9

Ack

AJRF/RID1345/DPD strategy

3rd September 2012

Planning Policy
Richmondshire District Council
Swale House
Frenchgate
Richmond
North Yorkshire
DL10 4JE

RICHMONDSHIRE
REC'D 03 SEP 2012

Dear Sir / Madam

LDF Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy
Proposed Submission August 2012
Comments submitted on behalf of Castlevale – Land at Hipswell Croft, Hipswell

We act on behalf of Castlevale Group Ltd who have an interest in land at Hipswell Croft and are therefore expressly interested in the future development housing options pertinent to Hipswell. The site has been identified as part of the Council's five year housing land supply in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (Site ID 12).

We have previously submitted representations on behalf of Castlevale Group Ltd in October 2011 and June 2010 with regards 'Additional Core Strategy Consultation: Control and release of Sites for Development' and 'Preferred Core Strategy' respectively.

Following the publication of your 'Local Plan Core Strategy Proposed Submission' document, please find detailed below my comments with specific regard to 'soundness'. Please also refer to the enclosed completed Representations Form.

NPPF and the test of 'Soundness'

Paragraph 182 of the NPPF relates to examination of Local Plans and that plans submitted for examination should be 'sound'. To be considered 'sound' the plan should be:

- Positively Prepared
- Justified;
- Effective; and
- Consistent with National Policy

Further details on soundness are set out below.

Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states:-

> *"A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:*

t: 0113 243 6116 f: 0113 245 9042 a: Atlas House, 31 King Street, Leeds, LS1 2HL
t: 0845 604 4665 a: Alder House, Willow Tree Park, Booths Lane, Lymm, Cheshire, WA13 0GH
w: www.idplanning.co.uk

Registered in ENGLAND No: 05271142

- ***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.*
- ***Justified*** *- the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;*
- ***Effective*** *– the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and*
- ***Consistent with national policy*** *– the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.*

Having reviewed the Core Strategy (Proposed Submission) in the context of advice and guidance set out in the NPPF, Castlevale Group Limited consider it to be sound on the basis that it (the Core Strategy):

- has been 'positively prepared' consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- is 'justified' in terms of setting out an appropriate strategy based on proportionate evidence;
- is 'effective' in terms of deliverability over the period to 2028 with effective joint working with neighbouring authorities (in particular Darlington, County Durham and Yorkshire Dales National Park): and
- is 'consistent with national policy' in that it has been prepared in accordance with the NPPF, in particular, its presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Castlevale Group Limited therefore maintains its support for the Core Strategy, and in particular to Policies SP1, SP2 and SP4 and the Central Richmondshire Spatial Strategy (CRSS).

Spatial Principle SP1 identifies Central Richmondshire as the area of greatest growth, reflecting the location of the main towns of Richmond and Catterick Garrison. This is the area where most housing and employment related development will take place. Castlevale Group therefore support the principles of promoting development with Catterick Garrison and in particular Hipswell where there is available land to meet the development aspirations of the council.

As regards Spatial Principle SP2 on settlement hierarchy, Castlevale Group support the recognition of Catterick Garrison being a principal town and being the main focus in the Plan area for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.

Castlevale Group Ltd also support the spatial principles of SP4 on the scale and distribution of housing development which recognises settlement hierarchy and the requirement to provide some 1,900 homes in Catterick Garrison which include Hipswell.

Castlevale Group Ltd also fully support the Central Richmondshire Spatial Strategy (CRSS), particularly the preferred direction of strategic growth for high quality new housing and employment development within the strategic growth area as defined in figure 8 on page 37 of the proposed submission document. Castlevale Group Ltd have an interest in land which is

genuinely available, deliverable and viable and can assist in meeting the objectives of delivering 1,900 homes through the Catterick Garrison area.

In relation to the core policies as set out in Chapter 4 of the proposed submission Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy, Castlevale Group also support Core Policies CP0, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP6 and CP13.

