

Ref No.	Comment by	Date	Introduction of local criteria	Introduction of fee	General comment - summarised where appropriate
1	Individual	26 Oct	I think this is acceptable and should be included.	I think this is a mistake, it will discourage people to register interest, particularly given the lack of self-build plots becoming available. I have been on the register with Ryedale for years and yet to receive a single invitation to a plot. It will result in an artificially low number of people registering who might otherwise be interested in self-building.	-
2	Individual	26 Oct	-	-	<p>I have been on the register for a lot of years and had no communication whatsoever from Ryedale Council or anyone else. i.e. a complete waste of time. I am surprised I am apparently still on the register.</p> <p>I would certainly not pay to be on a register unless I knew I would get some service.</p>
3	Individual	26 Oct	-	It is a disgrace to even think of charging people for this 'service' which was designed to aid self-builders.	<p>As I was registered with Harrogate Borough Council I assume that's why I'm being consulted. It is a disgrace to even think of charging people for this 'service' which was designed to aid self-builders.</p> <p>As HBC never bothered to contact me of any opportunities despite there being some I doubt NYC will do so, being a far more disorganised council.</p> <p>Please let me know of the outcome of the 'consultation'.</p>
4	Individual	26 Oct	A) I think that point 1 (to require a person to be a	B) I think that point 2 (to introduce a fee of £123 for inclusion on Part 1 of	-

			resident or have a proven connection with North Yorkshire to be on the register) is a very good idea.	the register) is a very very bad idea verging on the ridiculous. I have been on the Harrogate register for many years and have yet to be offered ONE potential building plot. A fee of £123 for inclusion would be dead money in my opinion.	
5	Individual	26 Oct	I'd like to agree on the proposals to introduce a local connection test for inclusion on Part 1 of the register. This requires a person to be a resident or have a proven connection with North Yorkshire as set out in the report (link above);	I'd like to agree on the proposals to introduce a fee of £123 for inclusion on Part 1 of the register.	I'd like to confirm: 1. I live within NYCC boundary since 2020. 2. I'm inclined to pay the fee. Therefore I'd like to request those as soon as they are available.
6	Individual		Having read and reviewed the proposed criteria, I would pass the comment that whilst I largely agreeable in principle of having some eligibility criteria, the proposed solution seems a bit crude. I say this as a resident of York, who whilst surrounded by North Yorkshire Council area, is excluded from it. I have been on the self-build register for some time with particular interest in the Maltkin/ Great Hammerton areas.	-	-

			Whilst these areas are geographically very close to my current home, I would now be excluded from these areas by the proposed eligibility criteria.		
7	Individual	26 Oct	-	<p>My feedback is simple. We registered two years ago and until now have never received any correspondence at all.</p> <p>So if you want a fee what is that for?</p> <p>Please don't say admin, that is such a nonsense, maintaining a database of interested parties would be extremely easy and cost next to nothing.</p> <p>A fee upon a successful application is a different matter and that makes sense but don't get the hopefuls to subsidise the successful.</p>	-
8	Individual	26 Oct	-	<p>Can I just clarify that to be on the register you will now have to pay an administration fee?</p> <p>I have been on this list for over 7 years at Harrogate council without any land ever coming up for sale, so if this is the case then it doesn't seem worth the money unless you are now going to relax the rules.</p>	-
9	Hudswell & District Parish Council	27 Oct	Agree	Agree	With regards to the consultation shown below, Hudswell & District Parish Council agree with both proposals.

10	Individual	27 Oct	-	-	Letter attached setting out their position. Would like to still be part of the register and receive updates on self-builds and conversions
11	Farlington Parish Meeting	28 Oct	-	-	I am contacting you in my capacity as clerk to Farlington Parish Meeting. I have recently received details of your self-build consultation document. I am just enquiring whether the above consultation/proposed rules apply or impact the application above which involves our village? The applicant does not live in Farlington but in a neighbouring village.
12	Individual	28 Oct	<p>Firstly the eligibility test. Residency. I currently live in West Yorkshire. Our home is 0.9 mile from the border of North Yorkshire which would, by your new rules, mean I would no longer be allowed to be on your register. We are based in West Yorks simply for ease due to work commitments at present.</p> <p>Looking through your other suggestions for eligibility, I would sadly not qualify on any counts. Family live in North Yorkshire and have done so for 3 years, not a minimum of 5 as indicated is now necessary. We spend as much time as we can in North Yorkshire when not working.</p>	<p>With regards to the £123 charge you wish to introduce, whilst I accept this may be fairer if you feel this is a necessity to cover costs for future applicants, I do feel those already on registers should not be charged to remain on your new one.</p> <p>There are likely many, numerous, purely clerical matters that have presented themselves across the county since the merging of the smaller councils into NYC. I would imagine, (hope), that not all people who had their details retained for one matter or another across various databases have been asked to pay a fee by the new council simply to have their details moved from one excel spreadsheet / computer system to your new one(s).</p> <p>You estimate that you anticipate on average five additional new persons</p>	-

