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		Russell
Last name		Hall
Job title (if applicable)		Principal Planner
Work/organisation (if applicable)	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	England & Lyle Ltd
Address	C/O Agent	Gateway House 55 Coniscliffe Road Darlington
Postcode		DL3 7EH
Telephone No.		(01325) 469236
Email address		info@england-lyle.co.uk

Part B - Your representation

Please use a separate sheet for each representation.

Name/Organisation	England & Lyle 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)	Spatial Principles– Policy SP4 Scale and Distribution and Housing
Page/paragraph number(s)	Page 23 - 25

<u>Please note:</u> 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. <u>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.</u>

Q2. Do you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is…?						
(a) Legally compliant	Yes		No		Don't Know	X
(b) Sound	Yes		No	X	Don't Know	
If you answered 'No' to (a) or (b) above, please continue to Q3, otherwise continue to Q5.						

Q3. **Do you consider the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not: (please refer to the guidance notes)**	
(a) Justified	**X**
(b) Effective	
(c) Consistent with national policy	**X**
(d) Positively prepared	**X**

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:

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The tone for the Council's approach to development across the District over the plan period is set out in Strategic Objectives A & B on Page 12 of the Core Strategy Submission. Objective A advises that the change in the District over the plan period should reflect the needs of the area and its *'relative lack of potential for growth'*. This approach is not justified in any detail within the Core Strategy Document and indeed contradicts earlier findings of the Council's

Search Areas & Strategic Direction of Development Papers (September 2011) which identified significant areas for growth, particularly within and around Catterick Garrison. The Core Strategy is **not planned positively**.

The National Planning Planning Policy Framework, at Section 6 (Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes) it makes explicit that local planning authorities should 'boost significantly the supply of housing' through a number of means, including:-

> *'use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets **the full, objectively assessed needs of market and affordable housing in the housing market area**, as far as consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period' (Paragraph 47 NPPF (2012))'*

RICHMONDSHIRE MARKET & AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENT (SCALE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT)

The Council acknowledges at Section 4.6.5 (Page 67) of the Core Strategy Submission Draft that the North Yorkshire SHMA 2011 identifies that there is an estimated need for 260 affordable dwellings per annum over the next 5 years based on both the existing and future demand. Notwithstanding this the Core Strategy seeks only to make provision for 180 dwellings (market & affordable) per annum over the plan period with an affordable housing requirement, set out in draft Policy CP6 (Page 66), ranging between 30 – 40% dependent upon the Sub Area.

The overall housing requirements (annual requirement for 180 dwellings) appears to be based entirely on population estimates form this point forward and does not take into account the 'pent up' demand/need or 'backlog' for housing resulting from low levels of affordable and market housing delivery over recent years. The NYSHMA demonstrates, that taking into existing/immediate need ('backlog') and future requirements, an average of 260 dwellings per annum would need to be delivered over the next 5 years. Once the backlog is cleared the need would be for around 156 dwellings per annum (net) – almost the same as the total housing requirement being sought by the draft Core Strategy.

Presuming that that 180 (net) new dwellings are delivered per annum and are complaint with Policy CP6 (Providing Affordable Housing) in respect of affordable delivery , this will amount to 71 affordable dwellings per annum which represents 28.5% of the identified

affordable housing need for the next 5 years. If the affordable backlog were addressed, 180 dwellings per annum would only deliver 45% of the future affordable housing requirement (net).

The Council's Local Plan **will not meet the full and objectively assessed needs of market and affordable housing in the housing market area**, it is therefore **in conflict with national policy** and **not positively prepared**. It is therefore **unsound.**

There is no reasoned justification provided for the assertion *'it is unlikely that new development will ever met the demand for affordable housing'* (page 67). There is no evidence or justification that demonstrates that planning for a greater number of houses to achieve greater amounts of affordable housing, or other alternatives (noting that the Council have acknowledged that there is insufficient public funding to deliver affordable housing schemes), would result in circumstances that would fundamentally conflict with the policies within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Core Strategy is **not justified** in this respect.

The suggestion from the outset of the Core Strategy (Strategic Objective A (Page 12) that the overall change in Richmondshire should reflect the lack of potential for growth. It would appear (see Strategic Objective D page 13) that this is very much directed at the historic built and natural environment around the town of Richmond which is constrained.

Richmond is however only one of the Principal Towns. It is clear that the Garrison Area, the other Principal Town, is the key location for growth across the plan period. Morover, and as identified in the Council's evidence base documents (see Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn Development Search Areas & Strategic Direction of Development Paper September 2011) there are extensive parcels of land within and around the entire Garrison Area suitable for development. In particular, there are viable greenfield sites that will provide a significant amounts of housing whilst meet all affordable housing and infrastructure requirements. The viability constraints of brownfield sites in the poorer sub-housing market areas of the Garrison, and indeed elsewhere, are, based on experience, unlikely to deliver the level of affordable housing required.

The final directions of growth taken forward by the Council, as set out in the Core Strategy Submission (see Figure 8 page 37) **were not** the only areas considered suitable for development. Instead, the Strategic Development Growth Areas are those identified by the

Council that would accommodate the Council's proposed development requirements over the plan period and are not the only appropriate areas for development.

