

**Richmondshire District Council**

**Submission Draft Core Strategy : Soundness Self Assessment**

**February 2013**



**Positively Prepared:** the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p><i>Vision and Objectives</i></p> <p>Has the LPA clearly identified what the issues are that the DPD is seeking to address? Have priorities been set so that it is clear what the DPD is seeking to achieve?</p> <p>Does the DPD contain clear vision(s) and objectives which are specific to the place? Is there a direct relationship between the identified issues, the vision(s) and the objectives?</p> <p>Is it clear how the policies will meet the objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the objectives of the DPD?</p> <p>Have reasonable alternatives to the quantum of development and overall spatial strategy been considered?</p> <p>Are the policies internally consistent?</p> <p>Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives?</p> <p>Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections of the DPD and other documents which set out (where applicable) the vision, strategic objectives, key outcomes expected, spatial portrait and issues to be addressed.</li> <li>Relevant sections of the DPD which explain how policies derive from the objectives and are designed to meet them.</li> <li>The strategic objectives of the DPD, and the commentary in the DPD of how they derive from the spatial portrait and vision, and how the objectives are consistent with one another.</li> <li>Sections of the DPD which address delivery, the means of delivery and the timescales for key developments through evidenced infrastructure delivery planning.</li> <li>Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the objectives and the identified means of delivery.</li> <li>Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about the scope and content (actual and intended) of each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure.</li> </ul>	<p>Core Strategy Chapter 1 explains the scope and structure of the DPD making it clear that it is the first stage of the overall Local Plan, consistent with the published Local Development Scheme.</p> <p>Core Strategy Chapter 2 addresses local conditions and identifies key strategic issues, which are the subject of the remainder of the DPD. The first stage of this process is the setting out of the overarching vision at the opening of Chapter 3. The challenge of drafting the DPD and anticipating the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy is met in the Local Strategy Statement (LSS 2011, PP006). This provided clear strategic objectives which have been built into the DPD and provide the setting for specific Local Objectives, which are directly related to the policies of the DPD.</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the DPD sets out the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the proposed monitoring framework. These sections have been developed with the relevant infrastructure providers. This has been achieved through ongoing consultation with relevant bodies (Consultation Statement, SD005), shared projects (Catterick Garrison Strategic Transport Study, TE003), routine contact through development management and the production of the draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (TE025) – due to be published shortly. The monitoring framework refers back to the preceding policies in the DPD.</p> <p>The DPD has been drafted at a time of uncertainty for infrastructure providers. The proposed A1 upgrade was announced prior to the drafting of the Preferred Core Strategy (PP007). Cancelled shortly afterwards and then reinstated after the publication of the Submission draft. Plans for military development have been similarly affected by the central government’s Defence and Security Review (2010), which currently indicates that there is unlikely to be the substantial level of growth catered for in the Catterick Garrison Long Term Development Plan (PS001).</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p><i>The presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF paras 6-17)</i></p> <p>Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:</p> <p>—any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>—specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An evidence base which establishes the development needs of the plan area (see Justified below) and includes a flexible approach to delivery (see ‘Section 3 Effective’, below).</li> <li>• An audit trail showing how and why the quantum of development, preferred overall strategy and plan area distribution of development were arrived at.</li> </ul>	<p>The quantum of development proposed in the DPD is based on an objective assessment of the needs of the local population and economy (Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population (2012, TE012) and Employment Land Review Update (2102, TE005)). These documents correct a number of problematic assumptions made about local conditions in national statistics and regional policy.</p> <p>Alternative distributions of development were proposed at the issues and options stage of DPD development and the impact of these addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal. The proposed approach was informed by the Settlement Facilities Study (2012,TE014), consultation responses (Consultation Statement (SD005)) and further refined through the Strategic Directions of Development (PP002-5, 2011) consultation, which addressed the options for development in the main settlements of Richmond, Catterick Garrison and Leyburn.</p> <p>The strategic approach to the scale and distribution of development is set out in Chapter 3 through 5 Spatial Principles and 3 Sub Area Strategies. Together these seek to strengthen a network of rural communities, with an emphasis on strengthening service centres.</p>
<p>Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A policy or policies which reflect the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (see <a href="http://www.planningportal.gov.uk">model policy at www.planningportal.gov.uk</a>).</li> </ul>	<p>Policy CP0 carries the model wording.</p>
<p><i>Objectively assessed needs</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background evidence papers</li> </ul>	<p>The quantum of development proposed in the DPD is based on</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>The economic, social and environmental needs of the authority area addressed and clearly presented in a fashion which makes effective use of land and specifically promotes mixed use development, and take account of cross-boundary and strategic issues.</p> <p>Note: Meeting these needs should be subject to the caveats specified in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF (see above).</p>	<p>demonstrating requirements based on population forecasts, employment projections and community needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical papers demonstrating how the aspirations and objectives of the DPD are related to the evidence, and how these are to be met, including from consultation and associated with the Duty to Co-operate.</li> </ul>	<p>an objective assessment of the needs of the local population and economy (Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population (2012, TE012) and Employment Land Review Update (2102, TE005)). These documents correct a number of problematic assumptions made about local conditions in national statistics and regional policy.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011, TE007-9) provides insight into local housing demand and need.</p> <p>The DPD takes a flexible approach to development and excludes no area from consideration for development. However, a hierarchical approach is taken to ensure that the benefits of development are maximised and the disbenefits are minimised. This overall approach does not treat individual settlements as either sustainable or unsustainable, rather it looks to the connections radiating out from service centres across this rural area as the basis of local communities.</p> <p>The Duty to Cooperate statement (SD006) sets out the approach taken with neighbouring authorities and designated bodies. It concludes that crossboundary impacts are minimal and have been addressed through plan preparation and ongoing work.</p>