Core Policy CP0 entitled "Planning Positively" seeks to reflect the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework and encourages applications that accord with the policies of this Local Plan to be approved without delay. This consistent approach to reflect national guidance is fully supported by Castlevale Group Ltd.

Core Policy CP3 seeks to support the settlement hierarchy with Core Policy CP4 seeking to support sites for development which, in particular, reflect the terms of the scale and distribution of development defined by Spatial Principles SP4 and SP5.

To that end, Castlevale Group consider the submission documents to be sound having due regard to the NPPF and the knowledge the objectives of the Core Strategy can be met through the availability and deliverability of appropriate land.

I trust that the above and enclosed will be given your full attention and look forward to attending and participating in the oral part of the examination.

Yours faithfully

Richard Irving BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Director

cc Castlevale Group Limited

enc – Completed Representations Form

RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Richmondshire District Council
Local Plan Core Strategy
Proposed Submission
August 2012

Representations Form

Please read the guidance notes before completing this form

This form comprises two parts:
Part A - Personal details
Part B - Your representation(s)

Both Part A and Part B of this form need to be completed in order for your representation(s) to be valid. Please complete a separate sheet (Part B) for each representation you wish to make. Further copies of this form can be downloaded from www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx
You do not need to fill out Part A for each representation, provided that all representations made are securely attached.

Your completed form must be returned to the following address to reach us no later than 4pm on Friday 14 September 2012:

Planning Policy
Richmondshire District Council
Swale House
Frenchgate
Richmond
DL10 4JE

Alternatively, you can email localplan@richmondshire.gov.uk and submit this form as an attachment.

Please note, all representations will be made available for public inspection on our website www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx with personal details (i.e. email address, telephone number and signature) removed.

PART A - Personal details

	YOUR DETAILS	AGENT'S DETAILS
Title		MR
First name		RICHARD
Last name		IRVING
Job title (if applicable)		DIRECTOR
Work/Organisation (if applicable)	CASTLEVALE GROUP LTD	I D PLANNING
Address	2 BAILEY COURT COLBURN BUSINESS PARK COLBURN	ATLAS HOUSE 31 KING STREET LEEDS
Postcode	DL9 4QL	LS1 2HL
Telephone no.		0113 243 6116
Email address		richard@idplanning.co.uk

PART B - Your representation(s)
Please use a separate form for each representation

Name/Organisation: CASTLEVALE Ltd

Q1 To which part of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document does this representation relate? (Spatial Principle, Sub Area Strategy or Core Policy)

Policy number (e.g. SP2, CRSS or CP8): SP1; SP2; SP4; CRSS; CP0; CP2; CP3; CP4; CP6; CP13

Page/paragraph number(s):

Please Note: Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to fully support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Q2 Do you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is ...?

	Yes	No	Don't know
(a) Legally compliant	✓	☐	☐
(b) Sound	✓	☐	☐

If you answered '*No*' to (a) or (b) above, please continue to Q3, otherwise continue to Q5

Q3 Do you consider the Core Strategy unsound because it is NOT...? *(please refer to guidance notes)*

- ☐ *Justified*
- ☐ *Effective*
- ☐ *Consistent with national policy*
- ☐ *Positively prepared*

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible:

N/A.

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Q4 Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q3 where this relates to soundness. You need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible:

N/A.

Q5 If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, please use the space below to set out your comments:

SEE ATTACHED SUPPORTING CORRESPONDENCE DATED 3rd SEPTEMBER 2012

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

If your representation is seeking a change to the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

☐ *No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination*

☑ *Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination*

If you have selected '*No*', your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

WE ACT FOR A DEVELOPMENT COMPANY WHO HAS AN INTEREST IN STRATEGIC LAND IN THE STRATEGIC GROWTH AREA.

If you wish to be notified of future stages of plan preparation, please tick the appropriate box(es) below:

☑ *Submission for Examination*

☑ *Inspector's Report Publication*

☑ *Adoption*

Please notify me by:

☑ *Post*

☑ *Email*

Please Note: The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature: FOR ID PLANNING

Date: 3rd SEPTEMBER 2012