Carperby (CPY1) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Embsay (EMB2) | 380 | 4 | 1 |
| Embsay (EMB3) | 377 | 3 | 1 |
| Grassington (GRA1) | 13 | 2 | 2 |
| Grassington (GRA5) | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| Grassington (GRA6) | 10 | 2 | 0 |
| Grassington (GRA7) | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| Hawes (HAW1) | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Hawes (HAW2) | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Hawes (HAW3) | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Hawes (HAW4) | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Horton in Ribblesdale (HOR1) | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| Horton in Ribblesdale (HOR6) | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Long Preston (LON5) | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| Long Preston (LON8) | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Millthorp (MIL3) | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Nateby (NAT2) | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Newbiggin on Lune (NLU1) | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Newbiggin on Lune (NLU2) | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Orton (ORT1) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Reeth (REE3) | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| Sedbergh (SED2) | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Sedbergh (SED9) | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Sedbergh (SED15) | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| Sedbergh (SED16) | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Threshfield (THR1) | 90 | 3 | 16 |
| Threshfield (THR3) | 3 | 3 | 16 |
| Threshfield (THR4) | 99 | 6 | 12 |

⁵ Figures relate to the number of respondents that recorded an objection against each site. Some respondents objected to multiple sites.

⁶ Includes qualified support for a site (for example subject to a reduced site area, or further constraints investigation) and support from landowners for their own site.

Alternative sites (Q2)

This issue accounted for 14% of all representations received and concerned:

- sites that had been considered by the Housing Land Availability Assessment, but not shortlisted as potential allocations; and,
- wholly new sites not previously considered by the Housing Land Availability Assessment.

They can be categorised as follows, with further analysis of each in the sections that follow:

| Subject | Proportion of representations |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Landowners suggesting additional site allocation candidates | 3% |
| Landowners requesting rejected sites be reconsidered and reinstated | 13% |
| Alternative sites suggested by members of the public (previously considered and rejected) | 20% |
| Alternative sites suggested by members of the public (not previously considered) | 35% |
| Members of the public supporting the rejection of specific sites | 25% |
| Observations about rejected sites | 4% |

Landowners suggesting additional site allocation candidates

Landowners have forwarded a total of 6 suggestions of land for potential housing development that are realistically capable of being considered as site allocations, rather than as smaller-scale infilling or 'rounding off'⁷.

One of these (a potential extension to THR1, Land east of Wharfeside Avenue, Threshfield) is already a matter of public record, having been included within the Housing Land Availability Assessment that accompanied the consultation.

The remaining five are relatively small scale sites in East Witton, Horton in Ribblesdale (2), Long Preston & Thoraby.

Landowners requesting rejected sites be reconsidered and reinstated

Landowners have also made representations seeking the reconsideration of 20 sites (including parts of sites where reduced in size) that were not included in the list of potential sites in Consultation No. 6. In some cases this is on the basis that the site be reinstated as an allocation, while in other cases there is the option of including them in revised housing development boundaries, resulting in some overlap with Q3:

⁷ These smaller sites are covered under Q3 later in the report.

