

# Ryedale District Council STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT



**ROGER TYM & PARTNERS**  
Planners and Development Economists

Main Report  
October 2009

**ROGER TYM & PARTNERS**

61 Oxford Street  
Manchester  
M1 6EQ

t 0161 245 8900  
f 0161 245 8901  
e [manchester@tymconsult.com](mailto:manchester@tymconsult.com)  
w [www.tymconsult.com](http://www.tymconsult.com)

*This document is formatted for double-sided printing.*

## **Foreword**

This document is the first Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) for Ryedale. The SHLAA considers the potential supply of housing across the part of the District outside of the National Park over a 20-year period from a base date of April 2008. The SHLAA is a technical study of housing potential, working on the best available information at a point in time; this means it is not necessarily fully inclusive.

Between April 2008 and the publication of the final report, it is likely that some circumstances will have changed such as, for instance, resolutions to grant planning permission on particular sites. The SHLAA will be updated to ensure that the assumptions within it and the estimates of supply are as up to date as possible.

The SHLAA forms part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) evidence base, along with a range of other technical studies. It does not in any way prejudice decisions to be taken by the District Council in relation to preferred directions of growth, site identification in Development Plan Documents (DPDs) or the determination of planning applications.

Ryedale District Council will use the SHLAA as a starting point for its consideration of which sites to bring forward as allocations in the Facilitating Development DPD. Considerable further work will be required in order to ensure that the identification of sites in the Housing Delivery DPD is based on sound and up to date information.

If you have more up to date information that you feel will be relevant to the first SHLAA update, and would help in analysing the full potential of any site, please contact the Council's Forward Planning Team on (tel) 01653 600666.

*Ryedale District Council*



# Glossary

| <b>Abbreviation</b> |   |
|---------------------|---|
| AONB                | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty  |
| AHLV                | Area of High Landscape Value  |
| CFS                 | Call for Sites  |
| CLG                 | Communities and Local Government  |
| DETR                | Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions<br>(former Government Department which no longer exists) |
| DPA                 | Dwellings Per Annum   |
| DPD                 | Development Plan Document   |
| DPH                 | Dwellings Per Hectare   |
| GOYH                | Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber  |
| HCA                 | Homes and Communities Agency  |
| LDD                 | Local Development Document  |
| IRS                 | Integrated Regional Strategy  |
| LDF                 | Local Development Framework   |
| LPA                 | Local Planning Authority  |
| NLUD                | National Land Use Database  |
| NYMNP               | North York Moors National Park  |
| PDL                 | Previously Developed Land   |
| PPG                 | Planning Policy Guidance  |
| PPS                 | Planning Policy Statement   |
| RSS                 | Regional Spatial Strategy   |
| SHLAA               | Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment  |
| SHMA                | Strategic Housing Market Assessment   |
| Y&HA                | Yorkshire and Humber Assembly   |



# CONTENTS

## GLOSSARY

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....   | <b>1</b>  |
|          | Purpose of the Study.....   | 1         |
|          | Stakeholder Involvement.....  | 1         |
|          | Structure of Our Report.....  | 2         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY REQUIREMENTS</b> .....   | <b>3</b>  |
|          | Planning Policy Statement 3 (November 2006): Housing .....  | 3         |
|          | SHLAA Practice Guidance (July 2007) .....   | 4         |
|          | Yorkshire and Humber’s Strategic Housing Land Availability - Regional Practice Guide<br>(Y&HA, April 2008)..... | 5         |
|          | The Yorkshire and Humber Plan - RSS12 (GOYH, May 2008) .....  | 6         |
|          | Emerging Ryedale Local Development Framework .....  | 7         |
| <b>3</b> | <b>STUDY METHODOLOGY</b> .....  | <b>9</b>  |
|          | Requirements of the SHLAA Practice Guidance .....   | 9         |
|          | Stage 1 - Planning the Assessment .....   | 9         |
|          | Stage 2 - Sources of Potential Housing Sites .....  | 10        |
|          | Stage 3 - Desktop Review of Existing Information.....   | 11        |
|          | Stage 4 - Determining Which Sites and Areas Will Be Surveyed .....  | 11        |
|          | Stage 5 - Carrying Out the Assessment .....   | 11        |
|          | Stage 6 - Estimating the Housing Potential of Each Site .....   | 13        |
|          | Stage 7 - Assessing When and Whether Sites are Likely to be Developed.....                                      | 13        |
|          | Stage 8 - Review of the Assessment.....   | 14        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>STUDY FINDINGS</b> .....   | <b>17</b> |
|          | Introduction .....  | 17        |
|          | Dwelling Targets .....  | 17        |
|          | Supply from Housing Commitments.....  | 18        |
|          | Potential Supply from the 209 SHLAA Sites.....  | 20        |
|          | Adequacy of Housing Provision .....   | 26        |





# 1 INTRODUCTION

## Purpose of the Study

- 1.1 In October 2008, Roger Tym & Partners was commissioned by Ryedale District Council to undertake a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), covering the part of the District outside of the North York Moors National Park<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.2 PPS3 establishes the requirement for LPAs to undertake SHLAAs, which are a key part of an LPA's evidence base. In Section 2 of our report, we outline the detailed requirements placed upon LPAs by PPS3; in summary, the role of a SHLAA is to provide evidence on the availability of suitable land for housing.
- 1.3 The purpose of the Ryedale SHLAA is therefore to:
- identify sufficient 'deliverable' sites to meet the 5-year dwelling targets for Ryedale that are prescribed by the adopted Yorkshire and Humber Plan (RSS12); and to
  - identify further 'developable' sites to meet the 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.4 As well as sites which already had planning permission for housing at the study base date (1 April 2008), we have assessed more than 200 additional sites (both greenfield and brownfield) in terms of their 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability' for housing development, in accordance with the CLG's SHLAA Practice Guidance of July 2007<sup>3</sup>. We have also taken account of advice in the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Practice Guide of April 2008.
- 1.5 **It is important to emphasise that the SHLAA is a technical study which forms part of the LDF evidence base, along with a range of other technical studies. It does not in any way prejudice decisions to be taken by the District Council in relation to preferred directions of growth, site identification in Development Plan Documents (DPDs) or the determination of planning applications.**

## Stakeholder Involvement

- 1.6 Reflecting advice in the Guidance that stakeholders should be engaged in the SHLAA process from the outset, we have undertaken a range of consultation exercises to inform the study. The various consultation exercises that informed the study are listed below (a more detailed review is provided in Appendix 11 of Volume 2):
- A stakeholder seminar was held on Monday 20 April 2009 at the District Council's offices in Malton, attended by Council officers and a range of external stakeholders including developers, housebuilders, planning consultants and agents.
  - Consultation with strategic public sector bodies and utilities providers, including strategic public sector bodies such as Natural England and the Homes and Communities Agency, as well as utilities providers such as Yorkshire Water, National Grid and United Utilities.
  - Consultations with local estate agents.
  - We also considered the sites that were submitted through the various call for sites exercises which the District Council has conducted over the last couple of years.

---

<sup>1</sup> As agreed with the Council we have considered sites anywhere in Helmsley, part of which falls within the National Park.

<sup>2</sup> Paragraphs 34, 53 and 55 of PPS3 require LPAs to identify a supply of deliverable sites for the first 5 years, and a further supply of developable sites for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15. The RSS runs until 2026, however, and so we have also considered a fourth 5-year period, which means the study covers the period 2008-28.

<sup>3</sup> Hereafter referred to as 'the Guidance'.

- 1.7 All of the very useful and informative dialogue described above - as well as close liaison with Council officers throughout the study - has informed our work and has helped to ensure that the study outputs are as robust as possible.

## Structure of Our Report

- 1.8 The remainder of our report is structured as follows:
- Section 2 contains a review of the national, regional and local planning policy contexts, as well as the requirements of the SHLAA Practice Guidance;
  - Section 3 describes the methodology that we employed for the study; and
  - Section 4 provides the results from the study and assesses how the RSS-based dwelling targets can be achieved.
- 1.9 Our overall study outputs are as follows:
- Volume 1 - 'Main Report';
  - Volume 2 - 'Appendices to the Main Report'<sup>4</sup>;
  - Volume 3 - 'Executive Summary'
  - the Microsoft Access Sites Database, which contains details of the 209 sites that we visited and assessed; and
  - a MapInfo GIS layer which contains digitised polygons for the 209 sites in our Sites Database.

---

<sup>4</sup> Any references in our report to 'Appendices' relate to the Appendices that are contained in Volume 2.

## 2 NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY REQUIREMENTS

### Planning Policy Statement 3 (November 2006): Housing

- 2.1 PPS3 establishes the requirement for LPAs to undertake SHLAAs, which replace the housing capacity studies required under PPG3 (the precursor to PPS3). The fundamental requirement placed upon LPAs by paragraphs 54 and 55 of PPS3 is to *'identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development'*. Furthermore, Annex C of PPS3 states that a SHLAA should:
- Assess the likely level of housing that could be provided if unimplemented planning permissions were brought into development.
  - Assess land availability by identifying buildings or areas of land (including previously developed and greenfield land) that have development potential for housing, including within mixed use developments.
  - Assess the potential level of housing that can be provided on identified land.
  - Where appropriate, evaluate past trends in windfall land coming forward for development and estimate the likely future implementation rate.
  - Identify constraints that might make a particular site unavailable and/or unviable for development.
  - Identify sustainability issues and physical constraints that might make a site unsuitable for development.
  - Identify what action could be taken to overcome constraints on particular sites.
- 2.2 PPS3 states that LPAs should set out in Local Development Documents (LDDs) their policies and strategies for delivering housing, and that they should identify sufficient land to enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption, taking account of the level of housing provision set out in the RSS.
- 2.3 One of the key differences between PPS3 and PPG3 is that windfall allowances should no longer be included in the first 10 years of land supply in LDFs, unless there are *'genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified. In these circumstances, an allowance should be included but should be realistic having regard to...historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends'*. This places greater emphasis on the need to identify sites which can be confidently allocated for housing in LDFs.
- 2.4 PPS3 reiterates the previous PPG3 policy that the priority for development should be PDL - in particular, vacant and derelict sites and buildings - and it requires LPAs to ensure that sufficient, suitable land is available to achieve their PDL delivery objectives. However, unlike housing capacity studies under PPG3, SHLAAs are required to consider the potential of greenfield sites to deliver housing, as well as PDL.
- 2.5 PPS3 states that LDDs should contain a local PDL target and trajectory, and strategies for bringing PDL into housing use. Where appropriate, the trajectory could be divided up to reflect the contribution expected from different categories of PDL - for example, vacant and derelict sites - in order to deliver the spatial vision for the area in the most sustainable way. In developing their PDL strategies, LPAs are advised (in paragraph 44) that they:

*'should consider a range of incentives or interventions that could help to ensure that previously developed land is developed in line with the trajectory/ies. This should include:*

- *planning to address obstacles to the development of vacant and derelict sites and buildings, for example, use of compulsory purchase powers where that would help resolve land ownership or assembly issues.*
  - *considering whether sites that are currently allocated for industrial or commercial use could be more appropriately re-allocated for housing development.*
  - *encouraging innovative housing schemes that make effective use of public sector previously-developed land.'*
- 2.6 The content of PPS3, as summarised above, has clear implications for the information to be included and assessed in a SHLAA.

