

## Neighbourhood Plan Additional Information for Rudby Neighbourhood Plan

The comments provided here are intended to help you produce a neighbourhood plan that will successfully proceed to adoption and is effective. It is up to you whether you amend the draft plan to take account of these comments, but it may affect how the plan proceeds.

### Policies

We have previously provided general guidance on writing policies. We would remind you that they should be worded in a positive manner, to state the circumstances that are required for a development proposal to be supported

When writing policies you should think about how they will be applied to the determination of a planning application. This means that it should be clear to the applicant what is expected from their application. It should also be clear to the Planning Officer what they need to do to assess the application.

You do not need to identify or list other policies that a proposal will need to comply with; the development plan, which the neighbourhood plan will be part of once adopted, should be read as a whole and it is the applicant's responsibility to determine which policies are relevant to their development proposal. When the application is determined all relevant policies will be considered.

The terms used in policies are also important as there are, often subtle, variations in meaning that could affect how policies are implemented. For example, it is best to avoid using 'shall' for requirements that you definitely think need to be met. Instead, we would suggest 'must' or 'will'. Similarly, 'should' is less firm and needs to be used carefully. It is also better to use the phrase '...will only be supported' rather than '...will be permitted' as the former means that the balance of this and other relevant policies can be made to reach a decision, whereas the latter constrains the decision making process.

Policies will be clear if you can be specific about the impacts that are and are not acceptable, using clearly defined terms.

### First Homes in Plan Making and Decision Making

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/first-homes#first-homes-eligibility-criteria>

New government guidance has been issued in relation to First Homes please see the link.

Neighbourhood planning groups can support the provision of all forms of affordable housing for sale, including [First Homes](#), by including relevant policies and identifying suitable sites within neighbourhood plans for these homes. Please see reference Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 70-017-20210524 on the NPPG link above.

If the neighbourhood plan is submitted for examination by 28 December 2021 it will not be required to reflect the First Homes policy requirement. However, if the plan is submitted after 28 December 2021 it will need to reflect the national policy for First Homes.

### Justification text

We advised previously on the use of justification text which should set out the evidence and thinking behind the requirements of each policy and give further detail and guidance for applications. We would specifically remind you to should consider how this can be done in a concise manner that helps readers understand what the policy is seeking to achieve. Information about how the content of the plan was decided upon is useful for readers at this stage, but you should carefully consider whether it will add value to the submission

version of the plan. It may be appropriate to move text to the start of chapters where it can provide context for a topic area. Alternatively you could move it to the consultation statement (see below).

## **Preparing for submission**

Even at this stage it is useful to think about what happens when the neighbourhood plan is ready for submission to HDC.

At the point of submission the below documents need to be submitted with the submission version of the neighbourhood plan:

### **1. Basic conditions statement**

A Basic Conditions Statement should be prepared to accompany the Rudby Neighbourhood Plan as per Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This Act requires that neighbourhood plans meet the following basic conditions:

- i. the draft plan must have appropriate regard to national policies and advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and also the guidance contained in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG);
- ii. the draft plan must contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (as set out in the NPPF);
- iii. the draft plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the local planning authority, currently the LDF Core Strategy, but it is likely that the emerging Local Plan will be adopted before the neighbourhood plan so regard should be had to the policies set out in Policy S4 of the new plan; and
- iv. the draft plan must meet the relevant EU obligations.

Please note that the NPPF has recently been revised. The latest version was published on 20 July 2021.

### **2. Consultation Statement**

The consultation statement must include the following information:

- Details of who was consulted on the proposed neighbourhood plan (including any of the consultation bodies)
- An explanation of how they were consulted (what methods were used)
- A summary of the main issues and concerns raised through consultation
- A description of how these issues were considered, and where relevant, addressed in the neighbourhood plan proposals (you should not respond to every comment).

The consultation statement is your opportunity to explain and demonstrate how engagement with your community and others has shaped the development and content of your neighbourhood plan. The consultation statement should include and summarise all the statutory (i.e. the pre-submission publicity and consultation period) and non-statutory consultation that has taken place with the community, organisations and other relevant bodies to develop your plan.

It is good practice to start compiling the consultation statement at an early stage in preparing your plan. It can be useful when consulting on the draft plan if you can show what has been done so far to engage with the community.