<b>NPPF Principles: Delivering sustainable development</b>		
<b>1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)</b>		
<p>Set out a clear economic vision and strategy for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21),</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulation of a clear economic vision and strategy for the plan area linked to the Economic Strategy and LEP Strategy where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p>Spatial Principles SP3 and SP5 develop a locally appropriate economic strategy, which reflects wider local, sub regional and former regional expectations. These are based on recent assessments of local employment growth (TE005) and the economic impact of the military presence in the District and North Yorkshire (TE021). The strategic economic approach</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		recognises the building blocks of the rural economy, their scale and need for development. The DPD recognises that rural areas are dynamic environments built in response to current and historic economic pressures. The DPD looks forward and encourages continuing diversification and adaptation of an appropriate scale in the countryside. Core Policies CP7(Sustainable Economy), CP8 (Rural Sustainability), CP9 (Town and Local Centres) and CP10 (Tourism) provide further guidance .
Recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing (21)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A criteria-based policy which meets identified needs and is positive and flexible in planning for specialist sectors, regeneration, infrastructure provision, environmental enhancement.</li> <li>• An up-to-date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that purpose) para (22)</li> </ul>	The DPD is a Core Strategy and does not allocate sites. The Employment Land Review (2012, TE005) demonstrated that there was a major oversupply of employment sites, many of which were longstanding allocations. It also showed that there was a substantial amount of vacant property. This more realistic assessment of local conditions has influenced the Council’s approach. Following publication of the submission draft Core Strategy planning permission has been granted for housing on a former employment site.
<b>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-37)</b>		
Policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments, and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period (23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan and its policies may include such matters as: definition of networks and hierarchies; defining town centres; encouragement of residential development on appropriate sites; allocation of appropriate edge of centre sites where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available; consideration of retail and leisure proposals which cannot be</li> </ul>	<p>The DPD actively promotes the development of a new town centre in Catterick Garrison to fulfil the deficits of the retail offer in the plan area and to complement the historic centre of Richmond and the significant rural service centre at Leyburn.</p> <p>The DPD is a Core Strategy and does not allocate sites. It does provide guidance on retail and town centre development in the Central Richmondshire and Lower Wensleydale Sub Area Strategies and Core Policy CP9. Town centre developments are</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	accommodated in or adjacent to town centres.	supported by Spatial Principle SP4 housing targets.
Allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community services and residential development needed in town centres (23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An assessment of the need to expand (the) town centre(s), considering the needs of town centre uses.</li> <li>• Primary and secondary shopping frontages identified and allocated.</li> </ul>	The Catterick Garrison Retail Impact Study (2006, TE011) assesses the impact of the proposed town centre development on existing and local town centres and estimates the leakage of retail trade outside of the district. The DPD is a Core Strategy and does not allocate sites. Core Policy CP4 provides criteria for the assessment of any development proposals adjacent to existing development limits. Core Policy CP11 provides guidance on a range of community, leisure and cultural assets
<b>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)</b>		
Support sustainable economic growth in rural areas. Planning strategies should promote a strong rural economy by taking a positive approach to new development. (28)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where relevant include a policy or policies which support the sustainable growth of rural businesses; promote the development and diversification of agricultural businesses; support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments, and support local services and facilities.</li> </ul>	Richmondshire is defined as one of the most rural areas by Defra. The local plan area does not include the national park areas, but remains predominantly rural in character, with at best urban fringe areas in Catterick Garrison. The overall strategic approach therefore, addresses a fundamentally rural economy. The presence of the Army at Catterick Garrison does not alter this perspective. Spatial Principles SP3 and SP5 develop a locally appropriate economic strategy, which reflects wider local, sub regional and former regional expectations. These are based on recent assessments of local employment growth and the economic impact of the military presence in the District and North Yorkshire (2010, TE021). The strategic economic approach recognises the building blocks of the rural economy, their scale and need for development. The DPD recognises that rural areas are dynamic environments built in response to current and historic economic pressures. The DPD looks forward and encourages continuing diversification and adaptation of an appropriate scale in the countryside. Core Policies CP7(Sustainable Economy), CP8 (Rural Sustainability), CP9 (Town and Local Centres) and CP10 (Tourism) provide further guidance .
<b>4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-</b>		