## SHLAA Practice Guidance (July 2007)

- 2.7 Practice Guidance for undertaking SHLAAs was published by Communities and Local Government (CLG) in July 2007<sup>5</sup>. It supersedes the advice in the previous guidance entitled 'Tapping the Potential'<sup>6</sup>, which related to housing capacity studies.
- 2.8 In paragraph 1, the Guidance states that SHLAAs are '*a key component of the evidence base to support the delivery of sufficient land for housing to meet the community's need for more homes*'. The Guidance emphasises that a SHLAA is significantly different from a housing capacity study, and if a recent capacity study has been carried out, further work will be needed to fulfill the requirements of the SHLAA.
- 2.9 The Guidance states that the primary role of the SHLAA is to:
- identify sites with potential for housing;
  - assess their housing potential; and
  - assess when they are likely to be developed.
- 2.10 A SHLAA should aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in the study area. The study area should preferably be a sub-regional housing market area, but may be an LPA area, where necessary. As a minimum, the SHLAA should aim to identify sufficient specific sites for at least the first 10 years of a plan, from the anticipated date of its adoption, and ideally for longer than the whole 15 year plan period<sup>7</sup>. Where it is not possible to identify sufficient sites, the SHLAA should provide the evidence base to support judgements around whether broad locations should be identified and/or whether there are 'genuine local circumstances' that mean a windfall allowance may be justified in the first 10 years of the plan.
- 2.11 Paragraphs 7 and 50 of the Guidance refer to 'genuine local circumstances', but neither paragraph defines what these circumstances might be. However, paragraph 52 does state that '*Coming to an informed view on a windfall allowance means reflecting how comprehensive and intensive the survey has been in identifying sites.*'
- 2.12 Paragraph 8 makes it clear that whilst the assessment is an important evidence source to inform plan-making, it does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for housing development. The Guidance also states that the SHLAA should be kept up to date as part of the Annual Monitoring Report exercise, so as to support the updating of the housing trajectory and the five-year supply of specific deliverable sites.
- 2.13 The Guidance provides details on the methodology for a SHLAA, which has eight main stages and two further optional stages covering broad locations and windfalls. The stages are as follows:

<sup>5</sup> Hereafter referred to simply as 'the Guidance'.

<sup>6</sup> DETR (2000).

<sup>7</sup> The CLG consultation document 'Streamlining Local Development Frameworks' (November 2007) suggests extending the lifespan of LDF Core Strategies from 10 to 15 years. This will increase compatibility with the requirements of PPS3, which directs LPAs to identify broad locations and specific sites on which to deliver housing for at least 15 years.

- Stage 1: Planning the Assessment;
  - Stage 2: Determining which sources of sites will be included in the Assessment;
  - Stage 3: Desktop review of existing information;
  - Stage 4: Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed;
  - Stage 5: Carrying out the survey;
  - Stage 6: Estimating the housing potential of each site;
  - Stage 7: Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed;
  - Stage 8: Review of the Assessment;
  - Stage 9: Identifying and assessing the housing potential of broad locations (when necessary); and
  - Stage 10: Determining the housing potential of windfalls (where justified).
- 2.14 Stage 2 identifies the sources of sites with potential for housing, which consist of sites currently in the planning process as well as those that are not in the planning process, namely:
- allocated employment or other land uses which are no longer required for those uses;
  - existing housing allocations, which have not yet been implemented;
  - unimplemented/outstanding planning permissions for housing; and
  - planning permissions for housing that are under construction.
- 2.15 Stage 7 assesses when and whether sites are likely to be developed. Central to this is the consideration of whether sites are suitable, deliverable and developable for housing. Suitability embraces policy restrictions, physical problems/limitations (for instance access, infrastructure, flood risk, ground conditions and contamination), potential impacts (upon the landscape and conservation) and the environmental conditions which would be experienced by prospective residents.
- 2.16 Availability considers, *'on best information available'* (paragraph 39 of the Guidance), whether there are any legal or ownership problems, such as multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners. Achievability is essentially a judgment about the economic viability of a site. It will be affected by market factors, cost factors (including site preparation costs relating to any physical constraints) and delivery factors (including phasing and build-out rates, which mostly concerns larger sites).

### Yorkshire and Humber's Strategic Housing Land Availability - Regional Practice Guide (Y&HA, April 2008)

- 2.17 In April 2008 the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly published a Regional Practice Guide for undertaking SHLAAs. The remit of the Guide is to *'add value to, not duplicate or challenge the official CLG advice'*, and as such it seeks to provide *'a clearer steer'* and *'practical advice'* on specific aspects of the process for undertaking SHLAAs in the region.
- 2.18 Accordingly, the Regional Practice Guide is largely based on the CLG Guidance, and affirms the role of the SHLAA as a *'process that identifies housing land for future development'*. The Guide considers that the Assessment should be founded upon the main principles and tests set out in PPS3, in that in order to be considered deliverable, sites must be suitable, available, and achievable. Importantly, the Guide is consistent with the CLG Guidance in that it asserts that the SHLAA should be approached as a

*'technical exercise'* that identifies potential supply, and does not seek to formulate policy or determine which sites should be developed.

- 2.19 The regional guidance also advocates conceptualising the housing supply as a *'conveyor belt'*, and sees the SHLAA as a continuous, updatable database of supply. Furthermore, the Guide provides a suggested approach to stakeholder consultation, the overall assessment of sites, and advice in dealing with issues such as windfalls, sites in rural areas, site size thresholds, flood risk, and the Green Belt.
- 2.20 According to the Guide, the SHLAA process should ultimately result in:
- a pool of deliverable housing sites to accommodate at least 15 years of housing supply, which generally accord with high-level planning policy; and
  - a degree of prioritisation, based on likely time periods for delivery.
- 2.21 We have carefully considered our approach to undertaking the Ryedale SHLAA, in order to ensure that our methodology reflects the advice set out in the Regional Practice Guide. As such, we are confident that the outputs of the study are entirely consistent with the expectations and outcomes specified in the Guide. Section 3 of our report discusses particular methodological issues in further detail.

### The Yorkshire and Humber Plan - RSS12 (GOYH, May 2008)

- 2.22 The Yorkshire and Humber Plan was approved in May 2008, and is intended to guide development in the region until 2026. The RSS divides the region into seven sub-areas (Leeds City Region; South Yorkshire; Humber Estuary; York; Vales and Tees Links; Coast; and Remoter Rural). The majority of Ryedale District falls within the York sub-area, although parts of the District also fall within the Vale and Tees Links and Remoter Rural sub-areas. The latter includes the northern third of the District, which falls within the North York Moors National Park (although as we explain more fully in Section 3, we are not considering the National Park area in this study).
- 2.23 Figure 2.3 of the RSS identifies Malton as a Principal Town. Policy YH5 states that Principal Towns should be the main focus for housing, and in paragraph 6.11 Malton is recognised as the main focus for growth in the eastern part of the York sub-area. To this end, York sub-area Policy Y1 states that plans and strategies should provide for an *'appropriate scale of development at Malton to support local regeneration and the role of York'*. Elsewhere in the sub-area, development should *'focus on meeting local housing needs and appropriate economic diversification'*.
- 2.24 Paragraph 9.6 asserts that within the Remoter Rural sub-area, development should be focused on the Local Centres of Helmsley, Kirkbymoorside and Pickering, and that development must *'contribute to sustaining their roles and should address affordable local housing needs'*.
- 2.25 Table 12.1 of the RSS indicates that between 2004 and 2008, Ryedale District should seek to accommodate 230 net additional dwellings, falling to 200 dwellings per annum (dpa) between 2008 and 2026. Table 2.1 below shows what the 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets would be if the RSS rate of 200 dpa (from 2008 onwards) was applied as an average rate across each of the forthcoming five-year periods.

**Table 2.1 Ryedale 5, 10, 15 and 20-Year Dwelling Targets (Based on the RSS Figures as an Average Across Each Five-Year Period)**

| Avg Dwgs/yr (same average across each 5-year period) <sup>a</sup> | 5-Year Dwelling Target | 10-Year Dwelling Target | 15-Year Dwelling Target | 20-Year Dwelling Target |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 200   | 1,000                  | 2,000                   | 3,000                   | 4,000                   |

<sup>a</sup> The 20-year figure assumes that the RSS target of 200 dpa will continue for a limited period beyond 2026.

- 2.26 Importantly, RSS Policy H2 explains that the housing provision figures set out in Table 12.1 of the RSS should not be treated as ceilings. Thus, in line with the *'plan, monitor,*

*manage* approach which underpins PPS3, the RSS lays the foundations for a more flexible approach to housing provision at the local level.

- 2.27 A selective review of the RSS was initiated in 2008, and consultation on revised Spatial Strategic Options took place between November 2008 and January 2009. However, at its meeting on 24 April 2009, the Joint Regional Board decided not to proceed with the RSS Update and to move straight to the development of a new Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS)<sup>8</sup>. The evidence base is scheduled to be complete by March 2010. It is worth noting that if different housing numbers are proposed by the IRS, then this will be taken into account through future reviews of the SHLAA.

## Emerging Ryedale Local Development Framework

- 2.28 Ryedale District Council submitted its LDF Core Strategy to the Secretary of State in 2005, although this was found to be unsound following an independent examination in July 2006. The Council is now preparing a 'revised' Core Strategy, and in July 2007 published a new consultation document entitled 'Accommodating Growth and Managing Change'. In this document, the Council set out a variety of options for the quantity, location and distribution of new housing in the District. However, the RSS has since been approved, and consequently some of the figures used in this consultation document have now been superseded. Accordingly, a second round of consultation took place in the summer of 2009, which takes into account the housing targets contained in the adopted RSS. The SHLAA will form an important part of the evidence base to support the preparation of the LDF.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Housing Green Paper requires Regional Planning Bodies and Regional Spatial Strategies to take into account infrastructure and related constraints. CLG published a policy document on the proposed content of Integrated Regional Strategies (IRS) in January 2009. This notes that the IRS should demonstrate how its plans for growth, housing and other development have had regard to available infrastructure.





## 3 STUDY METHODOLOGY

### Requirements of the SHLAA Practice Guidance

- 3.1 As we explained in Section 2 of our report, Figure 3 of the CLG's Practice Guidance identifies eight main stages, with two further optional stages covering broad locations and windfalls. Paragraph 18 of the Guidance states that the stages should generally be carried out in order, although Stages 3, 4, 6 and 7, and stages 9 and 10, may be carried out in parallel.

### Stage 1 - Planning the Assessment

- 3.2 The methodology that we employed for the Ryedale SHLAA was agreed with the Council at the inception meeting in October 2008 and is consistent with Figure 3 of the Practice Guidance, although we have undertaken some elements of the work in a slightly different order (as explained below). Furthermore, we have taken account of the advice in the Yorkshire and Humber SHLAA Regional Practice Guide, and we have also reflected best practice established by the significant number of SHLAA studies that have been undertaken across the country by RTP and others.
- 3.3 A summary of key study parameters which were agreed at the inception meeting is set out below.

#### *Study Area*

- 3.4 We agreed the area of search for potential housing sites at the outset of the study, rather than waiting until Stage 4 as recommended by the Guidance.
- 3.5 Paragraph 7 of the Guidance states that a SHLAA study should *'aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in the study area'*. Accordingly, it was agreed through discussion with Council officers that the study should not be limited to certain settlements and that we would consider sites anywhere in the part of Ryedale District outside of the North York Moors National Park (NYMNP). At the request of the Council we also considered sites within or adjacent to Helmsley, part of which falls within the National Park.<sup>9</sup> This is due to the fact that the Ryedale District Council and the NYMNP are preparing a joint DPD for Helmsley.
- 3.6 Our approach to the initial search for sites was therefore extensive. This was necessary in order to fully assess the potential to achieve the Council's dwelling targets and to illustrate the distribution of potential housing supply across the District.
- 3.7 The plan in Appendix 1 depicts the characteristics of the District and the location of its main settlements, most of which are adjacent to the A64 or the A170. The plan shows that the northern third of the District falls within the National Park and that a significant proportion of the remainder of the District is covered by AONB. Green Belt is limited to a small area in the south-western corner of the District, and of the part of the District outside the National Park, only a small amount is covered by designated SSSIs or is within Flood Risk Zone 3b.