The Consultation statement should:

- Be kept short and focused as much as possible
- Record details of all the consultation activities that you have held

- Include photographs, images and diagrams, as appropriate.
- Ensure you clearly record how you considered issues that were raised during any consultation activity and, where relevant, how you have addressed these in your plan.
- Make effective use of appendices

You may wish to consider including the following in appendices:

- A detailed list of all the consultation events, including an overview of the event, number of attendees and key outcomes
- Copies of questionnaires, surveys and details of any engagement techniques
- Copies or images of leaflets and other publicity material e.g. posters
- Copies of any newspaper cuttings or press coverage of your plan, including online sources
- Photographs of engagement events
- A list of the consultation bodies you consulted during the pre-submission consultation and publicity period. Details of those you did not consult and an explanation of the reasons why
- A record of all the comments you received during the pre-submission consultation and publicity period

You may find it useful to have a look at examples of other groups' consultation statements as there are various approaches you can use to structure yours.

### **3. SEA/HRA screening statements**

Screening statements for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) must be submitted. These statements will determine whether full SEA and/or HRA are required. It is not anticipated that these full assessments will be needed, but the screening must be completed. We can help with completing the screening processes, which can be completed by consultants or another organisation.

#### **The use of data and consultation**

The Council will use contact details for people who have commented during your consultation, if you supply those details to us. This will mean that people who have commented are notified about the submission consultation. However, this will require you to advise people that their contact details will be sent to HDC for this purpose. Alternatively you could notify anyone who has made comments yourselves about the Submission consultation, which would mean that you wouldn't need to pass on contact details. Other parishioners would not be notified unless they are already on the council's planning policy consultation database. It is up to the Steering Group to organise local publicity for the submission consultation.

#### **Recurring Issues**

The Neighbourhood Area covers the parishes of Hutton Rudby, Middleton on the Leven, Rudby, and Skutterskelfe. However, in places the plan seems like it is written primarily for Hutton Rudby, and this tends to dominate. You should carefully consider the way in which you refer to the neighbourhood plan area, in some cases it seems that the plan uses 'the parish', or similar, when it means the whole plan area. To address this we would suggest using 'the plan area' instead. This is a significant issue, through the whole plan and is particularly problematic in policies.

You can make reference to planning policy for Hambleton, but due to the ongoing examination of the Local Plan this should be done carefully. The timing of future stages for the neighbourhood plan are likely to mean that the Local Plan has been adopted and has replaced the LDF before the neighbourhood plan is adopted. The Local Plan will also replace the Interim Policy Guidance Note, although policy HG5 in the Local Plan will enable development in a similar way. Please be aware that the draft policies in the Local Plan may change through the examination process, (we anticipate main modifications being agreed very

soon with consultation on them starting towards the end of September) so it is advisable to refer only to the aims and objectives of policies and not to specific wording of policies.

Information about how the content of the plan was decided upon is useful for readers at this stage but you should carefully consider whether it will add value to the submission version of the plan. It may be appropriate to move text to the start of chapters where it can provide context for a topic area.