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<b>41)</b>		
<p>Facilitate sustainable development whilst contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. (29)</p> <p>Balance the transport system in favour of sustainable transport modes and give people a real choice about how they travel whilst recognising that different policies will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas. (29)</p> <p>Encourage solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and congestion (29) including supporting a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. (30)</p> <p>Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development. (31)</p> <p>Opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure. (32)</p> <p>Ensure that developments which generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (34)</p> <p>Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint working with adjoining authorities, transport providers and Government Agencies on infrastructure provision in order to support sustainable economic growth with particular regard to the facilities referred to in paragraph 31.</li> <li>• Policies encouraging development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport and a range of transport choices where appropriate, particularly the criteria in paragraph 35.</li> <li>• A spatial strategy and policy which seeks to reduce the need to travel through balancing housing and employment provision.</li> <li>• Policy for major developments which promotes a mix of uses and access to key facilities by sustainable transport modes.</li> <li>• If local (car parking) standards have been prepared, are they justified and necessary? (39)</li> <li>• Identification and protection of sites and routes where infrastructure could be developed to widen transport choice linked to the Local Transport Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>The spatial strategy of the DPD seeks to create a strong focus for the network of local communities through stronger service centres (Spatial Principles SP1 – SP5 and Sub Area Strategies). This increases the opportunities for offering a range of transport options focussed on access to services and facilities in the District. The focus of development in these areas increases the potential resources to resolve and encourage transport improvements, which would be lost if development was distributed more widely.</p> <p>The Lower Wensleydale Sub Area Strategy supports the reinstatement of the Wensleydale Railway.</p> <p>Core Policy CP2 (Sustainable Development) supports the provision of accessible transport opportunities.</p> <p>The Delivering Development DPD will address site specific opportunities for sustainable transport improvements. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the need for this type of improvement and provision will be made in the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging schedule (TE025).</p>



Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>the movement of goods or people. (35)</p> <p>Policies should aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. (37)</p> <p>For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties. (38)</p> <p>The setting of car parking standards including provision for town centres. (39-40)</p> <p>Local planning authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice. (41)</p>		
<p><b>5. Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)</b></p>		
<p>Support the expansion of the electronic communications networks, including telecommunications’ masts and high speed broadband. (43)</p> <p>Local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new telecommunications development in certain areas, impose blanket Article 4 directions over a wide area or a wide range of telecommunications development or insist on minimum distances between new telecommunications development and existing development. (44)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy supporting the expansion of electronic communications networks, including telecommunications and high speed broadband, noting the caveats in para 44.</li> </ul>	<p>Core Policy CP7m supports the expansion of communications infrastructure. Core Policy CP14 supports the integration of infrastructure with growth.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p><b>6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality housing (paras 47-55)</b></p>		
<p>Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements; this should include an additional buffer of 5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. 20% buffer applies where there has been persistent under delivery of housing(47)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) five years or more supply of specific deliverable sites; plus the buffer as appropriate</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Where this element of housing supply includes windfall sites, inclusion of 'compelling evidence' to justify their inclusion (48)</li> <li>• A SHLAA</li> </ul>	<p>A five year land supply is available that exceeds the buffers required for persistent undersupply, despite this being arguable. (AMR 2012, PP0019). The overall quantum of growth has been calculated at the District rather than plan area level. This reflects the different planning regime in the national park area of the district and also the calculation of housing targets in the former Regional Spatial Strategy (PS001). Housing growth in the national park will not deliver the strategic level of housing growth required by the resident population and the Core Strategy proposes to assimilate the net effect of this into the plan area (Duty to Cooperate, SD006).</p> <p>Windfall sites have been a substantial element of housing delivery, but by their nature are not predictable. Therefore the emphasis is on land supply in support of Core Strategy objectives.</p> <p>A SHLAA has been published (TE015).</p> <p>The interaction of Housing growth in the national park and local plan areas of the district and windfall sites will be monitored in subsequent AMRs.</p>
<p>Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15 (47).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of a supply of developable sites or broad locations for: a) years 6-10; b) years 11-15</li> </ul>	<p>Identified in the SHLAA(TE015).</p>
<p>Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory; and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained. (47)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A housing trajectory</li> <li>• Monitoring of completions and permissions (47)</li> <li>• Updated and managed SHLAA. (47)</li> </ul>	<p>The Core Strategy is not an allocations document. The housing trajectory can only be stated in terms of annual average delivery as summarised in the Annual Monitoring report (AMR 2012, PP0019). The Delivering Development Plan will allocate sites enabling a full housing trajectory to be defined.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
Set out the authority's approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (47).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy on the density of development.</li> </ul>	To be defined in the Delivering Development DPD
Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50) and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand. (para 159)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy on planning for a mix of housing (including self-build, and housing for older people</li> <li>SHMA</li> <li>Identification of the size, type, tenure and range of housing) required in particular locations, reflecting local demand. (50)</li> <li>Evidence for housing provision based on up to date, objectively assessed needs. (50)</li> <li>Policy on affordable housing and consideration for the need for on-site provision or if off-site provision or financial contributions are sought, where these can these be justified and to what extent do they contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. (50)</li> </ul>	<p>Spatial Principle SP4 is based on a robust assessment of demographic trends, which provides for the overall scale of development. (Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population, 2012, TE012)</p> <p>Central Richmondshire Sub Area Strategy provides for military housing, as required by national defence strategy.</p> <p>Core Policies CP5 and CP6 address housing mix and affordable housing provision and these are based on the North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011, TE007-9)</p> <p>Core Policy CP6 will be implemented through a Supplementary Planning Document currently in preparation</p>
<p>In rural areas be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate (54).</p> <p>In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of allowing some market housing to facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs.</li> <li>Consideration of the case for resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens. (This is discretionary)(para 53)</li> <li>Examples of special circumstances to allow new isolated homes listed at para 55.</li> </ul>	<p>The Richmondshire plan area is predominantly rural. Core Policy CP6 (Affordable Housing) provides for affordable housing need and scope for cross-subsidy of market housing on site.</p> <p>Core Policy CP8 (Rural Sustainability) provides for housing in the countryside where there is an explicit need for it to be located there.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<b>7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)</b>		
Develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area (58).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of policy or policies which seek to increase the quality of development through the principles set out at para 58 and approaches in paras 59-61, linked to the vision for the area and specific local issues</li> </ul>	Core Policy CP13 (High Quality Design)
<b>8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-77)</b>		
Policies should aim to design places which: promote community interaction, including through mixed-use development; are safe and accessible environments; and are accessible developments (69).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of a policy or policies on inclusive communities.</li> <li>Promotion of opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other, including through mixed-use developments which bring together those who work, live and play in the vicinity; safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion; and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. (69)</li> </ul>	<p>The following policies contribute to the promotion of healthy communities:</p> <p>Sub Area Strategies.</p> <p>Core Policy CP2 (Sustainable Development)</p> <p>Core Policy CP9 (Town and Local Centres)</p> <p>Core Policy CP11 (Community and Recreation Assets)</p> <p>Core Policy CP 13 (High Quality Design)</p>
Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of a policy or policies addressing community facilities and local service.</li> <li>Positive planning for the provision and</li> </ul>	<p>Spatial Principle SP2 (Settlement Hierarchy)</p> <p>Core Policy CP2 (Sustainable Development)</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>integration of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; safeguard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernize; and ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to key services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Core Policy CP11 (Community and Recreation Assets)</p>
<p>Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities; and set locally derived standards to provide these (73).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. (73)</li> <li>• A policy protecting existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land from development, with specific exceptions. (74)</li> <li>• Protection and enhancement of rights of way and access. (75)</li> </ul>	<p>A PPG17 assessment (TE019) was carried out in support of the proposed Garrison Town Centre development. This demonstrated that facilities in the area were in excess of expected minimum requirements. Since this was prepared the Catterick Garrison Leisure Centre was opened in 2011.</p> <p>Core Policy CP11 (Community and Recreation Assets)</p> <p>Core Policy CP12 (Natural and Historic Assets)</p>
<p>Enable local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them – ‘Local Green Space’ (76-78).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy enabling the protection of Local Green Spaces. (Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The designation should only be used when it accords with the criteria in para 77). Policy for managing development within a local green space should be consistent with</li> </ul>	<p>A task for the Delivering Development DPD</p> <p>There is no Green Belt</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	policy for Green Belts. (78)	
<b>9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)</b>		
<p>Local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. (81)</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. (83)</p> <p>When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. (84)</p> <p>Boundaries should be set using ‘physical features likely to be permanent’ amongst other things (85)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where Green Belt policies are included, these should reflect the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. (81)</li> <li>○ Accord with criteria on boundary setting, and the need for clarity on the status of safeguarded land, in particular. (85)</li> <li>○ Specify that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. (87)</li> <li>○ Specify the exceptions to inappropriate development (89-90)</li> <li>○ Identify where very special circumstances might apply to renewable energy development. (91)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Not Applicable
<b>10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)</b>		
<p>Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations. (94)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning of new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>• Support for energy efficiency improvements to existing building.</li> <li>• Local requirements for a building’s</li> </ul>	The Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (2012, TE010) provides the background to Core Policy CP1 (Climate Change)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	sustainability which are consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy . (95))	
Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy through a strategy, policies maximising renewable and low carbon energy, and identification of key energy sources. (97)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strategy and policies to promote and maximise energy from renewable and low carbon sources,</li> <li>• Identification of suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources (see also NPPF footnote 17)</li> <li>• Identification of where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers. (97)</li> </ul>	Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (2012, TE010)  Core Policy CP1 (Climate Change)
Minimise vulnerability to climate change and manage the risk of flooding (99)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Account taken of the impacts of climate change. (99)</li> <li>• Allocate, and where necessary re-locate, development away from flood risk areas through a sequential test, based on a SFRA. (100)</li> <li>• Policies to manage risk, from a range of impacts, through suitable adaptation measures</li> </ul>	Allocations will be made in the Delivering Development DPD. The technical advice for this process is provided by the North West Yorkshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010, TE006)  Core Policy CP1 (Climate Change) establishes the strategic approach in the DPD
Manage risk from coastal change (106)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of where the coast is likely to experience physical changes and identify Coastal Change Management Areas, and clarity on what development will be allowed in such areas.</li> <li>• Provision for development and</li> </ul>	Not applicable