#### *Study Base Date and Time Horizon*

- 3.8 LPAs are required, by paragraph 53 of PPS3, to set out in LDDs their policies and strategies for delivering the level of housing provision prescribed by the approved RSS, or the emerging RSS if the approved RSS is being reviewed. Paragraph 54 of

---

<sup>9</sup> We considered three sites that are immediately adjacent to the existing built-up area of Helmsley, two of which are within the National Park, namely site ref. 585 (to the north east of Helmsley) and site ref. 586 (to the north of Helmsley).

PPS3 states that LPAs should *'identify sufficient specific deliverable sites to deliver housing in the first five years'* from adoption of the relevant LDD. Paragraph 55 further states that LPAs should also *'identify a further supply of specific, developable sites for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15. Where it is not possible to identify specific sites for years 11-15, broad locations for future growth should be indicated.'*

- 3.9 The requirements of paragraphs 53 to 55 of PPS3 are carried through into the Guidance, paragraph 5 of which requires LPAs to *'identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development.'* Paragraph 7 of the Guidance further states that a SHLAA should *'as a minimum...aim to identify sufficient specific sites for at least the first 10 years of a plan, from the anticipated date of its adoption.'*
- 3.10 Thus, both PPS3 and the Guidance require LPAs to identify sites from the date of adoption of the relevant DPD. However, adoption of the Council's Facilitating Development DPD - which will allocate land across the part of the District outside of the National Park - is not scheduled to happen until June 2012<sup>10</sup>. We have therefore necessarily used the study base date of 1 April 2008 as the starting point in assessing the 5 year land supply, rather than the adoption date of the Facilitating Development DPD.
- 3.11 In accordance with the Guidance, the SHLAA should be regularly kept up-to-date as part of the Annual Monitoring Report exercise, so as to support the updating of the housing trajectory and the rolling 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites.

#### **Minimum Site Size Threshold**

- 3.12 Paragraph 5.2.4 of the Regional Practice Guide cites CLG advice to the Planning Inspectorate<sup>11</sup>, asserting that sites should not be included unless they are able to *'make a significant contribution to the delivery of housing'*. The Guide advocates using a site size threshold of 0.4ha, describing this as a *'suitable minimum'*. Therefore, in order to ensure consistency with other SHLAAs in Yorkshire and Humber, we adopted a site size threshold of 0.4ha for the purpose of this study. Nevertheless, although sites smaller than 0.4ha are outside the remit of this study, they will inevitably continue to come forward and make a contribution to housing supply.

#### **Stage 2 - Sources of Potential Housing Sites**

- 3.13 PPS3 sets a clear expectation that the supply of land for housing should be based upon specific sites and, where necessary, broad locations. Figures 4 and 5 of the Guidance provides a list of possible sources for identifying potential housing sites. The list includes sites that are already in the planning process as well as sites that are not currently in the planning process. In the early stages of the study we compiled an initial list of potential housing sites, drawing upon the sources listed in Figures 4 and 5, but broadening it slightly to include other sources.
- 3.14 The sources that we used to identify the list of sites are specified below. These sources are in addition to unimplemented/outstanding residential planning permissions, which are considered as a potential source of supply, irrespective of where the sites are located in the District (details of the supply from extant permissions are provided in Section 4 of our report):
- sites identified through the Council's 'call for sites' exercises;
  - sites identified from the 2005 Urban Capacity Study;

<sup>10</sup> As set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme, which can be accessed online at: [http://extranet.ryedale.gov.uk/pdf/LDS\\_Nov\\_07.pdf](http://extranet.ryedale.gov.uk/pdf/LDS_Nov_07.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> CLG Guidance to PINS on a 5 year supply of deliverable sites.

- the Council's latest NLUD submission;
- outstanding allocations from the Local Plan;
- sites identified in the Malton Norton River-Rail Study;
- sites identified in the Helmsley Masterplan;
- sites identified in the Strategy for Malton Town Centre;
- sites identified from withdrawn and refused planning applications; and
- other sites brought to our attention by the Council.

### Stage 3 - Desktop Review of Existing Information

- 3.15 Our initial list of potential housing sites - compiled from the sources listed above - contained around 580 sites, although at that stage there was a significant amount of duplication (that is, sites which had been identified from multiple sources). We then removed all duplicates and sites below the minimum site size threshold of 0.4ha. The Council will take account of important policy designations such as Green Belt and AONB later in the plan-making process - when it decides which sites to allocate for housing in the Facilitating Development DPD - and so we did not exclude any sites that were covered by policy designations. It is, however, appropriate to treat SSSIs and Flood Zone 3b (where residential development is effectively ruled out by PPS25) as 'absolute constraints', and so any land covered by either of these designations was excluded from the study.
- 3.16 After applying the various filters described above, the initial list of potential housing sites was reduced to 209, just under half of which are located within and around the District's main settlements. Detailed information in relation to the 209 sites is contained in our Microsoft Access sites database - which is described in Appendix 10 - and each of the 209 sites is represented as a 'polygon' (i.e. an area with boundaries) on an OS base map in our associated MapInfo GIS. The list includes both PDL sites (x58), greenfield sites (x129) and sites which contain a mix of PDL and greenfield land (x22). For the latter type of site, the database records the approximate split between PDL and greenfield, which varies from 90:10 to 10:90 based on the surveyor's observations.
- 3.17 The contribution to the housing supply of sites with planning permission for residential use at the study base date is assessed through separate analysis, as detailed in Section 4 of our report. These 'committed' sites therefore do not feature in our database, although it is important to note that some of the sites in the database might have been granted planning permission for residential use since the study base date of 1 April 2008. This issue will be addressed through the first annual update of the study.

### Stage 4 - Determining Which Sites and Areas Will Be Surveyed

- 3.18 As we explained above, the area of search for potential housing sites - and the 209 assessment sites - was agreed in Stages 1-3 of the study, rather than waiting until Stage 4 as recommended by the Guidance.

### Stage 5 - Carrying Out the Assessment

- 3.19 Using a survey pro-forma, which ensured a consistency of approach across all sites, we recoded site characteristics and various other information for each of the 209 sites in our database. Some of the information was collected at the desk, whereas other details can only be established on-site and so we visited each of the 209 sites in February and March 2009. The information that we collected includes:

- site size in hectares and basic identifier information such as site name/address, easting and northing and RTP unique reference;
  - current land uses both at the site and in the surrounding area;
  - the surveyor's assessment of what proportion of the site is available for development, taking account of any on-site permanent features;
  - details of any obvious physical constraints in relation to site access, drainage, ground conditions, and so on;
  - bad neighbour uses, and the surveyor's assessment of the severity of the constraint;
  - details of anything that might affect availability, such as whether there are any operational businesses on the site;
  - the surveyor's assessment of the desirability of the immediate area in housing market terms, and of any other factors that might affect achievability; and
  - the surveyor's overall assessment of the site's suitability, availability and achievability for housing.
- 3.20 It is important to emphasise that in a strategic study like this, it is not possible to assess physical constraints, availability and deliverability/viability in particular detail. In assessing sites we therefore necessarily focused on obvious constraints.
- 3.21 Using the information described above, all of the sites in the database were subjected to a comprehensive assessment against various 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability' criteria, as detailed in Appendix 2. The assessment criteria are closely related to the criteria referred to on pages 16 and 17 of the Practice Guidance. Our assessments thus provide a good indication of each site's performance against a broad number of important measures.
- 3.22 As we explain more fully in Appendix 2, we took account of certain 'core' constraints in the assessment exercise relating to bad neighbours, flood risk<sup>12</sup>, availability and cost/delivery factors. This is not to say that the constraint could not be overcome, but the core constraints are likely to delay the site coming forward until such time as it is possible, or worthwhile, to overcome the constraint.
- 3.23 Our assessment of the 'achievability' of each site was informed by a review of the local housing market, which is summarised in a Residential Market Commentary Paper (see Appendix 3). It is important to emphasise that our Paper does not constitute a formal housing market assessment, but draws instead upon key themes arising from existing, valuable data sources, including the Ryedale District Housing Needs Assessment (2007), our own primary research, and information on the local property market obtained through consultations with local estate agents.
- 3.24 Through our assessments, each site was placed into one of three 'Category' bands<sup>13</sup>. The overall categorisation of a site therefore depends on the particular combination of constraints affecting it. The database provides a summary of the reasons explaining why each site has been assigned to a particular Category band (this information is also provided in Appendix 12). Thus, it is immediately apparent from looking at the database whether a site is affected by particular constraints and, hence, what sort of intervention will be required in order to make the sites deliverable.

---

<sup>12</sup> As explained earlier in our report and in Appendix 2, we have reflected the clear sequential approach in PPS25 in our categorisation of sites. Furthermore, any sites in Zone 3b ('the Functional Floodplain', which is not suitable for housing) were automatically excluded from the study on that basis.

<sup>13</sup> Our definitions match those specified in paragraphs 54 and 55 of PPS3, which are carried through into paragraphs 5 and 33 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance.

- 3.25 PPS3 gives clear priority to housing on PDL rather than on greenfield sites<sup>14</sup>. However, greenfield and brownfield development can be regarded as complementary and the contribution of both will be required in order to meet projected demand in the long-term. We have therefore not made PDL/greenfield status a criterion for categorising sites, but have separately identified the theoretical dwelling yield from each land type to allow us to examine their respective roles in meeting overall dwelling targets.

### Stage 6 - Estimating the Housing Potential of Each Site

- 3.26 In order to assess the number of dwellings that could theoretically be provided at each site, we took account of permanent features, appropriate gross to net ratios<sup>15</sup> and a 'mixed use ratio' to reflect any non-residential uses that the site is likely to accommodate. As a matter of course in SHLAA studies we also reduce the gross area of any sites that are partially covered by SSSIs or Flood Zone 3b, although very little of the District is covered by these designations and so we only had to reduce the developable area of a limited number of sites in the Ryedale SHLAA due to SSSIs or Flood Zone 3b.
- 3.27 Having identified the net developable area of each site, we then applied a density of 45 dph to sites within and adjacent to the existing Development Limits of Malton, Norton and Pickering<sup>16</sup>, which in our assessment is appropriate for settlements of this scale and complements the existing built form and density. In Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley, we believe that 30 dph is a more achievable target. Achieving the national minimum target of 30 dph as an average in the ten Service Villages and elsewhere in the District will be more challenging, although given that we are considering sites over 0.4ha which are mainly on the edge of existing settlements, we consider that 30 dph should be the target even in these more rural areas.
- 3.28 Call for sites submissions often specify the number of dwellings that the developer intends to provide at the site. With these sites, if the number of dwellings proposed would result in a development density that is appropriate in the local context, then we inserted the yield figure manually.
- 3.29 The housing capacity of the sites in our database was therefore calculated on the following basis:
- $$\frac{\text{Gross site area} \times \text{permanent features factor} \times \text{gross to net factor} \times \text{mixed use factor} \times \text{density}}$$
- 3.30 The resultant dwelling 'yields', as specified in the database, are theoretical and the Council would have to undertake more detailed work on the densities that are achievable at any given site, as and when it is brought forward for development. Nevertheless, we consider that the consistent approach described above is sufficient for the purposes of this strategic study.