Page Number	Draft Plan	LPA Comments
1	Chapter 1 Introduction	There is some good content in this chapter that provides context for the neighbourhood plan and the process for preparing it. However, you should consider whether it is all needed in the submission version of the plan.
2	Introduction paragraph 06.	Suggest deleting 'and other development proposals' as other forms of development do not require planning permission so would not be subject to planning policies.
3	Introduction paragraph 07/08	This could be consolidated into one paragraph. The plan period for the local plan is going to be extended to 2036, but the neighbourhood plan does not have to follow the same time period. You should consider the monitoring arrangements for policies in the neighbourhood plan and the circumstances that would lead to a review being necessary.
4	1.3 How the Plan was prepared Paragraph 20	Paragraph 20 should be updated before submission
5	Paragraph 23	It would be useful to state that a key task of the examination is to assess whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions.
5	Paragraph 24	The referendum may, on the advice of the Examiner be extended beyond the neighbourhood plan area. Although this is unlikely it is suggested that some rewording would be useful here – possibly to the effect that there would be a referendum and more than 50% 'Yes' vote is required.
5	Paragraph 26	It may be simpler to say that the neighbourhood plan will become part of the Development Plan and its policies used by HDC to help determine planning applications in the neighbourhood area. However, paragraph 5 is similar so suggest some editing is needed.
5	1.5 How the Plan fits into the planning system	It is considered that this section may be better placed further up the document, before 1.4 'What's next for the Plan'
6	Paragraph 28	It is considered that this paragraph may benefit from being simplified. The essence of a Neighbourhood Plans is for the local people to decide where they would like to see development in their own area and in doing so allocate areas for development that they have selected. An agreement was made between the Council and the Parish that Hutton Rudby could allocated their own land for development and this would not feature in the Local Plan.
6	Paragraph 29	Please be aware that the new NPPF published in July has made amendments to the 'dimensions' set out here.
7	Chapter 2 About Rudby Parish	As with chapter 1 there is some good content here but, you should consider whether the level of detail is needed in the submission version of the plan.
13	3.3 Delivering the Plan Vision	Paragraph 53 repeats previous content, but is also somewhat inaccurate (the plan will form part of the Development Plan it is not part of HDC Local Plan) and should be deleted.
16	5.2 Policy RNP2 Design Principles	Some of this policy echoes that of Local Plan policies HG2 Delivering the Right Type of Homes, E1 Design, E5 Development Affecting Heritage Assets, E4 Green Infrastructure, E7 Hambleton's Landscapes Local Plan Policy. It is not necessary to repeat the Local Plan policies so we would suggest considering how this policy could be edited so that it concentrates on the specific issues that are important in the neighbourhood area. You should also consider whether some of the criteria fit within a 'design' policy (criteria 2 c. and 2 d.). There are a number of questions that are raised by the policy as currently written: The policy applies to 'all' development? But some of the requirements would be unachievable or disproportionate for some types of development. 1. c. Green Infrastructure Network and Green Spaces - where are these spaces defined? RNP13 deals with LGS is that the same? 2.b. carbon emissions are to be reduced. Reduce by how much, against what standard and what base date?
17	5.3 Justification	We would suggest careful consideration about whether all the justification text is relevant and relates to the content of the policy.
20	6 Housing, Paragraphs 83 - 97	Paragraph 83 is an example of where specific reference to the emerging Local Plan may not be appropriate. It is suggest that this is simplified to just state that policy S4 provides the context for housing development in the neighbourhood plan. Other content in this section should be carefully considered in terms of whether the level of detail it provides is needed and whether it is relevant for the submission version of the plan.

Page Number	Draft Plan	LPA Comments
23	6.2 Policy RNP3 Housing Provision	<p>There are several questions raised by the policy as currently written:</p> <p>2. Do you mean 51% will be 2 and 3 bed homes. What would be a high proportion of bungalows? This needs greater precision.</p> <p>3. Would access from anywhere other than Paddocks End be possible or opposed?</p> <p>5. There is a lack of precision about the location of the connection to footpath/cycleway on Langbarugh Road.</p> <p>6. What is it about Hundale Gill that is to be preserved or enhanced - what is the base line data?</p> <p>It may be useful to have Figure 6 (note that this shows Garbutts Lane but not Langbarugh Road, which is referenced in the policy).within the policy (reduced in size and area covered), but it is important to understand that figure 6 is not the Policies Map (also applies to paragraph 100).</p> <p>It is not necessary to state that compliance with development plan policies is necessary (affordable housing etc.) if there is no additional local qualification.</p> <p>'Urban' should be removed from 'Sustainable Urban Drainage System' to reflect current terminology (the acronym SuDS (rather than SUDS) is generally used to reflect this).</p> <p>It is likely that with the stated mix and density that the site is not considered to be viable for development and proposals with more and larger homes are likely. You should consider what your priorities are if such a proposal were to come forward.</p> <p>Criterion 4 seems to be at odds with paragraph 104.</p>
23	Justification text for Policy RNP3	<p>The justification text particularly section 6.4 is useful in setting out the selection process. However, for the submission version of the plan it may be more appropriate for this information to be moved to the start of the chapter or a supporting document. Some of the text seems repetitive. Paragraph 105 could be reduced with reference to the parking policy or removed completely.</p>
27	Policy RNP4 Windfall Housing	<p>There are questions raised by the policy as currently worded:</p> <p>1.a) - Where are the community priorities, are these the same as the Community Aspirations? Does it repeat what is stated in RNP2 part 2?</p> <p>Criterion 1 b. seems both overly restrictive and vague. This should be reworded so that it is simplified and relates to the character of the settlement (or other specific point of concern).</p> <p>2 b) and c) - Have any sites been tested and do they meet the requirements of 25% boundary to existing dwellings and 50%+ strong defensible boundary? The criteria are considered to be overly detailed and impractical to implement. They should be reworded. We would suggest identifying a requirement for a strong relationship with the existing built form (the justification text seems to suggest that this is the priority) and for the site to be well contained. Justification text can identify the type of boundary features in the current criteria.</p> <p>It is considered that the Local Plan Policies HG2 Delivering the Right Type of Homes, HG5 Windfall Housing Development covers most of this policy. We would suggest considering the main modifications for the Local Plan and whether the modified policies address the issues of concern.</p> <p>Through the Local Plan examination, it has been established that the use of 'small scale' for windfall development is not consistent with national policy. This would particularly be the case for development within the built form, as in part 1. 'Small scale' should therefore be removed from both part 1 and part 2 of the policy.</p> <p>The current LDF and the emerging local plan set out the circumstances where housing development in the countryside is considered acceptable. It is considered that Part 3 is potentially at odds with this, potentially supporting development where the LDF/Local Plan would not. We would suggest careful consideration of the requirements for parts 2 and 3, whether they are appropriate, justified and in line with existing/emerging policies, including the NPPF.</p> <p>3 b) - Is this the level intended for RNP2 2.b)? It would still help to set a percentage to exceed by rather than the vague wording of just 'materially exceeds'. Could you say 10%? Why have this only applying to sites in the countryside? We should also point out that building regulations do not cover all aspects of energy performance of development. We would suggest rewording so that the criterion is future proofed with regards to possible future changes in building regulations and is holistic in its approach to moving to net zero, as the national policy applies to greenhouse gases, not just carbon.</p>