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>infrastructure that needs to be re-located from such areas, based on SMPs and Marine Plans, where appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)</b></p>		
<p>Protect valued landscapes (109)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strategy and policy or policies to create, protect, enhance and manage networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</li> <li>• Policy which seeks to minimise the loss of higher quality agricultural land and give great weight to protecting the landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks, the Broads and AONBs.</li> </ul>	<p>Core Policy CP12 (Natural and Historic Assets)</p>
<p>Prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability (109)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy which seeks development which is appropriate for its location having regard to the effects of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity.</li> </ul>	<p>Core Policy CP2 (Sustainable Development)</p>
<p>Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (117)</p> <p>Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification and mapping of local ecological networks and geological conservation interests.</li> <li>• Policies to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the recovery of priority species</li> </ul>	<p>Core Policy CP12 (Natural and Historic Assets)</p> <p>Richmondshire Biodiversity Action Plan (TE016)</p> <p>Yorkshire and Humber Biodiversity Strategy (TE020)</p> <p>North Yorkshire Biodiversity Opportunities Map (TE022)</p>
<p><b>12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126-141)</b></p>		
<p>Include a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk (126)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strategy for the historic environment based on a clear understanding of the cultural assets in the plan area,</li> </ul>	<p>Core Policy CP12 (Natural and Historic Assets)</p>



Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>including assets most at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A map/register of historic assets</li> <li>• A policy or policies which promote new development that will make a positive contribution to character and distinctiveness. (126)</li> </ul>	Listed buildings and scheduled monuments (TE023)
<p><b>13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)</b></p>		
<p>It is important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation (142)</p> <p>Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial materials (146)</p>	<p>Account taken of the matters raised in relation to paragraph 143 and 145, including matters in relation to land in national / international designations; landbanks; the defining of Minerals Safeguarding Areas; wider matters relating to safeguarding; approaches if non-mineral development is necessary within Minerals Safeguarding Areas; the setting of environmental criteria; development of noise limits; reclamation of land; plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. This could include evidence of co-operation with neighbouring and more distant authorities.</p>	<p>County Council is Mineral Planning Authority and is in the process of defining safeguarding areas.</p>