				<p>wishing to join the register per year moving forward, and that the £123 paid by each (£615), will cover the operating costs. It is not a financial necessity then surely to require a payment from those of us that had already been accepted to be included on a database when there was no fee. I.e. by honouring those already added on the council register(s) this will not cause a realistic financial detriment to NYC.</p> <p>I really hope you are able to take the above points in to consideration when making your final decisions and alter your proposals in your report.</p> <p>For what it is worth, it is truly our dream to move a few miles further up gods country from West to North Yorks to live in the county and build our own, only, permanent home and be part of the community in the area.</p> <p>I appreciate there are other avenues available to us in seeking small plots of land via private sellers etc. but it would be fantastic to also be eligible to remain on the self build register, as I am now, and at no cost, as there was not one previously.</p>	
13	Individual	26 Oct	-	<p>I have read the proposed policy and it mostly it appears well thought out. The charging of a fee to be included on Part 1 is reasonable.</p>	<p>I wish to comment on section 3.18 however - the commitment to publish a list to those on part 1 "at least annually" is inadequate. Ideally whenever the council planning department</p>

					becomes aware of self build opportunities then those on the part 1 list should be notified immediately. Accepting that this may be administratively impractical then a list should be sent at least quarterly. Less often and any opportunities are likely to have been taken up by individuals using other channels rendering the process much less useful from a user's point of view.
14	Individual	7 Nov	-	-	We don't have any comments.
15	Skipton Town Council	8 Nov	Members of the Committee resolved to submit no objection to the recommendations set out in the consultation, but to comment that the area of North Yorkshire remains a very broad area, and could it be restricted to constituency areas?	-	-
16	Individual	14 Nov	-	-	I am writing in connection to the below email I have received regarding the proposed new self-build register for NYC. Having joined the self-build register at Selby District Council, I am interested to know what benefit there will be to join the new register.
17	Thornton le Beans and Crosby with	15 Nov	-	-	We are in agreement with the proposals

	Cotcliffe Parish Council				
18	Individual	16 Nov	I agree to part 1 the local connection.	Regarding part 2 I totally disagree in charging any fee that would be counter productive and discriminatory.	-
19	Individual	16 Nov	-	-	<p>The N. Yorkshire document states several times that the criteria in place for register 1 is in part to try and prevent people using plots to build a second home. There appears to be an assumption being made that those that meet the current criteria e.g. live locally, will not use the plot to build a second home and that those that do not meet the criteria will. If second home ownership is a significant concern then why not include a stipulation that the home built must be the main principle dwelling of the owners? And with this criteria include applications from those who live outside of the area who can demonstrate a clear rationale as to why they are moving to Yorkshire.</p> <p>Letter sets out personal situation.</p> <p>As you know it is difficult to find appropriate plots of land for single dwellings. It feels that people in our position are not being taken into consideration by the outlined criteria. Background information of applicants, such as I have summarised above, feels reasonable criteria to take into account.</p>

					I hope that my views are given full consideration by those taking the decisions within the North Yorkshire Council on this matter.
20	Individual	20 Nov	<p>1) In respect of a local connection:</p> <p>Yes, I feel a local connection should be a requirement. In fact, I don't think the requirement suggested is long enough for those working in North Yorkshire. I feel that, like residency, the proposed requirement should also be a minimum of 3 years (rather than 12 months).</p>	<p>3) Fee for being on the Register</p> <p>A blanket cost of £123 is high.</p> <p>It seems rather steep for the costs, especially as each council initially received £20,000 from central government to start their registers. It would be useful to see where this money went to across NYCC and to be more transparent with the forthcoming proposed registration cost. The wording in the consultation is vague and if people are going to be charged a large fee, then it needs to be spelled out on a spreadsheet the full breakdown of such costs. Where is a proper breakdown of the costs incurred? I would request something concrete.</p> <p>Based on previous workload (or perception thereof), this seems ludicrously high. Whether a person can afford the fee or not, is relevant. No one wishes to pay above going rates for anything. And at the risk of repeating myself, this seems very high.</p> <p>That being said, I respect that the council is not yet charging an annual fee. However, they themselves have</p>	<p>2) Financial solvency test:</p> <p>When did this become a legal requirement? Have I missed something in the national legislation?</p> <p>Fortunes could be made or lost in the amount of time it is taking to get any information from the former Harrogate Borough Council (HBC) about available plots. I think we need a conversation about the 3 year requirement to provide plots to those on the list first. Was HBC exempt? If they were, correspondence to this effect was not sent out. And if they weren't exempt, where is the list of available plots?</p> <p>When plots are finally made available, then a financial details will be necessary, but it feels like the council is putting the cart before the horse. If there is a national obligation, then yes, go ahead with it. But there isn't, so it shouldn't be required at this point. It only adds to the paperwork required on both sides.</p> <p>4) Diversification</p> <p>This isn't even mentioned in the consultation. Self-build allows housing to be more diverse—both in the types of housing and who creates it. Again, looking towards York City Council (and Leeds City Council), they are delivering far more</p>