### Stage 7 - Assessing When and Whether Sites are Likely to be Developed

- 3.31 Predicting when each site is likely to come forward for development is not an exact science. The placing of a site into one of the three Category bands referred to above is therefore intended to give a useful indication of the deliverability and potential timing of a site's development and, hence, its suitability for inclusion as an allocation in the LDF.

---

<sup>14</sup> See para 36 of PPS3.

<sup>15</sup> The gross to net ratio is derived from 'Tapping the Potential' (DETR 2000), adapted by RTP to reflect our experience around the country.

<sup>16</sup> For the purposes of this study, we treated any site within 100 metres of the existing Development Limits boundary as 'adjacent to'.

- 3.32 Sites in Category 1 have minimal constraints and are considered to be 'deliverable' within the first five years. It is important to emphasise that for a site to achieve a Category 1 rating, it would need to be suitable, and available (or capable of being made available) within 5 years, and achievable.
- 3.33 Sites in Category 2 have a limited level of constraints such that they are likely to be available for delivery after the first five years. These 'developable' sites may be suitable for development, depending on their individual circumstances and on specific measures being proposed to overcome their constraints.
- 3.34 Sites in Category 3 ('not currently developable') have more significant constraints. For these sites to be considered appropriate for development it would have to be clearly demonstrated that the significant constraints could be overcome in order to make them deliverable.
- 3.35 The inclusion of a site in a higher Category band should not be taken to represent a recommendation that it should be allocated in the LDF, as our categorisation process does not take account of all the policy considerations that are relevant in selecting sites for allocation. Equally, it should not be concluded that a site assigned to a lower Category band cannot come forward, or that it cannot be allocated for development. Rather, it would need to be demonstrated that the site's constraints could be overcome in order to secure its deliverability.

## Stage 8 - Review of the Assessment

- 3.36 Having estimated the housing potential of each site and assessed their developability/developability, we were able to place sites within one of the three Category bands, as explained above. Through this process we were able to establish how much housing could be provided over 5, 10, 15 and 20-year periods from April 2008. We then compared the capacity identified by the study with the RSS dwelling targets to identify whether there is any shortfall in housing land supply, adjusted to reflect the under-supply against the dwelling targets between the base date of the adopted RSS (1 April 2004) and the study base date (1 April 2008), and anticipated demolitions (because the RSS dwelling targets are net of clearance replacement). The findings from this process are set out fully in Section 4.
- 3.37 Paragraph 45 of the Guidance advises that if the Stage 8 review indicates a shortfall against the dwelling targets, then this should be planned for either by identifying 'broad locations', and/or by using a windfall allowance. As we demonstrate in Section 4, the 209 specific sites that we assessed in the study are capable of providing sufficient dwellings to meet the long-term dwelling targets set by the RSS. Accordingly, there is no need to identify broad locations or make a windfall allowance. Therefore for this assessment we have not undertaken the two 'optional' study stages 9 and 10.
- 3.38 There has been a significant supply from smaller windfall sites in Ryedale in recent years, although this is partly due to the generous development limits set by the Local Plan and also because few sites were allocated. Moreover, the SHLAA is concerned with the identified study sites which, as we explained above, are capable of meeting the long-term dwelling targets. Paragraph 54 of PPS3 states that the supply for the first five years should be based on 'specific deliverable sites', and paragraph 55 states that LPAs should also '*identify a further supply of specific, developable sites for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15*'. The requirements of paragraphs 54 and 55 of PPS3 are carried through into the CLG's SHLAA Guidance, paragraph 5 of which requires LPAs to '*identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development*'.
- 3.39 Paragraph 7 of the Guidance further states that a SHLAA should '*as a minimum...aim to identify sufficient specific sites for at least the first 10 years of a plan, from the anticipated date of its adoption*.' Furthermore, page 12 of the Regional Practice Guide states: '*A windfall allowance should therefore not generally*

*be considered as a component of a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment...* unless there is *'no reasonable prospect of identifying at least a 15 year supply of housing land.'* The Guide makes it clear that Hull is the only authority in the region which might be a candidate for a windfall (or small site) allowance.

- 3.40 Given the advice in PPS3 and the Guidance, we therefore agreed, in consultation with Council officers, not to make a small site allowance for any of the SHLAA study periods.





## 4 STUDY FINDINGS

### Introduction

- 4.1 In this section we provide the results from the study and assess how the RSS-based dwelling targets can be achieved. In summary, our approach is to:
- i) identify the 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets, take account of any under-provision against the RSS housing targets since the RSS base date of 1 April 2004, and making an allowance for likely future demolitions;
  - ii) identify the supply from housing commitments;
  - iii) establish the potential supply from Category 1 ('deliverable'), Category 2 ('developable') and Category 3 sites ('not currently developable'); and
  - iv) assess whether the identified supply from planning commitments and the 209 further, specific sites that we have assessed in the SHLAA is sufficient to meet the 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets.

### Dwelling Targets

#### *Consideration of Under-Provision Against the RSS Housing Targets Since 1 April 2004 (the RSS Base Date)*

- 4.2 It is necessary to take account of any under-provision against the RSS dwelling targets since the RSS base date of 1 April 2004. This is because paragraph 5(i) of the CLG's advice note entitled 'Demonstrating a 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Sites' (12 April 2007)<sup>17</sup> states that in order to identify the level of housing provision to be delivered over the following 5 years, LPAs should use provision figures in adopted development plans, '*adjusted to reflect the level of housing that has already been delivered*'.
- 4.3 Table 12.1 of the adopted RSS sets a target for Ryedale District of 230 net additional dpa for the period 2004 to 2008, which equates to a four-year target of 920 dwellings. Completions data and clearance figures supplied by the Council show that 642 net additional dwellings were delivered in the District between 1 April 2004 and 31 March 2008. This translates to a shortfall of 278 dwellings across Ryedale District compared to the RSS target, as shown in Table 4.1 below.

**Table 4.1 Under-provision vis-à-vis the RSS Housing Target Between the Base Date of the Adopted RSS (1 April 2004) and the SHLAA Base Date (1 April 2008)**

| Year         | Gross Dwg Completions | Total Demolitions | Net Dwg Completions | RSS Dwgs/Yr Target | Shortfall Against the RSS Dwgs/yr Target |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--|
| 2004-05      | 113                   | 4                 | 109                 | 230                | -121                                     |
| 2005-06      | 121                   | 8                 | 113                 | 230                | -117                                     |
| 2006-07      | 202                   | 8                 | 194                 | 230                | -36                                      |
| 2007-08      | 233                   | 7                 | 226                 | 230                | -4                                       |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>669</b>            | <b>27</b>         | <b>642</b>          | <b>920</b>         | <b>-278</b>                              |

- 4.4 Given that the identified shortfall is significant in the Ryedale context, and bearing in mind prevailing market conditions, we do not consider it appropriate or realistic to apportion the shortfall of 278 dwellings wholly to the first five-year study period (i.e. 2008 to 2013). Thus, we have split the 278 dwellings equally across the first and second 5-year periods (that is, we have assigned 139 dwellings - half the shortfall - to the first 5-year period i.e. 2008-2013, with the remaining 139 dwellings being added onto the target for the 2013-2018 period).

<sup>17</sup> [http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/advice\\_for\\_insp/advice\\_produced\\_by\\_dclg.htm](http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/advice_for_insp/advice_produced_by_dclg.htm)

### *Likely Future Demolitions*

- 4.5 Based on past trends, the Council estimates that there will be 36 demolitions in each five-year study period. Accordingly, we have made an allowance for these demolitions when establishing the 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets for the District.

### *Dwelling Targets, Reflecting Under-Provision Since 2004 and Allowing for Likely Future Demolitions*

- 4.6 Between 2008 and 2026, the adopted RSS sets a target for Ryedale of 200 net additional dpa. The resultant 'core' 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets would therefore be 1000, 2,000, 3,000 and 4,000 dwellings, respectively. Taking account of likely demolitions and the identified shortfall of 278 dwellings that occurred between 2004 and 2008, the 'adjusted' targets for each of the four 5-year study periods are set out in Table 4.2 below.

**Table 4.2 Ryedale 5, 10, 15 and 20-year Dwelling Targets Based on Approved RSS Figures (adjusted to reflect under-provision since 2004 and allowing for likely future demolitions)**

| <b>First 5 Years</b>            |  |                        |                                    |
|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| RSS Dwelling Target (2008-2013) | Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2004, and Planned/Likely Demolitions | 5-Year Dwelling Target | Cumulative 5-Year Dwelling Target  |
| 1,000                           | 175  | 1,175                  | 1,175                              |
| <b>Second 5 Years</b>           |  |                        |                                    |
| RSS Dwelling Target (2013-2018) | Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2004, and Planned/Likely Demolitions | 5-Year Dwelling Target | Cumulative 10-Year Dwelling Target |
| 1,000                           | 175  | 1,175                  | 2,350                              |
| <b>Third 5 Years</b>            |  |                        |                                    |
| RSS Dwelling Target (2018-2023) | Allowance for Likely Demolitions   | 5-Year Dwelling Target | Cumulative 15-Year Dwelling Target |
| 1,000                           | 36   | 1,036                  | 3,386                              |
| <b>Fourth 5 Years</b>           |  |                        |                                    |
| RSS Dwelling Target (2023-2028) | Allowance for Likely Demolitions   | 5-Year Dwelling Target | Cumulative 20-Year Dwelling Target |
| 1,000                           | 36   | 1,036                  | 4,422                              |

<sup>a</sup> The 20-year figure assumes that the RSS target of 200 dpa will continue for a limited period beyond 2026.

- 4.7 The figures contained in the fourth column of Table 4.2 are those that we worked to when assessing whether there are sufficient deliverable and developable sites to meet the District's dwelling targets. It is worth noting that these figures are higher than the figures in Table 2.1 of our report - which were based purely on the RSS target of 200 dpa - because they take into account under-provision since 2004 and likely demolitions; accordingly, the figures in Table 4.2 are more robust.

## **Supply from Housing Commitments**

### *What Are Housing Commitments?*

- 4.8 Housing 'commitments' comprise dwellings with full or outline planning permission. The District Council supplied a schedule of commitments at the study base date (1 April 2008) to inform our assessment of housing land availability in the present study. It is reasonable to assume that not all of the commitments in the schedule will be implemented and so we consider that there is a need to apply a non-implementation rate (any failure of specific commitments to be taken up can be dealt with through routine monitoring and supply management). We return to this issue, below.

- 4.9 If there were any outline permissions for large numbers of dwellings (i.e. over 100) where no dwellings were completed or under construction at the base date, then care would have to be taken because implementation of these permissions may potentially extend beyond five years. Housing production on such sites would need to be carefully monitored and sufficient appropriate allocations would need to be included in the LDF to allow for the possibility that they may not generate their full supply within the first five years. However, the Council has confirmed that there were no such permissions in the District at the study base date.
- 4.10 Because the latest comprehensive data on residential commitments supplied by the Council relate to a base date of 1 April 2008, it should be noted that some of the permissions at the study's base date may now be partly or fully completed. This is unavoidable, however, and can be dealt with when the study is updated.
- 4.11 Three housing allocations in the adopted Local Plan have not yet been implemented<sup>18</sup>, and potential from these sites has therefore been assessed as part of this study, in the same way as the other sites in our database.

#### *Commitments at the Study Base Date*

- 4.12 Data supplied by the Council show that in total there was extant permission for 740 dwellings across Ryedale District as of 1 April 2008; this comprises 81 dwellings with extant outline planning permission, and 659 dwellings with outstanding full or reserved matters approval. These dwellings were either un-commenced or started but not completed at the study base date, and could therefore potentially form part of the District's future housing supply.
- 4.13 We assume that the number of dwellings built will be as given in the latest permission, although it is possible that these will be superseded by further approvals on the same sites.