| Site Ref | Location | Change sought |
|----------|--|--|
| AIR1 | Land at Hallgarth, Airton | Request to consider larger area of field |
| AIR2 | Land between Hambledon House & Gatesgarth, Airton | Request to reinstate site |
| BUR1 | Land south of Fell Hotel, Burnsall | Request to reinstate site |
| CAR1 | Land west of the Coverdale Memorial Hall, Carlton | Request to reinstate site |
| CPY1 | Land at East End Farm, Carperby | Request to consider croft adjoining (to the west of farmstead) |
| CRA3 | Land between Fell Lane and Back Lane, Cracoe | Request to allocate site, rather than treat as infill |
| DEN1 | Land west of Glebe Fold, Dent | Request to reinstate site |
| EAS1 | Land east of Cruik Barn, Barden Road, Eastby | Request to reinstate site (amended site area) |
| EAS2 | Land east of 23 Kirk Lane, Eastby | Request to reinstate site (amended site area) |
| EMB1 | Land at Holly Farm, Embsay | Request to reinstate site |
| EWT1 | Land north of Low Thorpe Farm, East Witton | Request to reinstate site |
| GIG1 | Land west of Stackhouse Lane, Giggleswick | Request to reinstate site |
| GRA4 | Land adjacent to Ash View/Garsdale, Grassington | Request to consider larger area |
| LON1 | Land between Hartley Green and Back Lane, Long Preston | Request to reinstate site (amended site area) |
| LON2 | Land east of 20 Main Street, Long Preston | Request to reinstate site |
| LON4 | Land south of Tranmere Cottage, Hoyle Hill, Long Preston | Request to reinstate site |
| LON7 | Land north and west of Megs Croft, Long Preston | Request to reinstate site |
| SED3 | Land north of Toll Bar Workshops, Station Road, Sedbergh | Request to reinstate site (amended site area) |
| SED4 | Land at former Baliol School, Cautley Road, Sedbergh | Request to allow residential development on employment site |
| SET1 | Land north of allotments, Ingfield Lane, Settle | Request to reinstate site |

Alternative sites suggested by members of the public (previously considered and rejected)

Members of the public have also requested that some sites so far rejected be reconsidered. Many of these suggestions are premised on attempts to identify more suitable alternatives to other shortlisted sites that were the subject of objections:

| Site ref | Location | Respondents suggesting site as alternative |
|----------|---|--|
| CPY1 | Land at East End Farm, Carperby (the croft area) | 1 |
| CRA1 | Land east of Cracoe Primary School, Cracoe | 1 |
| CRA2 | Land opposite Cracoe Grange Farm, Cracoe | 1 |
| CRA4 | Land east of Whitakers Barn, Cracoe | 1 |
| CRA5 | Land between Toppan Farm and Cracoe House Cottage, Cracoe | 2 |
| EAS2 | Land east of 23 Kirk Lane, Eastby | 1 |
| EMB1 | Land at Holly Farm, Embsay | 1 |
| HOR2 | Land west of Cragg Hill Road, Horton-in-Ribblesdale | 1 |
| HOR3 | Land east of Cragg Hill Road, Horton-in-Ribblesdale | 1 |
| SED3 | Land north of Toll Bar Workshops, Station Road, Sedbergh | 4 |
| THR2 | Land north of Skirethorns Lane and east of B6160, Threshfield | 1 |
| THR6 | Land south of Skirethorns Lane, Threshfield | 8 |
| THR7 | Land east of the B6160 at Simon Seats View, Threshfield | 30 |
| THR8 | Lane east of the junction between the B6160 and Monkholme Lane, Threshfield | 27 |

Alternative sites suggested by members of the public (not previously considered)

Members of the public have also suggested other alternative sites, heretofore not considered for housing development in the Housing Land Availability Assessment. Again, many of these suggestions are premised on attempts to identify more suitable alternatives to other shortlisted sites that were the subject of objections. The additional sites, most suggested, in order of popularity, are listed below:

| Site | Respondents suggesting site as alternative |
|--|--|
| Threshfield – Lower Quarry (allocated employment site) | 47 |
| Threshfield - NYC Highways Depot | 44 |
| Linton Camp (allocated employment site) | 24 |
| Threshfield & Grassington - others ⁸ | 13 |

⁸ Including land at Grassington Hospital, Land behind Piecefields, Land behind the Spar/Threshfield filling station, Land further along Skirethorns Lane, Land either side of the road between Monkholme and the old railway, Long Ashes, Land along road from Grassington Bridge to Threshfield Primary School, land beyond Wharfedale RUFC.