In real, and policy, terms the Garrison Area is relatively unconstrained in landscape, historic and environmental designations. Morover, subject to appropriate mitigation, there is appropriate infrastructure to accommodate a very significant scale of development.

(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:

The housing requirements set out in Policy SP4 should be increased to approximately 600 dwellings for the first 5 years of the plan (to address the affordable housing backlog) and thereafter 347 dwellings per annum for the remainder of the plan period to address affordable and market needs.

The suggested quantum of development, coupled with the affordable housing requirement as set out in Policy CP6 (Providing Affordable Housing), will allow for the Core Strategy to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area in a manner which is consistent with the policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Strategic Development Growth Area Diagram for Richmond and Catterick Garrison

(Figure 8) should be amended to increase the extent of the Strategic Development Growth Area in the Garrison Area to accommodate the required amount of development in this Principal Town consistent with the proposed distribution of development.

Extract from *Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn (Catterick Garrison): Development Search Areas and Strategic Directions of Development Paper (2011)*

Subject to refinement, it is clear from the assessment of Pro's and Con's as set out in the Council's *Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn (Catterick Garrison): Development Search Areas and Strategic Directions of Development Paper (2011)* that a significant portion of land in the Area B - North and East of Colburn/Walkerville, in particular the land directly to the north of Catterick Road (as identified below), could provide a sustainable and logical housing site within the Garrison Area without undermining or significantly conflicting with the requirements of the NPPF or any historical, landscape or ecological designations.

Pros	Cons
Close to local amenities at The Broadway and White Shops.	Ownership of some of the land in the area is not known and therefore availability of all the land for development cannot be confirmed at this stage.
Southern and Eastern areas have access from the A6136 and A1, particularly with junction improvements.	Close to small settlement of Colburn Village, Colburn Hall and Colburn Farm and need to maintain some separation to protect the character of the village. There is a desire to maintain some separation between Colburn and Hipswell
Areas of land to the south are close to existing bus routes, serving Town Centre, Richmond and Darlington.	Access to the most westerly areas may require upgrading of access.
Close to existing employment at Colburn and Walkerville.	Colburn Beck is to the western extreme of this area and can be liable to flooding affecting a very limited extent of the most westerly areas.
Potential for mixed use and future employment in this location.	Reports of Clinker presence on land to south west.
Potential to redevelop the Sewage Works for alternative use.	The Waste Water Treatment Works is located to the north of Piper Hill and it may restrict nearby residential development due to amenity issues such as smells and odours.
Predominantly within low flood risk areas (Flood Zone 1).	Colburn primary school has some limited capacity.
Although predominantly greenfield it is located between large scale development at Hipswell and Colburn/Piper Hill, which may minimise the impact on the overall settlement form.	The Coast to Coast footpath runs is to the north of this option. Careful consideration should be given to the design of development to ensure that there is not an adverse impact on views from the path.
	A public right of way runs through the area.
	Grade 3 agricultural land (moderate)
Relatively close to existing primary schools.	
Northern parts of the site have good access to the Coast to Coast path	
Pedestrian and cycle routes along the A6136 provide reasonably level routes to the town centre from the south of the option.	

Extract from *Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn (Catterick Garrison): Development Search Areas and Strategic Directions of Development Paper (2011)*

In addition, the development of the site would not affect the character or setting of Colburn Hall, Colburn Village or Colburn Farm and would maintain a significant separation between Colburn and Hipswell.

The development of the site would accord with the aspirations and details of the Central

Richmondshire Spatial Strategy (CRSS) in respect of the strategic growth of Catterick Garrison and all other relevant proposed Core Policies.

The above-mentioned approach will ensure that the Core Strategy Local Plan is:-

Positively Prepared – The proposals will set out a strategy which seeks to meet the objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements of the plan area including tackling the significant affordable housing shortfalls of the District.

Justified – The above-mentioned proposal would be the most appropriate strategy by providing significant amounts of development land, across a range of relatively unconstrained sites, providing the right amount of development to meet the identified need of the plan area.

The proposed approach of the Council to affordable and market housing delivery has not evolved through a thorough assessment of alternatives. The Core Strategy submission draft provides no logical justification, having regard to national planning policy, why any approach other than meeting the full and identified needs of the plan area should be adopted.

Effective – The land and quantum of development suggested above will assist in meeting the identified development needs of the District in a viable and deliverable manner in the short to medium term.

Consistent with National Policy – the amount of housing development suggested above will ensure that the Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area (Paragraph 47 of the NPPF).

Moreover, the delivery of significant scale of development at Catterick Garrison (the main Principal Town for development), in our professional view, will fully accord with the policies set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular in respect of delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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:
(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	X

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:
To be party to the discussions on the matters set out within this representation and to expand on the points raised if considered necessary/helpful by the Council or the Planning Inspector.

If you wish to be notified of future stages of plan preparation, please tick the appropriate box(es) below.			
Submission for Examination	**X**	**Notify me by:** (please tick)	
Inspector's Report Publication	**X**	Post	
Adoption	**X**	Email	**X**

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:	R Hall
Date:	14/09/2012