#### *Allowance for Non-Implementation*

- 4.14 It is reasonable to assume that not all residential commitments will be implemented, particularly given the current downturn in the market. This has been acknowledged by Council officers, and therefore in order to ensure a robust approach we consider that there is a need to make an allowance for non-implementation of a proportion of the outstanding residential planning permissions. Applying a 'non-implementation rate' will ensure that the District's housing supply is not over-reliant on extant planning permissions, which may not all progress in practice. Indeed, such an approach is advocated by the Regional Practice Guide, section 5.2.2 of which states: '*In an uncertain market, with changes in the make-up of housing delivery, it is important that local authorities adopt a realistic approach to including existing planning permissions within their supply.*' The Guide then confirms that a 'discounting rate' can be used.
- 4.15 For the purpose of this study we have applied a 20 per cent non-implementation rate to the total outstanding housing supply (comprising both outline and full planning permissions). This is higher than the 10 per cent non-implementation rate referred to in Chapter 5 of the Local Plan, and the 15 per cent rate which was being applied by Scarborough Borough Council in 2008, as cited in the Regional Practice Guide. However, given the severity of the current downturn, we consider 20 per cent to be more realistic. After applying the non-implementation rate to the 740 dwellings in outstanding permissions, the total realistic housing supply at 1 April 2008 from residential commitments in the District stands at 592 dwellings. Future updates of the SHLAA will provide an opportunity to update the number of outstanding residential commitments.

---

<sup>18</sup> Pasture Lane in Hovingham (database site ref. 387), Feversham Drive in Kirkbymoorside (database site ref. 386) and Whitfield Avenue in Pickering (database site ref. 387).

## Potential Supply from the 209 SHLAA Sites

### *Site Yield by Category Band - the Five Location Types*

- 4.16 We have identified the theoretical dwelling supply from each of five Location Types, as follows:
- **Location Type 1** - Supply from sites within the existing Development Limits of those settlements specified in the emerging Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy (i.e. the Principal Service Centre of Malton/Norton; the Local Service Centres of Pickering, Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley; and the 10 Service Villages).
  - **Location Type 2** - Supply from sites adjoining the existing Development Limits of the settlements proposed in the emerging Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy.
  - **Location Type 3** - Supply from sites within the existing Development Limits of the other Villages listed at the rear of the Ryedale Local Plan (i.e. the 99 Villages with Development Limits, minus the Service Villages which are covered by Location Types 1 and 2).
  - **Location Type 4** - Supply from sites adjoining the existing Development Limits of the other Villages listed at the rear of the Ryedale Local Plan (i.e. the 99 Villages with Development Limits, minus the Service Villages which are covered by Location Types 1 and 2).
  - **Location Type 5** - Supply from sites elsewhere in the study area.
- 4.17 For the avoidance of doubt, location is not one of the assessment criteria. Instead we have merely presented details of the potential dwelling supply from various location types as an added reporting output to help inform the Council in preparing its LDF; the potential aggregate supply from the five Location Types is shown at the bottom of Table 4.8 later in this section. Thus, a site will not be scored down simply because it is in a particular Location Type; each site's categorisation is based on its performance against the agreed suitability, availability and achievability criteria.
- 4.18 The tables below detail, for each Location Type, the number of sites assigned to Category bands 1-3 and their potential combined dwelling yield. The yield from each Category band is further classified as PDL or greenfield, and the supply from sites below 10ha, and sites above 10ha, is also distinguished (suffixed 'a' and 'b' in the tables, respectively)<sup>19</sup>. This is because the database includes some large sites where a decision to allocate or approve development would have to be based on wider policy considerations than is the case with smaller sites. These considerations are likely to include the broad sustainability of the total development pattern, and strategic transport and other infrastructure capacity. Before such large sites could be proposed for allocation they would also require careful attention to their size, capacity and boundaries, which would be beyond the remit of this strategic study.

### *Location Type 1 - Supply from Sites Within the Existing Development Limits of Settlements Specified in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy*

- 4.19 Table 4.3 shows the number of sites in each Category band - and their potential combined yield - for those sites covered by Location Type 1. The table shows that sites within the Development Limits of the 15 largest settlements could provide a total of 1,251 dwellings from 27 sites. Just under one-third of this supply (370 dwellings) is from the 12 Category 1 ('deliverable') sites, and about one-third of the Category 1 supply is from 7 PDL sites (141 dwellings), with the remaining 229 dwellings coming from greenfield sites. The Category 1 sites under Location Type 1

---

<sup>19</sup> In each table, the total number of sites is less than the sum of the numbers of sites for PDL and GF, which is because some sites are a combination of PDL and GF. In each case the yield has been divided between the two parts accordingly.

include two sites within the Howardian Hills AONB. These two Category 1 AONB sites provide a combined yield of 49 dwellings.

- 4.20 A further 9 sites, providing 356 dwellings, fall into Category 2 ('developable' sites), all of which comes from PDL. Of these Category 2 sites, one is located within the AONB (providing a theoretical yield of 137 dwellings).
- 4.21 The 21 Category 1 and Category 2 sites in Location Type 1 could therefore potentially provide a total of 726 dwellings.
- 4.22 The remaining 6 sites in Location Type 1 provide a theoretical yield of 525 dwellings, but they fall within the most heavily constrained Category 3 ('not currently developable'). None of these Category 3 sites is located within a sensitive landscape area<sup>20</sup>
- 4.23 All of the above information is summarised in Table 4.3, which also shows that none of the sites in Location Type 1 are larger than 10ha.

**Table 4.3 Schedule of Theoretical Yields from Categorised Sites, Location Type 1 (Sites Within Development Limits of Main Settlements)**

|   | Site area (gross) | Total        |           | PDL        |           | GF         |           |
|---|-------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|   |                   | Dwgs         | No. Sites | Dwgs       | No. Sites | Dwgs       | No. Sites |
| Category 1a sites   | < 10 ha           | 370          | 12        | 141        | 7         | 229        | 6         |
| Category 1b sites   | > 10 ha           | 0            | 0         | 0          | 0         | 0          | 0         |
| <b>All Category 1 ('Deliverable') Sites</b>               |                   | <b>370</b>   | <b>12</b> | <b>141</b> | <b>7</b>  | <b>229</b> | <b>6</b>  |
| Category 2a sites   | < 10 ha           | 356          | 9         | 289        | 8         | 67         | 1         |
| Category 2b sites   | > 10 ha           | 0            | 0         | 0          | 0         | 0          | 0         |
| <b>All Category 2 ('Developable') Sites</b>               |                   | <b>356</b>   | <b>9</b>  | <b>289</b> | <b>8</b>  | <b>67</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>SUB-TOTAL All Category 1 and Category 2 Sites</b>      |                   | <b>726</b>   | <b>21</b> | <b>430</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>296</b> | <b>7</b>  |
| Category 3a sites   | < 10 ha           | 525          | 6         | 362        | 6         | 163        | 1         |
| Category 3b sites   | > 10 ha           | 0            | 0         | 0          | 0         | 0          | 0         |
| <b>All Category 3 ('Not Currently Developable') Sites</b> |                   | <b>525</b>   | <b>6</b>  | <b>362</b> | <b>6</b>  | <b>163</b> | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>OVERALL TOTALS</b>                                     |                   | <b>1,251</b> | <b>27</b> | <b>792</b> | <b>21</b> | <b>459</b> | <b>8</b>  |

### *Location Type 2 - Supply from Sites Adjoining the Existing Development Limits of Settlements Proposed in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy*

- 4.24 Table 4.4 shows that sites adjoining the main 15 settlements could provide a total yield of 9,653 dwellings from 75 sites. Over half of this theoretical yield comes from Category 1 ('deliverable') sites: 6,089 dwellings from 51 sites. Around 40 per cent of these Category 1 sites (and about 40 per cent of the total supply, i.e. 2,388 dwellings) falls within sensitive landscape area designations. Almost all of the potential yield from Category 1 sites comes from greenfield land (including 6 large sites of 10-25ha), and over 80 per cent of the Category 1 yield is from sites on the edges of Malton, Norton and Pickering. Such sites can therefore clearly make a significant contribution towards meeting the District's dwelling targets, but would necessitate some expansion of the main towns.
- 4.25 The table also shows that this Location Type provides a large supply of Category 2 'developable' sites, i.e. those which face some constraints but could still theoretically come forward in the medium term if desired. There are 18 such sites (including 5 sites over 10ha), from which the potential yield is over 3,000 dwellings, the vast majority of this potential supply coming from greenfield land.

<sup>20</sup> Namely sites within 'the Howardian Hills AONB' (Local Plan Policy ENV2), 'Areas of High Landscape Value' (Policy ENV3), and 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas' (ENV5). Any further references in this section of our report to 'sensitive landscape area' relate to these designations.

- 4.26 The combined yield from the deliverable (Category 1) and developable (Category 2) sites in Location Type 2 is therefore 9,399 dwellings, from 69 sites.
- 4.27 This Location Type also provides four Category 3 sites, yielding 254 dwellings. None of the sites in Category bands 2 or 3 in this Location Type fall within a sensitive landscape area.

**Table 4.4 Schedule of Theoretical Yields from Categorised Sites, Location Type 2 (Sites Adjoining Development Limits of Main Settlements)**

|  | Site area (gross) | Total        |           | PDL        |           | GF           |           |
|--|-------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
|  |                   | Dwgs         | No. Sites | Dwgs       | No. Sites | Dwgs         | No. Sites |
| Category 1a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 4,183        | 45        | 178        | 7         | 4,005        | 42        |
| Category 1b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 1,906        | 6         | 0          | 0         | 1,906        | 6         |
| <b>All Category 1 ('Deliverable') Sites</b>          |                   | <b>6,089</b> | <b>51</b> | <b>178</b> | <b>7</b>  | <b>5,911</b> | <b>48</b> |
| Category 2a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 634          | 15        | 96         | 4         | 538          | 12        |
| Category 2b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 2,676        | 5         | 0          | 0         | 2,676        | 5         |
| <b>All Category 2 ('Developable') Sites</b>          |                   | <b>3,310</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>96</b>  | <b>4</b>  | <b>3,214</b> | <b>17</b> |
| <b>SUB-TOTAL All Category 1 and Category 2 Sites</b> |                   | <b>9,399</b> | <b>71</b> | <b>274</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>9,125</b> | <b>65</b> |
| Category 3a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 254          | 4         | 0          | 0         | 254          | 4         |
| Category 3b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 0            | 0         | 0          | 0         | 0            | 0         |
| <b>All Category 3 ('Not Currently Developable')</b>  |                   | <b>254</b>   | <b>4</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>  | <b>254</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>OVERALL TOTALS</b>                                |                   | <b>9,653</b> | <b>75</b> | <b>274</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>9,379</b> | <b>69</b> |

*Location Type 3 - Supply from Sites Within the Existing Development Limits of the Other Villages Listed in the Ryedale Local Plan*

- 4.28 Table 4.5 shows the yield from sites within the development boundaries of the smaller villages in the District. It can be seen that the supply from these sites is very limited, with only two (relatively small) sites and a total potential yield of 57 dwellings across Category bands 1 and 2. None of these sites fall within a sensitive landscape area.