## Justified

- Founded on a robust and credible evidence base involving: research / fact finding demonstrating how the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts; and evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area.
- The most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p><i>Participation</i></p> <p>Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?</p>	<p>The consultation statement. This should set out what consultation was undertaken, when, with who and how it has influenced the plan. The statement should show that efforts have been made to consult hard to reach groups, key stakeholders etc.</p> <p>Reference SCI</p>	<p>Consultation Statement (SD005)</p> <p>Statement of Community Involvement (PP018)</p>
<p><i>Research / fact finding</i></p> <p>Is the plan justified by a sound and credible evidence base? What are the sources of evidence? How up to date, and how convincing is it?</p> <p>What assumptions were made in preparing the DPD? Were they reasonable and justified?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The studies, reports and technical papers that provide the evidence for the policies set out in the DPD, the date of preparation and who they were produced by.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections of the DPD (at various stages of development) and SA Report which illustrate how evidence supports the strategy, policies and proposals, including key assumptions.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very brief statement of how the main findings of consultation support the policies, with reference to: reports to the council on the issues raised during participation, covering both the front-loading and formulation phases; and</li> </ul>	<p>Each section of the submission draft DPD and its predecessors references relevant evidence. The key documents are set out in the Document Library. The most significant of these are:</p> <p>The Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population (Edge Analytics, 2012, TE012), which corrects problematic national population projections and provides a robust projection for the objective assessment of development demands.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review (Experian/internal,2012, TE005), which creates realistic expectations for economic growth</p> <p>The Catterick Garrison Strategic Transport Assessment (Jacobs, 2011, (TE003), assesses the key transport corridor for the development strategy and recommends necessary improvements to sustain growth.</p> <p>The North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (GVA, 2011, TE007-9), which provides the most recent assessment of</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>any other information on community views and preferences.</p> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each policy (or group of policies dealing with the same issue), a very brief statement of the evidence documents relied upon and how they support the policy (where this is not already clear in the reasoned justification in the DPD).</li> </ul>	<p>the local housing market and local housing need</p> <p>The Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (Three Dragons, 2011, TE004), which demonstrates the viability of affordable housing contributions policy.</p> <p>The Consultation Statement (SD005) shows how the Council has responded to issues raised in the development of individual policies or the overall strategic approach.</p>
<p><i>Alternatives</i></p> <p>Can it be shown that the LPA's chosen approach is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives? Have the reasonable alternatives been considered and is there a clear audit trail showing how and why the preferred approach was arrived at? Where a balance had to be struck in taking decisions between competing alternatives, is it clear how and why the decisions were taken?</p> <p>Does the sustainability appraisal show how the different options perform and is it clear that sustainability considerations informed the content of the DPD from the start?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports and consultation documents produced in the early stages setting out how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and the reasons for selecting the preferred strategy, and reasons for rejecting the alternatives. This should include options covering not just the spatial strategy, but also the quantum of development, strategic policies and development management policies.</li> <li>An audit trail of how the evidence base, consultation and SA have influenced the plan.</li> <li>Sections of the SA Report showing the assessment of options and alternatives.</li> <li>Reports on how decisions on the inclusion of policy were made.</li> <li>Sections of the consultation document demonstrating how options were developed and appraised.</li> <li>Any other documentation showing how alternatives were developed and</li> </ul>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2008, TE018) identified a series of sustainability objectives. These are the basis of the Sustainability Appraisal which tested the options available in this DPD. A further SA was completed for the Strategic Directions of Development consultation (2011, PP003-8)</p> <p>The Consultation Statement (SD005) shows how the Council has responded to issues raised in the development of individual policies or the overall strategic approach.</p> <p>The development of the Core Strategy DPD was considered by the Council's Local Plan Working Group (formerly Local Development Framework Working Group). LPWG papers cover the preparation of the DPD from inception in 2008.</p> <p>The Council's Strategy Board approved the Local Strategy Statement, the Strategic Directions of Development and the Submission Draft Core Strategy for publication as emerging Council policy</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	evaluated, including a report on how sustainability appraisal has influenced the choice of strategy and the content of policies.	

## Effective

- Be deliverable
- Demonstrate sound infrastructure delivery planning
- Have no regulatory or national planning barriers to its delivery
- Have delivery partners who are signed up to it
- Be coherent with the strategies of neighbouring authorities
- Demonstrate how the Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled
- Be flexible
- Be able to be monitored