				<p>said that this could change. And I feel it is unfair to change the parameters after someone has signed up for the register.</p> <p>I certainly feel it is unfair to charge people now that have been on the register for more than 3 years in good faith, and not received any correspondence from local government in respect of the register (except to get them to confirm they wish to stay on, with the hope of shortening the government's list).</p> <p>Some councils are not even charging. York City Council is a perfect example AND they're located in the very same county with similarly priced land and properties (albeit in a different local authority).</p> <p>Across the border in Darlington, in Durham County, the local authority charge the following:</p> <p>£50 to be on the register and a £25 annual fee to remain on it</p> <p>If I were on the list in Darlington, I would pay £125 over 3 years (so a similar cost to NYCC who is proposing to not institute an annual fee), but if I did so, I would expect to be offered a plot during that time. I have already been on the list for more than 3 years</p>	<p>housing in urban areas with their local communities. This is an area that certainly needs improvement in NYCC.</p> <p>Earlier this year, Michael Gove stated that he wanted 5% of housing to be self-build. We should be facilitating that as much as possible and making it possible, not putting up more hurdles.</p> <p>Those are my thoughts. I hope the results of the consultation will be made available. If so, please feel free to email them to me. Or direct me to the results on your website.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>and not heard a thing. I wouldn't wish NYCC to incorporate an annual fee if they couldn't deliver on the land in the time stipulated by central government. Or if they couldn't deliver land in my local area.</p> <p>That brings me to a further concern about this consultation. What are the boundaries of the register? I signed up for a register in the Harrogate local district. Would I now potentially be required to accept a plot on the other side of the county? These are questions I'd love answers for.</p> <p>Lastly, I'd once again request a breakdown of the costs of keeping the register and where the respective £20,000 went to across the county. The costs are only very generally spelled out in the consultation. A more concrete breakdown should be provided, especially as this is an optional cost and NYCC has opted to charge.</p>	
21	Shipton by Beningbrough Parish Council	22 Nov	-	-	Concern over the number of consultations recently. Could these be spread out and given longer response times.
22	Individual	22 Nov	I agree with the proposal to create a new Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Register for North Yorkshire	Agree with the introduction of a fee	3. Discontinue the use of the Local Needs Occupancy Condition in Ryedale or amend the wording of the occupancy condition to be identical with the wording of the proposed

			and include new eligibility criteria. However, for the criteria to make sense, and be equally relevant across the whole of the county, a minor change is required. The new North Yorkshire-wide register requires amendment to the Ryedale Local Needs Occupancy Condition wording, or, better still, for the LNOC to be discontinued.		eligibility criteria of the new self-build register as copied below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · An applicant has previously lived in North Yorkshire for a continuous period of three years within the past ten years; · An applicant is currently employed in North Yorkshire and has been for the past twelve consecutive months · An applicant is currently self-employed, with an ongoing viable venture where work is within North Yorkshire, and has been for the past 12 consecutive months · An applicant has close family living in North Yorkshire, who have done so for at least five years, e.g. children, parents, brothers and sisters only. · An applicant currently lives in North Yorkshire and has done so for at least three consecutive years;
23	Newsham Parish Council	23 Nov	Newsham Parish Council are in favour of the proposals to introduce both the local connection test, and fee, before inclusion on the register.	Newsham Parish Council are in favour of the proposals to introduce both the local connection test, and fee, before inclusion on the register.	-
24	Easingwold Town Council	4 Dec	Easingwold Town Council agrees with the proposals.	-	-
25	Individual	23 Nov	-	-	I was interested to see that North Yorkshire Council is setting up a self-build register and that consultation is underway. I would like to think

					<p>that this forms part of a broad-based and consistent review of planning policy for the rural areas and will address the Local Needs Occupancy Condition.</p> <p>In Ryedale we have experienced this policy for many years now and in my opinion, it has backfired big style. I am not alone in thinking this; other agents, landowners and builder/developers have a similar view. I believe this policy has reduced the number of plots coming forward which has had a detrimental effect, not only on village life but also the rural economy.</p> <p>It does not make sense to me that Ryedale and the other former local authority areas have different planning policies, and I think this is an ideal opportunity to lift and remove the Local Needs Occupancy Condition from North Yorkshire Council planning policy.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---