**Table 4.5 Schedule of Theoretical Yields from Categorised Sites, Location Type 3 (Sites Within the Existing Development Limits of the Other Villages listed in the Ryedale Local Plan)**

|  | Site area (gross) | Total     |           | PDL       |           | GF        |           |
|--|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|  |                   | Dwgs      | No. Sites | Dwgs      | No. Sites | Dwgs      | No. Sites |
| Category 1a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 12        | 1         | 0         | 0         | 12        | 1         |
| Category 1b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>All Category 1 ('Deliverable') Sites</b>          |                   | <b>12</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>12</b> | <b>1</b>  |
| Category 2a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 45        | 1         | 45        | 1         | 0         | 0         |
| Category 2b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>All Category 2 ('Developable') Sites</b>          |                   | <b>45</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>45</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>SUB-TOTAL All Category 1 and Category 2 Sites</b> |                   | <b>57</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>45</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>12</b> | <b>1</b>  |
| Category 3a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Category 3b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>All Category 3 ('Not Currently Developable')</b>  |                   | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>OVERALL TOTALS</b>                                |                   | <b>57</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>45</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>12</b> | <b>1</b>  |

*Location Type 4 - Supply from Sites Adjoining the Existing Development Limits of the Other Villages Listed in the Ryedale Local Plan*

- 4.29 Table 4.6 shows the potential supply from sites adjoining the Development Limits of the smaller villages throughout the District, of 2,328 dwellings from 61 sites. Over 1,500 of these potential dwellings - two-thirds of the supply - come from the 55



Category 1 ('deliverable') sites. Almost three-quarters of the Category 1 supply comes from greenfield sites.

- 4.30 More than half of the 'deliverable' sites fall within Green Belt (117 dwellings) or sensitive landscape area designations (721 dwellings). The 23 Category 1 sites which lie outside these designations have a rather smaller potential yield, of 604 dwellings.
- 4.31 The remaining 6 sites in this Location Type are Category 2 'developable' sites - including a 33ha site at Harome - which provide a potential 755 dwellings. However, four of these sites (including the large site at Harome) lie in a sensitive landscape area; if these sites are excluded, the potential yield falls to just 130 dwellings.
- 4.32 None of the sites in this Location Type fall into the Category 3 band ('not currently developable').
- 4.33 Sites from Location Type 4 could therefore make an appreciable contribution to the District's dwelling targets, but such development would imply significant expansion of some very small settlements.

**Table 4.6 Schedule of Theoretical Yields from Categorised Sites, Location Type 4 (Sites Adjoining the Existing Development Limits of the Other Villages Listed in the Ryedale Local Plan)**

|  | Site area (gross) | Total        |           | PDL        |           | GF           |           |
|--|-------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
|  |                   | Dwgs         | No. Sites | Dwgs       | No. Sites | Dwgs         | No. Sites |
| Category 1a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 1,573        | 55        | 406        | 27        | 1,167        | 38        |
| Category 1b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 0            | 0         | 0          | 0         | 0            | 0         |
| <b>All Category 1 ('Deliverable') Sites</b>          |                   | <b>1,573</b> | <b>55</b> | <b>406</b> | <b>27</b> | <b>1,167</b> | <b>38</b> |
| Category 2a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 250          | 5         | 0          | 0         | 250          | 5         |
| Category 2b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 505          | 1         | 0          | 0         | 505          | 1         |
| <b>All Category 2 ('Developable') Sites</b>          |                   | <b>755</b>   | <b>6</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>  | <b>755</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>SUB-TOTAL All Category 1 and Category 2 Sites</b> |                   | <b>2,328</b> | <b>61</b> | <b>406</b> | <b>27</b> | <b>1,922</b> | <b>44</b> |
| Category 3a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 0            | 0         | 0          | 0         | 0            | 0         |
| Category 3b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 0            | 0         | 0          | 0         | 0            | 0         |
| <b>All Category 3 ('Not Currently Developable')</b>  |                   | <b>0</b>     | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>     | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>OVERALL TOTALS</b>                                |                   | <b>2,328</b> | <b>61</b> | <b>406</b> | <b>27</b> | <b>1,922</b> | <b>44</b> |

### *Location Type 5 - Supply from Sites Elsewhere in the Study Area*

- 4.34 Table 4.7 shows the potential supply from sites neither within nor adjoining any of the defined settlements in the District. There are 45 such sites, offering a potential of almost 4,300 dwellings. Of these sites, 23 fall into the 'deliverable' Category 1 band, offering a potential yield of 651 dwellings, about two-thirds of which comes from greenfield sites. About half of the Category 1 sites are located within sensitive landscape areas; if these sites are excluded, the Category 1 yield drops to 321 dwellings from 10 sites.
- 4.35 There is a larger supply of sites from the 'developable' Category band under this Location Type, with 17 sites offering a total potential yield of 1,698 dwellings. The supply from Category 2 sites is almost solely from greenfield land, including two very large sites of over 30ha outside Thornton-le-Dale and Rillington. Seven of the Category 2 sites fall within a sensitive landscape area; if these sites are excluded, the potential supply falls to 733 dwellings.
- 4.36 The combined yield from the deliverable (Category 1) and developable (Category 2) sites in Location Type 5 is therefore 2,349 dwellings, from 40 sites.
- 4.37 There are five sites, providing around 2,000 potential dwellings (just under half of the total from this Location Type) which fall into the 'not currently developable' Category 3 band. The bulk of this comes from one large PDL site outside

Wombleton (Wombleton airfield); this site could accommodate over 1,600 dwellings if fully exploited, but considerable investment would be needed to make the site developable. Moreover, the site would effectively constitute a new settlement and would be subject to much wider planning considerations than are dealt with by this study.

**Table 4.7 Schedule of Theoretical Yields from Categorized Sites, Location Type 5 (Sites Elsewhere in the Study Area)**

|  | Site area (gross) | Total        |           | PDL          |           | GF           |           |
|--|-------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
|  |                   | Dwgs         | No. Sites | Dwgs         | No. Sites | Dwgs         | No. Sites |
| Category 1a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 651          | 23        | 201          | 13        | 450          | 14        |
| Category 1b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 0            | 0         | 0            | 0         | 0            | 0         |
| <b>All Category 1 ('Deliverable') Sites</b>          |                   | <b>651</b>   | <b>23</b> | <b>201</b>   | <b>13</b> | <b>450</b>   | <b>14</b> |
| Category 2a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 853          | 15        | 63           | 5         | 790          | 10        |
| Category 2b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 845          | 2         | 0            | 0         | 845          | 2         |
| <b>All Category 2 ('Developable') Sites</b>          |                   | <b>1,698</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>63</b>    | <b>5</b>  | <b>1,635</b> | <b>12</b> |
| <b>SUB-TOTAL All Category 1 and Category 2 Sites</b> |                   | <b>2,349</b> | <b>40</b> | <b>264</b>   | <b>18</b> | <b>2,085</b> | <b>26</b> |
| Category 3a sites                                    | < 10 ha           | 285          | 3         | 56           | 1         | 229          | 2         |
| Category 3b sites                                    | > 10 ha           | 1,647        | 1         | 1,647        | 1         | 0            | 0         |
| <b>All Category 3 ('Not Currently Developable')</b>  |                   | <b>1,932</b> | <b>4</b>  | <b>1,703</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>229</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>OVERALL TOTALS</b>                                |                   | <b>4,281</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>1,967</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>2,314</b> | <b>28</b> |

### *Category Schedules and Plans*

- 4.38 Categorisation schedules are set out in Appendices 5, 6 and 7, which for each of the five Location Types identify the Category rating (1, 2 or 3) for all 209 sites in the database. The schedules also provide for each site: brief address details; the gross site area; and the theoretical dwelling yield (after allowance has been made for any site-specific permanent features).
- 4.39 The plans in Appendix 8 show, in schematic terms, the spatial distribution of Category 1, Category 2 and Category 3 sites across the study area. The plans illustrate the way sites in the various Location Types are distributed. The plan for Location Type 1 shows that there are a relatively small number of sites within the Development Limits of the main towns (27 from the 209 that we considered in the study), with the largest concentrations in Malton/Norton and Pickering. Moving on to Location Type 2, it can be seen that there is a much larger supply of sites when the land immediately adjoining the Development Limits of the larger towns and villages is included, with concentrations around Malton/Norton, Pickering and Kirkbymoorside and clusters around some of the second-tier settlements. Most of these sites fall into Category 1 and, as discussed above, they could potentially provide the bulk of the District's 20-year supply.
- 4.40 The plan showing supply from Location Type 3 shows that there are very few sites within the Development Limits of the smaller villages in the District. Location Type 4, meanwhile, shows a large number of Category 1 and 2 sites scattered fairly evenly throughout the District. Location Type 5 has a similar scattering of sites, although it is apparent from the plan that several significant sites are, while falling beyond the definition of 'adjoining', still very close to some of the larger settlements and could potentially be viewed as minor urban extensions to (for example) Kirkbymoorside and Helmsley.
- 4.41 The final plan in Appendix 8 shows all sites in the District. It can be seen that the greatest clusters are around the main settlements (Malton/Norton, Pickering and Kirkbymoorside). Most of the other sites that we have considered are adjacent to the A64 and the A176.



### Summary of Potential Supply from the 209 SHLAA Sites

- 4.42 The potential supply from the five Location Types is summarised in Table 4.8 below. Our work shows that there is a plentiful supply of 'deliverable' (Category 1) sites within Ryedale District - approaching 8,700 dwellings - together with a good supply from 'developable' (Category 2) sites, of over 6,000 dwellings.
- 4.43 The supply from Location Type 1 sites - i.e. those within the Development Limits of the 15 largest settlements - is rather limited, at 1,251 dwellings (or 5 per cent of the total theoretical yield from the 209 sites that we assessed). Furthermore, of the 1,251 dwellings from Location Type 1, only 726 are from Category bands 1 and 2. The supply from sites within the Development Limits of the District's 89 'Other Villages' - i.e. the sites in Location Type 3 - is very low, at just 57 dwellings.
- 4.44 It is clear, therefore, that the potential supply from within the existing Development Limits of Ryedale's largest settlements will not be sufficient to meet the District's long-term dwelling targets, of 2,350 dwellings (first 10 years), 3,386 dwellings (first 15 years) and 4,422 dwellings (first 20 years).