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p><i>Deliverable and Coherent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the policies will meet the Plan’s vision and objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the objectives of the DPD?</li> <li>• Are the policies internally consistent?</li> <li>• Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives?</li> <li>• Does the DPD explain how its key policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections of the DPD which address delivery, the means of delivery and the timescales for key developments and initiatives.</li> <li>• Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the objectives and the identified means of delivery, such as evidence that the plans and programmes of other bodies have been taken into account (e.g.</li> </ul>	<p>The Local Development Scheme (PP001) sets out the relationship of this DPD with the planned suite of documents which comprise the Local Plan.</p> <p>DPD Chapter 3 explains the overall strategic approach of the DPD</p> <p>DPD Chapter 5 (Implementation and Delivery) addresses delivery issues and provides the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
objectives will be achieved?	<p>Water Resources Management Plans).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about the scope and content (actual and intended) of each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure.</li> <li>Section in the DPD that shows the linkages between the objectives and the corresponding policies, and consistency between policies (such as through a matrix).</li> </ul>	<p>The Duty to Cooperate Statement (SD006) and Consultation Statement (SD005) set out how each significant infrastructure provider has been engaged with the production of this DPD. This work is ongoing because of changes in national infrastructure and defence strategy affecting the plan area.</p>
<p><i>Infrastructure Delivery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the infrastructure implications of the policies clearly been identified?</li> <li>Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales for implementation of the policies clearly identified?</li> <li>Is it clear who is going to deliver the required infrastructure and does the timing of the provision complement the timescale of the policies?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A section or sections of the DPD where infrastructure needs are identified and the proposed solutions put forward.</li> <li>A schedule setting out responsibilities for delivery, mechanisms and timescales, and related to a CIL schedule where appropriate.</li> <li>Confirmation from infrastructure providers that they support the solutions proposed and the identified means and timescales for their delivery, or a plan for resolving issues.</li> <li>Demonstrable plan-wide viability, particularly in relation to the delivery of affordable housing and the role of a CIL schedule.</li> </ul>	<p>DPD Chapter 5 (Implementation and Delivery) addresses delivery issues and provides the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This now forms part of the draft CIL charging schedule , which is due to be published shortly.</p> <p>The Duty to Cooperate Statement (SD006) sets out how each significant infrastructure provider has been engaged with the production of this DPD. This work is ongoing because of changes in national infrastructure and defence strategy affecting the plan area.</p> <p>Both the CIL Viability Assessment (2012, TE025) and the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (2011, TE004) assess plan wide viability and drill this down into the sub areas.</p>
<p><i>Co-ordinated Planning</i></p> <p>Does the DPD reflect the concept of spatial planning? Does it go beyond traditional land use planning by bringing together and integrating policies for development and the use of land with other policies and programmes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections of the DPD that reflect the plans or strategies of the local authority and other bodies</li> <li>Policies which seek to pull together different policy objectives</li> </ul>	<p>This DPD is a Core Strategy and sets out key strategic objectives for development. The Duty to Cooperate Statement sets out how key agencies have been engaged in its production. Most significant locally is the Ministry of Defence, requiring understanding of local context and national defence strategy as</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>from a variety of agencies / organisations that influence the nature of places and how they function?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expressions of support/representations from bodies responsible for other strategies affecting the area</li> </ul>	<p>set out in the Central Richmondshire Sub area Strategy.</p> <p>Infrastructure delivery is a coordinated approach, with close liaison with North Yorkshire County Council.</p> <p>The Consultation Statement (SD005) and Representations Statement SD011) summarise support and identify continuing areas for work.</p>
<p><i>Flexibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the DPD flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances?</li> <li>Does the DPD include the remedial actions that will be taken if the policies need adjustment?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections of the DPD setting out the assumptions of the plan and identifying the circumstances when policies might need to be reviewed.</li> <li>Sections of the annual monitoring report and sustainability appraisal report describing how the council will monitor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the effectiveness of policies and what evidence is being collected to undertake this</li> <li>b. changes affecting the baseline information and any information on trends on which the DPD is based</li> </ul> </li> <li>Risk analysis of the strategy and policies to demonstrate robustness and how the plan could cope with changing circumstances</li> <li>Sections within the DPD dealing with possible change areas and how they would be dealt with, including mechanisms for the rate of development to be increased or slowed and how that would impact on other aspects of the strategy and on</li> </ul>	<p>The DPD sets out and overall scale and distribution of development, which is argued to best support the growth needs and capacities of the plan area. DPD Chapter 5 sets out the approach to implementation and monitoring, indicating the likely responses to departures from expected performance.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>infrastructure provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections of the DPD identifying the key indicators of success of the strategy, and the remedial actions which will be taken if adjustment is required.</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Co-operation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Duty to Co-operate has been undertaken appropriately for the plan being examined?</li> <li>Is it clear who is intended to implement each part of the DPD? Where the actions required are outside the direct control of the LPA, is there evidence that there is the necessary commitment from the relevant organisation to the implementation of the policies?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A succinct Duty to Co-operate Statement which flows from the strategic issues that have been addressed jointly. A 'tick box' approach or a collection of correspondence is not sufficient, and it needs to be shown (where appropriate) if joint plan-making arrangements have been considered, what decisions were reached and why.</li> <li>The Duty to Co-operate Statement could highlight: the sharing of ideas, evidence and pooling of resources; the practical policy outcomes of co-operation; how decisions were reached and why; and evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues which need other organisations to deliver on, common objectives for elements of strategy and policy; a memorandum of understanding; aligned or joint core strategies and liaison with other consultees as appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p>Duty to Cooperate statement (SD006)</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DPD Chapter 5)</p>
<p><i>Monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the DPD contain targets, and milestones which relate to the delivery of the policies, <b>(including housing trajectories where the DPD</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections of the DPD setting out indicators, targets and milestones</li> <li>Sections of the current annual monitoring report which report on</li> </ul>	<p>DPD Chapter 5 sets out the approach to implementation and monitoring. The Council's Annual Monitoring Report for 2013 and following years will be revised to reflect this approach.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>contains housing allocations)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how targets are to be measured (by when, how and by whom) and are these linked to the production of the annual monitoring report?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the significant effects identified in the sustainability appraisal report will be taken forward in the ongoing monitoring of the implementation of the plan, through the annual monitoring report?</li> </ul>	<p>indicators, targets, milestones and trajectories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to any other reports or technical documents which contain information on the delivery of policies</li> <li>• Sections of the current annual monitoring report and the sustainability appraisal report setting out the framework for monitoring, including monitoring the effects of the DPD against the sustainability appraisal</li> </ul>	<p>Sustainability Appraisal (SD002)</p>