Members of the public supporting the rejection of specific sites

A number of members of the public submitted representations endorsing the rejection of certain sites and reserving the right to submit objections should they be reinstated. These were:

| Site ref | Location | Respondents endorsing rejection |
|------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| AIR2 | Land between Hambledon House & Gatesgarth, Back Lane, Airton | 5 |
| CAS3 & CAS4 | Land south of Casterton School courts and swimming pool, Casterton; Land east of Fern Croft & Smithy How, Casterton | 1 |
| CRA1 | Land east of Cracoe Primary School, Cracoe | 2 |
| CRA2 | Land opposite Cracoe Grange Farm, Cracoe | 2 |
| CRA4 | Land east of Whitakers Barn, Cracoe | 1 |
| CRA5 | Land between Toppan Farm and Cracoe House Cottage, Cracoe | 1 |
| MIL1 & MIL2 | Land west of Blandses Farm, Millthrop; Land east of Derry Cottages, Millthrop | 1 |
| NAT1 | Land rear of Nateby Service Station, Nateby | 1 |
| STI1 | Land west of Cock Hill, Stirton | 10 |
| TBY1, TBY2, TBY3 | Land at & south west of Manor Farm, Thorlby; Land opposite Evergreens & Twin Ashes, Thorlby | 7 |
| THR2 | Land north of Skirethorns Lane and east of B6160, Threshfield | 2 |
| THR6 | Land south of Skirethorns Lane, Threshfield | 2 |
| THR7 | Land east of the B6160 at Simon Seats View, Threshfield | 2 |
| THR8 | Lane east of the junction between the B6160 and Monkholme Lane, Threshfield | 3 |
| WWT1 | Land east of Grassgill, West Witton | 24 |

Housing development boundaries (Q3)

This issue accounted for 9% of all representations received. Although many more responses referenced housing development boundaries, this was often in the context of, and as an extension to, objections about potential housing site allocations (Q1). Those that made specific representations in relation to the role of housing development boundaries in controlling small-scale windfall developments can be categorised as follows:

| Category | Respondents / summary of issues raised | |
|---|--|---|
| Comment on general approach to defining boundaries | 6% | These responses were divided evenly between those who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were generally supportive of the approach; • thought the approach was too restrictive; and |
| Comment on approach to the whole of a specific settlement | 42% | The bulk of these respondents were generally supportive or made general observations, outweighing objections by a ratio of four to one. Objections were principally based on the boundaries being deemed to be too restrictive. |
| Requests to exclude specific area from development boundary | 20% | The majority of these responses sought the removal of an area of land with identified development potential ⁹ . This included areas in Cracoe, Langthwaite, Horton, Austwick, Buckden and Grassington. |
| Requests to include specific area in development boundary | 26% | <p>The majority of these responses were from individuals seeking inclusion within the boundary of a plot deemed to have development potential. Landowners submitted 19 suggestions, while other respondents suggested 2. In a limited number of cases there is overlap with sites suggested under Q2 above, where either an allocation or a development boundary change might be made. A further number of responses requesting areas to be included in development boundaries sought changes primarily for accuracy reasons, without any suggestion of future development potential.</p> <p>These changes related to plots of land in Airton (1), Barbon (4), Castle Bolton (1), Cracoe (3), East Witton (1), Fremington (1), Grassington (1), Hetton (1), Horton in Ribblesdale (2), Linton (1), Scosthrop (1), Sedbergh (1), Settle (2), Thoraby (1), Threshfield (2), West Burton (2).</p> <p>Finally, a small number of responses sought to ensure that specific housing site allocations/ongoing developments were included within development boundaries, for the avoidance of doubt about their developability.</p> |
| Support for area included in dev boundary | 6% | Landowners supporting the inclusion of their land (with development potential) within development boundaries. |

⁹ Land that had either been submitted through the call for sites or that had been the subject of recent planning applications

Important open space (Q4)

This issue accounted for 10% of all representations received and can be categorised as follows:

| Category | Respondents / summary of issues raised | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Comment on overall approach | 3% | Split between objections and support. |
| Comment on whole settlement | 34% | Most respondents were either supportive or offered observations. Ten respondents objected either because of the identification of areas without any public access, a failure to routinely designate features such as footpaths, or a general lack of open space in the settlement. |
| Request specific area added | 54% | The majority of these responses objected on the basis that a potential housing site allocation/infill site should instead be designated as important open space. Sites most often referred to were in Embsay (EMB2&3), Threshfield (THR1&4) and Cracoe (CRA3/CRA.g). The remaining responses identified other candidate spaces that were deemed to meet the criteria for designation. |
| Request specific area removed | 9% | Split evenly between those seeking the removal of an area of important open space that might prejudice the delivery of a housing development site (allocation and infill), and those seeking removals for other reasons. |