Page Number	Draft Plan	LPA Comments
		Through the examination of the Local Plan the policy E3 will be modified to more clearly require net gain for biodiversity. The Environment Bill is understood to set the required level at 10%. It is suggested that this criterion is either changed to refer to 'biodiversity net gain', so it is consistent with emerging terminology or you consider whether it is necessary to have this criterion at all.
27	Justification text for Policy RNP4	The justification text here is extensive and should be rationalised to that which is necessary to justify and explain the policy. With reference to the comment above regarding small scale development we suggest that paragraph 112 is deleted. With regards to paragraph 117 see our comments below on Appendix J. The paragraph should be amended. While we understand the views expressed in the first part of paragraph 118 you should consider what value this text has when the relationship with the built form will be considered on a case by case basis for each application. For the second part of this paragraph you should be aware that Skutterskelfe is not identified in the Local Plan as a settlement in the settlement hierarchy and so would be considered to be part of the countryside. Paragraph 122 is confusing and potentially misleading as some forms of reuse and conversion are possible without planning permission. Also, the policy is silent about conversion and yet this paragraph states that the policy does not support it. We suggest deleting the paragraph.
29	6.7 Policy RNP5 Affordable Housing	Only Rural Exception Sites deliver 100% affordable homes can be subject to the local connection criteria. A local connection requirement may also be applied to First Homes, but this must be established through evidence that this is necessary, but will be time-limited. We would suggest that you engage with the Council's Rural Housing Enabling officer to discuss the scope of this policy or remove it from the plan.
29	Justification text for Policy RNP5	Notwithstanding comments above on policy RNP5, as with other sections of justification text, you should consider rationalising to that which is necessary to justify and explain the policy. For example, paragraph 124 is not specifically concerned with affordable housing. Also commentary about the various recent surveys is likely to be of little relevance and as it stands does not relate to the content of the policy.
31	Chapter 7 Rural Economy	There is considered to be significant potential to rationalise the introductory text, paragraph 132 and the bullet points that follow in particular seems to add little to the plan.
32	Policy RNP 6 Redevelopment of Redundant Buildings in the Countryside	The policy is unclear about the range of uses that are considered suitable and it is not clear what the justification for this part of the policy is. You should be aware that the Use Classes Order was amended last year, affecting retail and business uses, and there are range of changes within and between uses that would not require planning permission. This may mean that restrictions may be ineffective. Modifications to policy S5 Development in the Countryside should be considered when re-writing this policy and whether it is still deemed necessary.
32	Justification text for policy RNP6	Paragraph 134 states that control should be made towards extensions of rural buildings. This does not currently form part of the policy requirements and so either should be moved into the policy or reconsidered. Subject to the comments on policy RNP6, further justification text will be needed to clarify any restriction on uses. Care should be taken with the terminology used, for example the word 'trade' has a range of meanings and could lead to development which was not the intended use of the policy.
33	Paragraph 140	Typo on the last line '...small *wating* list.'
34	Policy Safeguarding and Improvement of Community Facilities RNP 7	Careful thought is needed for this policy as it stands by stating 'safeguarded from development' this would stop all development for these facilities. This could potentially mean that any improvements to these facilities would be contrary to policy. All the listed facilities need to be mapped to show the location and extent of them for any protection to be effective. IC3 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Local Plan, and IC4 Community Facilities polices do cover these issues and should be considered. Part 2. - It is not clear under what circumstances this part of the policy would be invoked.