**Table 4.8 Schedule of Theoretical Yields from All Categorised Sites, Location Types 1 to 5**

| Location Type   | Category Band              | Total         |            | PDL          |           | GF            |            |
|---|----------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
|   |                            | Dwgs          | No. Sites  | Dwgs         | No. Sites | Dwgs          | No. Sites  |
| 1 - Sites Within Development Limits of Settlements Named in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy    | All Category 1 Sites       | 370           | 12         | 141          | 7         | 229           | 6          |
|   | All Category 2 Sites       | 356           | 9          | 289          | 8         | 67            | 1          |
|   | <b>All C1 and C2 Sites</b> | <b>726</b>    | <b>21</b>  | <b>430</b>   | <b>15</b> | <b>296</b>    | <b>7</b>   |
|   | All Category 3 Sites       | 525           | 6          | 362          | 6         | 163           | 1          |
|   | <b>Totals</b>              | <b>1,251</b>  | <b>27</b>  | <b>792</b>   | <b>21</b> | <b>459</b>    | <b>8</b>   |
| 2 - Sites Adjoining Development Limits of Settlements Named in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy | All Category 1 Sites       | 6,089         | 51         | 178          | 7         | 5,911         | 48         |
|   | All Category 2 Sites       | 3,310         | 20         | 96           | 4         | 3,214         | 17         |
|   | <b>All C1 and C2 Sites</b> | <b>9,399</b>  | <b>71</b>  | <b>274</b>   | <b>11</b> | <b>9,125</b>  | <b>65</b>  |
|   | All Category 3 Sites       | 254           | 4          | 0            | 0         | 254           | 4          |
|   | <b>Totals</b>              | <b>9,653</b>  | <b>75</b>  | <b>274</b>   | <b>11</b> | <b>9,379</b>  | <b>69</b>  |
| 3 - Sites Within Development Limits of Other Villages Listed in the Local Plan                        | All Category 1 Sites       | 12            | 1          | 0            | 0         | 12            | 1          |
|   | All Category 2 Sites       | 45            | 1          | 45           | 1         | 0             | 0          |
|   | <b>All C1 and C2 Sites</b> | <b>57</b>     | <b>2</b>   | <b>45</b>    | <b>1</b>  | <b>12</b>     | <b>1</b>   |
|   | All Category 3 Sites       | 0             | 0          | 0            | 0         | 0             | 0          |
|   | <b>Totals</b>              | <b>57</b>     | <b>2</b>   | <b>45</b>    | <b>1</b>  | <b>12</b>     | <b>1</b>   |
| 4 - Sites Adjoining Development Limits of Other Villages Listed in the Local Plan                     | All Category 1 Sites       | 1,573         | 55         | 406          | 27        | 1,167         | 38         |
|   | All Category 2 Sites       | 755           | 6          | 0            | 0         | 755           | 6          |
|   | <b>All C1 and C2 Sites</b> | <b>2,328</b>  | <b>61</b>  | <b>406</b>   | <b>27</b> | <b>1,922</b>  | <b>44</b>  |
|   | All Category 3 Sites       | 0             | 0          | 0            | 0         | 0             | 0          |
|   | <b>Totals</b>              | <b>2,328</b>  | <b>61</b>  | <b>406</b>   | <b>27</b> | <b>1,922</b>  | <b>44</b>  |
| 5 - Sites Elsewhere in the Study Area   | All Category 1 Sites       | 651           | 23         | 201          | 13        | 450           | 14         |
|   | All Category 2 Sites       | 1,698         | 17         | 63           | 5         | 1,635         | 12         |
|   | <b>All C1 and C2 Sites</b> | <b>2,349</b>  | <b>40</b>  | <b>264</b>   | <b>18</b> | <b>2,085</b>  | <b>26</b>  |
|   | All Category 3 Sites       | 1,932         | 4          | 1,703        | 2         | 229           | 2          |
|   | <b>Totals</b>              | <b>4,281</b>  | <b>44</b>  | <b>1,967</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>2,314</b>  | <b>28</b>  |
| ALL LOCATION TYPES  | All Category 1 Sites       | 8,695         | 142        | 926          | 54        | 7,769         | 107        |
|   | All Category 2 Sites       | 6,164         | 53         | 493          | 18        | 5,671         | 36         |
|   | <b>All C1 and C2 Sites</b> | <b>14,859</b> | <b>195</b> | <b>1,419</b> | <b>72</b> | <b>13,440</b> | <b>143</b> |
|   | All Category 3 Sites       | 2,711         | 14         | 2,065        | 8         | 646           | 7          |
|   | <b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>       | <b>17,570</b> | <b>209</b> | <b>3,484</b> | <b>80</b> | <b>14,086</b> | <b>150</b> |

- 4.45 There is, however, a much greater supply from Location Type 2 (sites adjoining the District's main settlements), which could be sufficient on its own to meet the District's long-term targets. Indeed, the Category 1 ('deliverable' sites) in Location Type 2 have a considerable potential supply of more than 6,000 dwellings.
- 4.46 Further interrogation of our sites database shows that there is a theoretical potential for over 5,000 dwellings from the 27 sites in Category bands 1 and 2 within and adjoining the existing Settlement Limits of Malton and Norton that we assessed (2,229 dwellings from the 14 Category 1 sites and 2,824 dwellings from the 13 Category 2 sites).
- 4.47 Each of the four options for distributing housing across the District set out on page 16 of the Core Strategy consultation document incorporates a requirement for

at least 50 per cent of the District's new dwellings to be provided in Malton/Norton. This translates to a minimum of 588 dwellings (first five years), 1,175 dwellings (first 10 years), 1,693 dwellings (first 15 years) and 2,211 dwellings (first 20 years) in Malton/Norton. The finding described above is therefore important because it demonstrates that there is sufficient land in Malton/Norton which, on the basis of our strategic assessment, appears to have potential to meet these dwelling targets.

- 4.48 There is a significant potential housing supply in Location Types 4 and 5, although many of the sites are in isolated and rural areas.

## Adequacy of Housing Provision

### *Introduction*

- 4.49 Below, we assess how the 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets could be met. The elements of potential housing supply comprise:

- i) sites with planning permission; and
- ii) the 209 further, specific sites which we have considered through the SHLAA.

- 4.50 Of the identified sites in (ii) above, those in Category band 3 should be considered to represent real potential only when it has been demonstrated that the significant constraints affecting these sites - which could relate to physical, availability or achievability factors, or a combination thereof - can be mitigated or overcome to make them deliverable.

### *Approach*

- 4.51 The components of potential housing supply, as set out in Tables 4.9 and 4.10, are referenced as follows:

- PP = dwellings still to be completed at 1 April 2008 with outstanding planning permission at that date<sup>21</sup>;
- L1, L2, L3, L4, L5 = potential of sites within geographical Location Types 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, respectively; and
- C1, C2, C3 = potential of sites in Category bands 1, 2 and 3 respectively, suffixed 'a' for sites with a gross area of up to 10ha, and 'b' for sites over 10ha gross. Thus, for example, the reference 'L1/C1a' refers to the potential of Category 1 sites, under 10ha in size, in Location Type 1 (i.e. located within the existing Development Limits of those settlements proposed in the emerging Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy).

- 4.52 Tables 4.9 and 4.10 detail the overall composition of potential housing supply across the 5, 10, 15 and 20 year study periods<sup>22</sup>. There is no definitive 'answer' and so within each period, the yield from a combination of components is compared with the dwelling target for the period. Where a combination is sufficient to meet the target, the yield and the number of additional identified sites which make up the yield is highlighted in green. Otherwise the yield and number of sites are left without colour. It is therefore immediately apparent to what extent the potential housing supply for a period is sufficient to meet the target.

- 4.53 The approach described above is adopted for both the total yield and the yield on PDL. It should be noted, however, that the yields for the latter include dwellings from planning permissions on greenfield as well as PDL sites. In treating PDL separately from greenfield yield, it is immediately apparent from the table whether

---

<sup>21</sup> As we explained above, we have applied a non-implementation rate of 20 per cent to all outstanding residential planning permissions that had not been commenced at the study base date. This is taken into account in Tables 4.9 and 4.10.

<sup>22</sup> For reference purposes, the composition of potential housing supply from each individual Location Type is set out in Tables 1 to 5 in Appendix 9.

and to what extent it is likely to be necessary to call on additional greenfield land to meet the RSS target.

- 4.54 As we have already made clear, our site categorisation does not take account of all the policy considerations that are relevant in selecting sites for allocation, which are likely to include the broad sustainability of the total development pattern, impact on biodiversity and landscape, and strategic transport and other infrastructure capacity issues. Thus, we have not undertaken any analysis to consider whether the Category 1 supply, as indicated in Tables 4.9 and 4.10, is in the right place to meet strategic policy objectives. Similarly, we have not considered whether it would be better to remove the obstacles affecting Category 2 PDL and bring these sites forward in advance of Category 1 greenfield sites in order to limit encroachment into open countryside. These issues are beyond the scope of a SHLAA and will need to be considered through the LDF preparation process.

### *Yield Assessment*

#### *Total potential supply (from all sites)*

- 4.55 Table 4.9 confirms that outstanding planning permissions in the District are not sufficient to meet the dwelling target for the first five years of 1,175 dwellings. However, the target can be reached with the use of some Category 1a sites (that is, sites in Category band 1, which are 10ha or less in size) in Location Types 1 and 2 (i.e. sites located within and adjoining the existing Development Limits of settlements proposed in the emerging Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy, labelled L1 and L2 in the table, respectively). The target could theoretically be reached from sites only in Location Type 1, but this would require the use of some Category 2 sites and we are not convinced that the constraints affecting these sites could be overcome within 5 years. We have therefore not included this permutation in Table 4.9.
- 4.56 All of the Category 1a PDL sites in Location Types 1, 2 and 3 - together with the supply from planning permissions - could collectively provide 911 dwellings. In order to achieve the target for the first five years solely without using greenfield sites, it would therefore be necessary to also use some of the supply from the PDL sites in Location Type 4.
- 4.57 Table 4.9 shows that the 10, 15 and 20-year targets cannot be reached from sites solely located within the existing Development Limits of settlements proposed in the emerging Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy (Location Type 1), and within the other villages listed in the Ryedale Local Plan (Location Type 3), even if all sites in Category bands 1, 2 and 3 are used.
- 4.58 The 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets can, however, be met by using a combination of Category 1a sites in Location Types 1 and 2 (i.e. sites located within and adjoining the existing Development Limits of settlements proposed in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy which are under 10ha). It is important to emphasise that this is just one permutation and it does not preclude appropriate sites over 10ha coming forward and being viewed favourably by the Council. The Council might decide to allocate some sites over 10ha, once it has taken account of the sort of factors referred to in paragraph 4.17.
- 4.59 The 10 and 15-year dwelling targets could theoretically be met solely from PDL, if a combination of sites in all three Category bands and across all Location Types is used, although the 20-year target cannot be met solely from PDL. However, the location of some of these sites may not be appropriate for development.

Table 4.9 Adequacy of Cumulative Housing Potential in the Ryedale Study Area, Forthcoming 5, 10, 15 and 20 Year Periods (All Sites)