Policy approach

This issue accounted for 19% of all representations received. The consultation did not seek to explore issues of policy principle covered by previous consultations, for example the housing target, the need for more housing, the spatial strategy or the type/tenure of housing provided. Nonetheless, the potential practical implications of some of these issues, as expressed through potential sites allocations, development boundaries and important open spaces, meant that respondents also sought to explore the policy principles underpinning housing land supply.

Almost two thirds of the representations made under this issue were objections. The bulk of these were made in connection with potential housing site allocations and sought to explore wider issues, beyond site-specific suitability for development, that underpinned the need for more housing. In line with the volume of site-specific objection, many of these representations were connected to the localities of Embsay, Grassington and Threshfield. A range of issues were raised, many of them linked, including:

- Conflict with National Park purposes arising from developing greenfield sites that were considered to impact negatively on special qualities, climate change and biodiversity aims;
- Skewed apportionment of housing, with potential site allocations disproportionately concentrated in Craven and Grassington, Threshfield and Embsay in particular;
- A failure to focus housing development opportunity in the areas needing it most, with a perception that too many proposed sites were in settlements seen as thriving, with population growth, a more balanced age profile, full school rolls etc, rather than in settlements/areas that were the subject of greater threats to community sustainability. This, in turn, was seen as a further threat to community sustainability, since people would relocate away from the remoter settlements;
- Issues of scale with individual housing sites, with many respondents declaring support for smaller, more sensitive and evenly distributed housing sites, but not for larger scale developments. Relying on larger sites is described as 'lazy planning';
- A preference for continued reliance on small-scale windfall developments to deliver housing in the National Park, rather than site allocations.
- Deficient infrastructure and services to support new development, with road/transport, school, water and sewage facilities featuring prominently;
- A lack of existing employment, and a lack of a strategy to increase employment and economic development opportunities, so as to attract a working-age population;
- A perception that houses would still become holiday/second/retirement homes and would not be affordable enough so as to attract younger households;
- Fears over whether the affordable housing provided would be truly affordable, or otherwise whether developers would seek to negotiate down the proportions of affordable housing on viability grounds;
- Wider issues with the type of housing provided, including provision for older persons' accommodation and high environmental sustainability requirements.

Other issues raised were:

- The need to address issues with other land use allocations in the Local Plan, notably existing employment site allocations. This included:
 - objection to any continued allocation of land north of the Dales Centre in Reeth;
 - a request for the remaining employment land allocation at Askrigg to be retained;
 - a request for land allocations for 'entry-level' farming to allow sustainable local food production;
 - potential redeployment of Threshfield Quarry to provide some live-work units;
 - potential redeployment of Baliol School (Sedbergh) for a broader range of (non-employment) uses;
- Special considerations applicable to potential site allocations and the wider evidence base for the Local Plan (largely raised by public bodies e.g. flood risk, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, nutrient neutrality, assessments of heritage significance, potential loss of sporting facilities, potential impact on horse riders etc);
- A lack of public profile for the consultation, especially the lack of direct notification of residents affected by potential site allocations.