Page Number	Draft Plan	LPA Comments
34	8.3 Justification	As with other sections please consider what is needed to justify and explain the policy, particularly if you add any qualification to the safeguarding of the policy.
35	Policy RNP 8 Communication Technology	We would suggest you consider rewording the first part of the policy, specifically 'and developments' as this could be interpreted as applying to any development, which would not be practical or proportionate.
35	Justification text for RNP8	As with other sections please consider what is needed to justify and explain the policy.
37	Policy RNP 9 The Transport and Parking Provision	The spirit of this policy is recognised, however some of this policy is mirrored in the local plan, in particular reference to footpaths joining sites to the existing network. As has been established through the Local Plan examination development plan policies cannot insist on compliance with another document. Additionally, the North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) parking standards referred to have not formally been adopted by NYCC or HDC and it is not clear whether they are publicly available. National policy and guidance discourages the use of parking standards and requires them to be justified by clear evidence. The policy requirements relating to the conservation area should be carefully considered as it could have a detrimental impact. Local Plan policy IC2: Transport and Accessibility should be considered when editing this policy.
37-38	9.3 Justification	The comments on the policy about the NYCC parking standards should be noted. The justification text could usefully identify the potential conflict between providing high levels of car parking and the impact on design, with cars dominating, and identify ways to mitigate this, for example by placing parking spaces to the rear of properties, where possible.
39-41	10 Natural Environment	It should be noted that the Council Local Plan policy E3 Natural Environment does also cover this matter.
41	Policy Natural Environment and Landscape RNP 10	It is suggested that the you read through the E3 Natural Environment policy within the Local Plan once main modifications have been agreed as there is significant similarity between policies. National policy requires there to be a hierarchy of protection for sites, with most protection being afforded to sites such as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar sites and less for local designations. As noted above with regards to figure 6, figures within the plan do not constitute the policies map. Making reference to Appendix F would be useful.
41/42	10.3 Justification	Paragraph 177 should be reworded as it implies that SINCs are nationally recognised. This is not the case, SINCs are a local designation. Paragraph 178 states "all new development is expected to have compensatory measures applied on-site. Any development will be expected to enhance the unique nature of the local landscape and its surroundings"- if this requirement is to be implemented it should be incorporated into a policy. Again, it is considered that Local Plan policy E3 The Natural Environment covers this requirement.
42	Policy Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure RNP11	It is considered that this policy replicates some of the Local Plan Policy E 3 The Natural Environment. Reference should also be had to policy E4: Green Infrastructure. It should be noted that DEFRA's biodiversity metric version 3.0 has recently been released, as well as a metric for small scale development. It is suggested that the policy therefore makes reference to the 'latest appropriate DEFRA metric' or similar. Criterion 3 may be problematic. Can 25% tree cover be achieved and get the number of dwellings and open space on the allocation site at Paddocks End, has this been tested with a draft housing layout?. When would trees be considered to be mature? Criterion 4 the felling of TPOs is dealt with via separate legislation not through the development plan. The felling of trees is also covered in Local Plan Policy E 7 Hambleton Landscapes which includes provision for replanting, sustainable tree management, local distinctiveness within the landscape and supporting biodiversity.
42	10.5 Justification text to policy RNP11	There are several parts in the justification text that set policy, but are not currently reflected in the policy text. Any requirements should be move into the policy if they are expected to be delivered.