| Period                           | Component                                    | Total        |                      | PDL          |                      | Comments   |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|--|
|                                  |  | Yield        | Additional Sites (i) | Yield (ii)   | Additional Sites (i) |  |
| First 5 years                    | PP   | 592          | 0                    | 592          | 0                    | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within settlement boundaries.  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a                                    | 962          | 12                   | 733          | 7                    |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L3/C1a                             | 974          | 13                   | 733          | 7                    |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a                             | 5,145        | 63                   | 911          | 14                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within and adjoining settlement boundaries.  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a                      | 5,157        | 64                   | 911          | 14                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a               | 6,730        | 119                  | 1,317        | 41                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a+L5/C1a        | 7,381        | 142                  | 1,518        | 54                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within, adjoining and outside settlement boundaries.   |
|                                  | <b>Dwelling Target (iii)</b>                 | <b>1,175</b> |                      | <b>1,175</b> |                      |  |
| First 10 years                   | PP   | 592          | 0                    | 592          | 0                    | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) and developable (C2) sites within settlement boundaries.   |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a                             | 1,318        | 21                   | 1,022        | 15                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L3/C1a+L3/C2a               | 1,375        | 23                   | 1,067        | 16                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within and adjoining settlement boundaries.  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a                             | 5,145        | 63                   | 911          | 14                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a               | 6,730        | 119                  | 1,317        | 41                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a+L5/C1a        | 7,381        | 142                  | 1,518        | 54                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within, adjoining and outside settlement boundaries.   |
|                                  | PP+C1+C2 (all location types)                | 15,451       | 186                  | 2,011        | 72                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within, adjoining and outside settlement boundaries. |
|                                  | PP+C1+C2+C3 (all location types)             | 18,162       | 224                  | 2,714        | 80                   |  |
| <b>Dwelling Target (iii)</b>     | <b>2,350</b>                                 |              | <b>2,350</b>         |              |                      |  |
| First 15 years                   | PP   | 592          | 0                    | 592          | 0                    | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within settlement boundaries.                        |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L1/C3a                      | 1,843        | 27                   | 1,384        | 21                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L1/C3a+L3/C1a+L3/C2a+L3/C3a | 1,900        | 29                   | 1,429        | 22                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a                             | 5,145        | 63                   | 911          | 14                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within and adjoining settlement boundaries.  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a               | 6,730        | 119                  | 1,317        | 41                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b+L3/C1a+L4/C1a        | 8,391        | 125                  | 1,317        | 41                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b+L3/C1a+L4/C1a+L5/C1a | 9,287        | 148                  | 1,518        | 54                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within, adjoining and outside settlement boundaries.   |
|                                  | PP+C1+C2 (all location types)                | 15,451       | 186                  | 2,011        | 72                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within, adjoining and outside settlement boundaries. |
| PP+C1+C2+C3 (all location types) | 18,162                                       | 224          | 4,076                | 80           |                      |  |
| <b>Dwelling Target (iii)</b>     | <b>3,386</b>                                 |              | <b>3,386</b>         |              |                      |  |
| First 20 years                   | PP   | 592          | 0                    | 592          | 0                    | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within settlement boundaries.                        |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L1/C3a                      | 1,843        | 27                   | 1,384        | 21                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L1/C3a+L3/C1a+L3/C2a+L3/C3a | 1,900        | 29                   | 1,429        | 22                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a                             | 5,145        | 63                   | 911          | 14                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within and adjoining settlement boundaries.  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a               | 6,730        | 119                  | 1,317        | 41                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b+L3/C1a+L4/C1a        | 8,391        | 125                  | 1,317        | 41                   |  |
|                                  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b+L3/C1a+L4/C1a+L5/C1a | 9,287        | 148                  | 1,518        | 54                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within, adjoining and outside settlement boundaries.   |
|                                  | PP+C1+C2 (all location types)                | 15,451       | 186                  | 2,011        | 72                   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within, adjoining and outside settlement boundaries. |
| PP+C1+C2+C3 (all location types) | 18,162                                       | 224          | 4,076                | 80           |                      |  |
| <b>Dwelling Target (iii)</b>     | <b>4,422</b>                                 |              | <b>4,422</b>         |              |                      |  |

4.60 As we explained earlier in this section, the Council will take account of important policy designations such as Green Belt, AONB and other areas of high landscape value later in the plan-making process - when it decides which sites to allocate for housing in the Facilitating Development DPD - and so we did not exclude any sites that were covered by policy designations. The housing potential shown in Table 4.9 above thus includes sites located on land that is covered by the aforementioned designations. Nevertheless, these sites are covered by important policy designations. In Table 4.10 we therefore show, for illustration purposes, the effect on housing supply if sites within the Green Belt and other sensitive landscape areas<sup>23</sup> are excluded from Ryedale's cumulative housing potential.

*Potential housing supply (excluding sites located within the Green Belt and sensitive landscape areas)*

4.61 Some 83 of the 209 sites in our database are covered by sensitive landscape area designations, and a further two sites are within the small area of Green Belt the south-western corner of the District. We specified the potential yield from these 85 sites earlier in this section; it is useful to summarise that information here in order to set the context for the remainder of this section:

- Location Type 1 contains three sites within the AONB (186 dwellings).
- Location Type 2 contains 26 sites within sensitive landscape areas (2,288 dwellings).
- None of the Location Type 3 sites are within the Green Belt or sensitive landscape areas.
- Location Type 4 contains the two Green Belt sites (117 dwellings), and 34 sites within sensitive landscape areas (1,477 dwellings).
- Location Type 5 contains 20 sites within the AONB (1,295 dwellings).

4.62 The theoretical yield from the 85 sites referred to above is therefore significant, at 5,363 dwellings. It is important to emphasise that only a small fraction of this figure (117 dwellings) is from Green Belt sites, and so Table 4.10 mainly shows the effect of excluding sites within sensitive landscape areas.

4.63 Table 4.10 shows that when sites located within the Green Belt and sensitive landscape areas are excluded from Ryedale's housing supply, it is still possible to reach the 5-year target of 1,175 dwellings solely from a combination of Category 1a sites in Location Types 1 and 2 (that is, deliverable sites located within and adjacent to the existing Development Limits of settlements proposed in the emerging Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy).

4.64 Indeed, the 10-year target of 2,350 dwellings, and the 15-year target of 3,886 dwellings, can also be reached using a combination of Category 1a sites in Location Types 1 and 2.

4.65 In order to cover the 20-year period, there is insufficient supply from Category 1a and Category 2a sites (i.e. sites within and adjoining the main 15 settlements proposed in the emerging Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy. The target could be reached, however, by using some Category 2a sites in Location Types 1 and 2. Alternatively, it is possible to meet the 20-year target purely from Category 1a sites; which would require the use of sites within and adjoining the existing Development Limits of the other villages listed in the adopted Local Plan (i.e. Location Types 3 and 4).

---

<sup>23</sup> Namely sites within 'the Howardian Hills AONB' (Local Plan Policy ENV2), 'Areas of High Landscape Value' (Policy ENV3), and 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas' (ENV5).

- 4.66 Again, it is important to emphasise that the permutations referred to above are examples of how the dwelling targets could be reached. The Council will undertake further work to determine which sites to bring forward as allocations in the Facilitating Development DPD, taking account of the sort of factors referred to in paragraph 4.17. Through that process it is possible that the Council might decide to allocate some of the larger sites over 10ha and/or sites in Location Types 3, 4 or 5, , but in the interests of brevity we have not sought to include all of the numerous permutations in our tables.



Table 4.10 Adequacy of Cumulative Housing Potential in the Ryedale Study Area, Forthcoming 5, 10, 15 and 20 Year Periods (Excluding Sites Located Within Sensitive Landscape Areas)

| Period                                       | Component                                    | Total        |                      | PDL          |   | Comments  |
|--|--|--------------|----------------------|--------------|---|---|
|  |  | Yield        | Additional Sites (i) | Yield (ii)   | Additional Sites (i)  |   |
| First 5 years                                | PP   | 592          | 0                    | 592          | 0   |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a                                    | 913          | 10                   | 708          | 6   | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within Development Limits.  |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L3/C1a                             | 925          | 11                   | 708          | 6   |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a                             | 3,267        | 33                   | 854          | 11  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a                      | 3,279        | 34                   | 854          | 11  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within and adjoining Development Limits.  |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a               | 3,883        | 57                   | 983          | 20  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a+L5/C1a        | 4,204        | 67                   | 1,043        | 25  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within, adjoining and outside Development Limits.   |
|  | <b>Dwelling Target (iii)</b>                 | <b>1,175</b> |                      | <b>1,175</b> |   |   |
| First 10 years                               | PP   | 592          | 0                    | 592          | 0   |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a                             | 1,132        | 18                   | 860          | 13  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) and developable (C2) sites within Development Limits.   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L3/C1a+L3/C2a               | 1,189        | 20                   | 905          | 14  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a                             | 3,267        | 33                   | 854          | 11  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within and adjoining Development Limits.  |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a               | 3,883        | 57                   | 983          | 20  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a+L5/C1a        | 4,204        | 67                   | 1,043        | 25  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within, adjoining and outside Development Limits.   |
|  | PP+C1+C2 (all location types)                | 10,088       | 109                  | 1,375        | 40  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within, adjoining and outside Development Limits. |
| PP+C1+C2+C3 (all location types)             | 12,799                                       | 124          | 3,440                | 48           |   |   |
|  | <b>Dwelling Target (iii)</b>                 | <b>2,350</b> |                      | <b>2,350</b> |   |   |
| First 15 years                               | PP   | 592          | 0                    | 592          | 0   |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L1/C3a                      | 1,657        | 24                   | 1,222        | 19  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within Development Limits.                        |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L1/C3a+L3/C1a+L3/C2a+L3/C3a | 1,714        | 26                   | 1,267        | 20  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a                             | 3,267        | 33                   | 854          | 11  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a               | 3,883        | 57                   | 983          | 20  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within and adjoining Development Limits.  |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b+L3/C1a+L4/C1a        | 5,353        | 61                   | 983          | 20  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b+L3/C1a+L4/C1a+L5/C1a | 5,674        | 71                   | 1,043        | 25  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within, adjoining and outside Development Limits.   |
| PP+C1+C2 (all location types)                | 10,088                                       | 109          | 1,375                | 40           | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within, adjoining and outside Development Limits. |   |
| PP+C1+C2+C3 (all location types)             | 12,799                                       | 124          | 3,440                | 48           |   |   |
|  | <b>Dwelling Target (iii)</b>                 | <b>3,386</b> |                      | <b>3,386</b> |   |   |
| First 20 years                               | PP   | 592          | 0                    | 592          | 0   |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L1/C3a                      | 1,657        | 24                   | 1,222        | 19  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within Development Limits.                        |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L1/C3a+L3/C1a+L3/C2a+L3/C3a | 1,714        | 26                   | 1,267        | 20  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a                             | 3,267        | 33                   | 854          | 11  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b                      | 4,145        | 37                   | 854          | 11  |   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L3/C1a+L4/C1a               | 3,883        | 57                   | 983          | 20  | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) and developable (C2) sites within and adjoining Development Limits.   |
|  | PP+L1/C1a+L1/C2a+L2/C1a+L2/C2a               | 4,956        | 53                   | 1,079        | 21  |   |
| PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b+L3/C1a+L4/C1a        | 5,353  | 61           | 983                  | 20           |   |   |
| PP+L1/C1a+L2/C1a+L2/C1b+L3/C1a+L4/C1a+L5/C1a | 5,674  | 71           | 1,043                | 25           | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1) sites within, adjoining and outside Development Limits.   |   |
| PP+C1+C2 (all location types)                | 10,088                                       | 109          | 1,375                | 40           | Cumulative dwelling yield from deliverable (C1), developable (C2), and not currently developable (C3) sites within, adjoining and outside Development Limits. |   |
| PP+C1+C2+C3 (all location types)             | 12,799                                       | 124          | 3,440                | 48           |   |   |
|  | <b>Dwelling Target (iii)</b>                 | <b>4,422</b> |                      | <b>4,422</b> |   |   |

### *Summary*

- 4.67 Over the entire 20-year period, the additional land required to meet the District's dwelling targets as prescribed by the RSS (taking into account under provision since the RSS base date, and likely demolitions), can be provided entirely by sites in Category 1a. Indeed, when all sites are considered, the District's 5-year dwelling target can be met solely from Category 1 sites within the existing Development Limits of settlements proposed in the emerging Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy (i.e. Location Type 1), although this would necessitate the release of some greenfield land.
- 4.68 There is insufficient capacity, however, from deliverable (Category 1) sites within existing Development Limits to meet the 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling targets, although these targets can be reached if Category 1 sites adjoining the largest 15 settlements (i.e. Location Type 2) are taken into account. If the Council does not want to use sites located within the Green Belt or sensitive landscape areas, it will also be necessary to use Category 1 sites within and adjoining the other villages listed in the Ryedale Local Plan (i.e. Location Types 3 and 4) in order to achieve the long-term targets. Alternatively, some of the more constrained Category 2 sites in Location Types 1 and 2 could be released, in order to meet Ryedale's 20-year dwelling targets.
- 4.69 Overall, therefore, there is no need for any Category 3 sites (which we have judged to have serious constraints) to be allocated in order to meet the District's 20-year housing land requirements. Similarly, the Council would not have to rely on the development of the more strategic sites - that is, the 'large sites' with a gross area of 10ha or above that we have identified, all of which are outside of settlement boundaries - in order to meet its housing land requirements over the next 20 years.