### Consistent with national policy

The DPD should not contradict or ignore national policy. Where there is a departure, there must be clear and convincing reasoning to justify the approach taken

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the DPD contain any policies or proposals which are not consistent with national policy and, if so, is there local justification?</li> <li>• Does the DPD contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance? If so, why have these been included?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections of the DPD which explain where and how national policy has been elaborated upon and the reasons.</li> <li>• Studies forming evidence for the DPD or, where appropriate, other information which provides the rationale for departing from national policy.</li> <li>• Evidence provided from the</li> </ul>	<p>DPD policies provide detailed, but proportionate, local responses to NPPF. NPPF Compatibility Assessment (SD013) published with DPD.</p> <p>Core Policy CP0 is consistent with the recommended approach to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>The overall approach to the quantum of development may appear to be contrary to NPPF, but is based on an objective</p>



Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>sustainability appraisal (including reference to the sustainability report) and/or from the results of community involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations have been considered and dealt with.</li> </ul>	<p>assessment of local conditions. The background to this and the impact of erroneous national population projections for mid 2006 and mid 2008 is argued in the Richmondshire Scrutiny of Population (2102, TE012) and explained in the DPD (Spatial Principle SP4).</p> <p>The Representations Summary (SD011) identifies areas where representors consider aspects of the DPD to be inconsistent.</p>

## Planning policy for traveller sites

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites was published in 23 March 2012 and came into effect on 27 March 2012. Circular 01/06: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and Circular 04/07: Planning for Travelling Showpeople have been cancelled. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, including the implementation policies of that document.

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<b>Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)</b>		
Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early and effective engagement undertaken, including discussing travellers' accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups.</li> </ul>	The North Yorkshire Gypsies and Travellers Study (2008, TE017) identified the need for an additional two pitches in Richmondshire. There has been no demand for these pitches and no evidence of pressure from legitimate or unauthorised means.
Co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstration of a clear understanding of the needs of the traveller community over the lifespan of your development plan.</li> <li>• Collaborative working with neighbouring local planning authorities.</li> <li>• A robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of your local plan and make planning decisions.</li> </ul>	The Council has cooperated with Darlington Borough Council, which has a large traveller community. Both authorities are satisfied that the lack of demand in Richmondshire does not equate to resistance to development
<b>Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)</b>		

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in your area, working collaboratively with neighbouring LPAs.</p> <p>Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need.</p> <p>Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification, and annual update, of a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against locally set target. Identification of a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10, and, where possible, for years 11-15.</li> <li>• An assessment of the need for traveller sites, and where an unmet need has been demonstrated a supply of specific, deliverable sites been identified.</li> <li>• Policy which takes into account criteria a-h of para 11</li> </ul>	<p>(2008, TE017) identified the need for an additional two pitches in Richmondshire. There has been no demand for these pitches and no evidence of pressure from legitimate or unauthorised means. Spatial Principle SP4 sets out the approach to deal with future demand.</p>
<p><b>Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)</b></p>		
<p>When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings LPAs should ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.</p>		<p>Core Policy CP4 provides criteria for the assessment of all development proposals adjacent to settlements.</p>
<p><b>Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)</b></p>		
<p>If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, LPAs in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a rural exception site policy is used, and if so clarity that such sites shall be used for affordable traveller sites in perpetuity.</li> </ul>	<p>This DPD does not allocate sites</p>

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
travellers sites.		
<b>Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)</b>		
<p>Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</p> <p>Exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (which might be to accommodate a site inset within the Green Belt) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site ... should be done only through the plan-making process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green Belt boundary revisions made in response to a specific identified need for a traveller site, undertaken through the plan making process.</li> </ul>	Not applicable
<b>Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)</b>		
<p>Local planning authorities should consider, wherever possible, including traveller sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of the need for sites for mixed residential and business use (having regard to safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents), or separate sites in close proximity to one another.</li> <li>N.B. Mixed use should not be permitted on rural exception sites</li> </ul>	This DPD does not allocate sites.
<b>Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)</b>		

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Local planning authorities should work with the planning applicant and the affected traveller community to identify a site or sites suitable for relocation of the community if a major development proposal requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where a major development proposal requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site, the identification of a site or sites suitable for re-location of the community.</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable</p>