Page Number	Draft Plan	LPA Comments
43	Policy RNP 12 The Leven Valley	<p>Criterion 1 - Has the Leven Valley that this would be apply to been mapped? This is essential for this policy to be effective. Elements of the policy that apply to heritage assets would be covered by Local Plan policy E 5 Development Affecting Heritage Assets and the NPPF 2021 Chapter 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The second part to this policy should be considered carefully as it is currently not clear what is required to comply with the criterion. It may help in you were to subdivide each of the criteria.</p>
44	Justification text to policy RNP12	<p>Paragraph 190 Doesn't really add any value and should be removed. Paragraph 191 The point of the significance of the Leven Valley is understood in the paragraphs before 191. In terms of requesting an assessment for development this would be a Development Management requirement as the site lies within the conversation area and includes listed buildings. It seems that the intension here is to ensure an applicant or decision maker takes into consideration the qualities of the area. If that is the case then it should be stated in the policy.</p>
45/46	10.8 Local Green Space	<p>Sites that are identified as being designated as local green space should be checked for consistency with the modifications to the Local Plan.</p>
46	Policy Local Green Space RNP 13	<p>The extension of some of the proposed local green space sites in the Local Plan is acknowledged. Care should be taken that the proposed new local green spaces comply with the NPPF criteria for designation <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space</a>. In particular paragraph 011 which states: "Different types of designations are intended to achieve different purposes. If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space" See also paragraphs 101 and 102 of the NPPF 2021. It should be noted that footpaths or highway grass verges are not considered to be part of local green space. The Local Plan Inspectors have advised against the Local Authority using the term 'very special circumstances' and as such it is recommended that it is better just to refer to national policy and guidance. You may also wish to check the sites have clearly defined boundaries so that the extent of land designated is clear.</p>
47	Paragraph 199	<p>The comments in relation to landowners are noted. It is suggested that you consider whether this paragraph is appropriate for the submission version of the plan.</p>
47	Policy Significant Views RNP14	<p>Criterion 1. Local Plan policy E6 Nationally Protected Landscapes does include impact on the North York Moors National Park. You may also wish to consider whether it is necessary to include the list of locations of views and instead just say any public views? We have previously commented on the neighbourhood plan with regard to its requirements on views. Further to those comments we would suggest that careful consideration is given to the policy requirements relating to the identified 'significant views' in contrast with those that would apply to other views that may be available to the public. It should also be acknowledged that views may evolve over time, due to factors such as the growth of vegetation. Care should be taken to ensure that the scope of requirements, which type of view, either significant or other, they apply to is clear. The policy should make reference to Appendix I, rather than 'A'. See also comments on Appendix I. Criterion 2. We would suggest reordering this criterion so that it is easier to follow. It seems that this applies to all types of development (which should be clarified), if so there is a question of whether that is justified. It seems that a screening assessment is required in all cases (although you should consider whether any types or scales of development would be exempt) so this should be the first part of the criterion. You should then set out what happens subject to the findings of the screening assessment. Setting for heritage assets is also based upon the proposed development as a whole and how this impacts on the views of the heritage asset itself not just how it sits in the landscape. Historic England have produced a document "The setting of heritage assets: historic environment good practice advice in planning: 3" <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/</a>. The guidance note refers to the setting of a heritage asset, when considering the setting of a place the guidance seeks to reflect upon the location and siting, form and appearance, wider effects, and permanence. This also would include sites less than 0.1ha and more than one dwelling, so the use of thresholds should be considered carefully. Applicants are invited to consider the impact</p>