Appendix – list of groups¹⁰ responding to Consultation No.6

| | |
|---|---|
| Airton Parish Meeting | Long Preston Parish Council |
| Arkengarthdale Parish Council | Nateby Parish Meeting |
| Askrigg & Low Abbotside Parish Council | National Trust |
| Austwick Parish Council | Natural England |
| Bainbridge Parish Council | Network Rail |
| Bolton Estate | North Craven Heritage Trust |
| British Hedgehog Preservation Society | North Yorkshire Council |
| British Horse Society | Orton Parish Council |
| Burton-cum-Walden Parish Council | Pennine National Trails Partnership |
| Clapham-cum-Newby Parish Council | Richmondshire Ramblers |
| Coal Authority | Scosthrop Parish Meeting |
| Cracoe Parish Meeting | Sedbergh Economic Partnership |
| Craven Pothole Club | Sedbergh Parish Council |
| Council for the Protection of Rural England | Skipton Properties Ltd |
| Diocese of Carlisle | Sport England |
| Embsay Action Group | Stirton Water Trust |
| Embsay Hogwatch | Stirton-with-Thorlby Parish Meeting |
| Embsay with Eastby Environmental Action Group | The Devonshire Group (Chatsworth Settlement Trustees) |
| Embsay with Eastby Parish Council | Threshfield Development Concern Group |
| Environment Agency | Threshfield Parish Council |
| Friends of the Lake District | Threshfield Quarry Development Trust |
| Grassington Parish Council | United Utilities |
| Historic England | Upper Wensleydale Sports and Recreational Association |
| Home Builders Federation | Wensleydale and Coverdale Parish Forum |
| Kettlewell Parish Council | Westmorland & Furness Council |
| Home Builders Federation | Wharfedale Homes |
| Linton Parish Council | Wharfedale RUFC |
| Friends of The Dales | |

¹⁰ Not including respondents that were a named individual member of the public or landowner/agent

Annex B

Housing Sites Working Group: Remit and Guidelines.

1. The overall purpose of the group is to consider the potential housing site options and make recommendations to the full Authority about which sites should go forward into the Publication Local Plan. This includes:
 - consider any new sites received through the recent consultation and reconsider (where necessary) sites that just failed to make it to the list of 33 potential sites in the Housing Land Availability Assessment
 - consider housing development boundary issues where these might lead to significant changes.
2. In considering the options, the Group should have regard to:
 - the Statutory purposes for which the National Park is designated
 - the public consultation response, and give weight to those comments where they are relevant to Planning and related land use issues
 - the Authority's Housing Statement and the Authority's agreed Local Plan objectives
 - the need to retain a supply of land sufficient to meet the Local Plan housing target
3. In reaching its recommendations, the group should:
 - make recommendations by majority voting (where necessary)
 - record reasons for each recommendation

It is suggested that the Working group comprises four or five Members providing geographic and national representation and experience of Planning for housing. The following is suggested:

- a) a North Yorkshire Council Member from each of the former Craven and Richmondshire parts of the National Park;
- b) a Member from Westmorland & Furnace Council; and,
- c) a Secretary of State Member
- d) the Group to be chaired by the Member Champion for Sustainable Development

The working group would report its initial findings to a Policy Development Forum for informal Member discussion. The final recommendations would be presented to the September Authority meeting for formal decision.

Policy C3 – Rural Exceptions Sites

Q. Should the policy permit a small proportion of open market (principal residency) homes on rural exceptions sites?

The Authority's current policy requires that all new housing on rural exceptions sites (i.e. outside an allocated site or housing development boundary) **must be for affordable local needs only**. This is because of the added environmental value of land in the National Park and the objective to only allow development in open countryside for affordable needs rather than wider market demand.

National policy would however allow local planning authorities to consider whether some market housing on exceptions sites might help to facilitate delivery of affordable homes. The argument in favour of using this flexibility would be to incentivise landowners to come forward with rural exception sites. The suggestion is that the ability to build one house for themselves or their family, as part of such developments might encourage more landowners to make their land available for schemes that would benefit the wider community. The case against is two-fold. First, any relaxation in policy is likely to encourage landowners to increase their land valuations. Second, the new Local Plan will already be releasing a large amount of 'greenfield' land for market housing. In the north west of the Park between 70% and 80% of each allocated site will be available for market housing, albeit with a 'principal residency' clause. There is therefore no requirement to release more land for open market homes. Homes England grant aid is already available on 100% affordable exceptions sites so it is questionable whether allowing a proportion of market housing would make any difference to the availability of rural exceptions sites coming forward in the Park.

[It is recommended that the justification to the policy clarifies that all other avenues towards securing 100% affordable housing, including Government grant aid, are exhausted first before considering whether to allow a small proportion of market homes on rural exceptions sites.](#)