Page Number	Draft Plan	LPA Comments
		<p>of setting in a design and access statement or a heritage statement.</p> <p>Criterion D. states that the development will be fully screened by existing landscaping features and the screening would not be removed or reduced as part of the development or routine land management activities. It is suggest that this may be clearer if it distinguishes between features that are within the control of the applicant and those that aren't, as no controls could be placed on land outside the control of the applicant.</p> <p>It should be noted that there is an issue with different font sizes in this policy.</p>
48	Justification text for policy RNP14	<p>Paragraph 203 – With reference to the comments above it should be clear what type of development the requirements of the policy apply to and how this is justified.</p> <p>Reference to the North York Moors National Park management plans should be referred to in the justification text</p> <p><a href="https://www.northyorkmoors.org.uk/looking-after/new-management-plan">https://www.northyorkmoors.org.uk/looking-after/new-management-plan</a></p>
49	11 Heritage Assets	<p>Paragraph 210 - Comments relating to non-designated heritage assets are welcomed, however it is considered that the repeated reference to the VDS does not add any benefit to the text or to the Plan itself.</p>
50	Policy Protection and Enhancement of the Conservation Area RNP15	<p>The Local Plan Policy E5 Development Affecting Heritage Assets covers development in conservation areas, this will be modified but should be considered with this policy. Care should be taken to ensure that criterion 1 falls within the limitations of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 see Historic England reference towards demolition with conservation areas</p> <p><a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/consent/cac/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/consent/cac/</a></p> <p>It is suggested that criterion 3 should be merged with criterion 4.</p>
51	11.3 Justification	<p>Paragraph 213, and 215 reference to the VDS is not necessary and may confuse the reader. It is suggested that this is re-worded and reference to the VDS is removed.</p>
53	Appendix A Hambleton's Local Plan Sustainability Objectives	<p>As these are the SA objective for the Local Plan it is not clear why they have been included. Screening statements for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) must be completed and submitted with the plan. These statements will determine whether full SEA and/or HRA are required.</p>
56	Appendix C Housing Supply and Demands Analysis	<p>It is recommended that you considered whether it is appropriate for all of the information presented here to be included in the submission version of the plan. It may be more appropriate for it to be moved to a supporting evidence document, but even then it is very detailed. It should also be acknowledged that it is static point in time information. Although it can be updated, once the plan is adopted the information here is likely to become out of date quite quickly. Wherever the information is presented it should be checked for clarity.</p>
60	Appendix E Village Design Statement Extracts	<p>The introduction and rationale to explain the difference between the VDS and the Plan is noted. This could be used at the front of the Plan to set context. However, to quote extracts from the VDS is considered unnecessary, if there are elements within the VDS which have not changed then they can just be incorporated into the Plan with out referring to the VDS.</p> <p>In our previous comments we pointed out that the VDS would not have been adopted by HDC as a Supplementary Planning Document as the terminology used at the time was Supplementary Planning Guidance. If the text is retained please make sure this is corrected.</p>
68	Appendix G	<p>It is recognised that this is a consultation document and that it was important to be clear about which sites were proposed as Local Green Space by which plan. The maps should be updated to show only the Local Green Space proposals of the neighbourhood plan.</p>
72/73	Appendix H Heritage Assets and Features	<p>It should be remembered that the list of listed buildings will be a static point in time list and that this information is maintained and available on the HDC website. This will mean that the value of including the list in the plan reduces over time.</p> <p>H2 Non designated heritage assets. Remove reference to VDS. If the Station Hotel is not considered to be an asset any more then remove from the list altogether.</p>
74/75	Appendix I Significant View	<p>It is clear that a lot of thought and effort has gone into drawing up both the list and map of significant views. We continue to have some concerns about this and how it will be implemented. In the notes following the table, 1 in effect states that some views are not</p>

Page Number	Draft Plan	LPA Comments
		<p>unique, as similar views are available along a road etc. This potentially gives problems when considering the impact a development proposal will have on that view. For note 2 it is not clear whether the differences in viewer has any bearing on the consideration of the development proposal. If there is no difference why include this? For note 3 it is good that you have considered the extent of views, but there would seem to be no 'framed' or 'panoramic' views in the table.</p> <p>Figure 13 – care should be had when including any maps in the plan that they will be legible, both when printed and viewed onscreen. Some elements shown on the map are hard to make out and some text is very small. You should also consider whether some things that are shown on the map are needed and whether they are appropriately identified in policies.</p>
77/78/ 79/80	Appendix J	<p>Through the examination of the Local Plan the Planning Inspectors and the Council have worked to produce a refined definition for the 'Built Form' which has taken into consideration when other developments take place, and the impact development has on settlements. The maps are potentially misleading as the boundaries drawn will not have taken the refined definition into account. Also the boundaries may include land that, at the point of a planning application, is not considered to be part of the built form, and vice-versa. The map for Rudby is a case in point; land to the east identified as being within the built form would not be 'within' until development had taken place. It is considered that this Appendix is not necessary and potentially confusing so should be removed.</p>
81/82	Appendix K Natural Environment and Biodiversity Policy Maps.	<p>It is considered that these maps do not add any value to the Plan; all of these features can change and most of the constraints are available from local authority/ County Council or statutory consultee web pages where the most up to date information can be viewed.</p> <p>Figure 17 - Comments above regarding figure 13 also apply here. If retained this map would be better if it were turned through 90 degrees so that north is to the left side and the image fills the A4 page. This would allow the map to be bigger and therefore text would be more legible.</p> <p>Figure 18 – This map is not at all clear, please revise.</p>
83	References	<p>4. NPPF has been updated reference to the 2021 version should be used <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2</a></p> <p>5. Reference to the Local Plan should be updated. It may be more appropriate to link to the examination pages of the HDC website.</p>