

Public Document Pack

Local Plan Working Party

Held as a Virtual Meeting
on Thursday 4 August 2022

Present

Councillors Paul Andrews, Cleary, Docwra, Frank, Goodrick, Potter and Thackray

In Attendance

Rachael Balmer, Matthew Lishman, Lizzie Phippard and Jill Thompson

Minutes

54 **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Cllr Windress and Cllr Mason.

55 **Minutes of Meeting Held 7 July 2022**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

56 **Report: Local Plan Review - Occupancy Conditions**

Item 3 Addendum

Firstly, Councillors were asked by the Chair if they had any comments to make in relation to the addendum to item 3 which present actual figures for LNO.

The only note was that the figures demonstrate that the condition has been putting a break on the delivery of houses that has the LNOC. In more recent years, a lot less completions than approvals.

Throughout the course of the meeting, it was mostly agreed that the LNO is no longer viable and some viewed it as unsustainable.

Primary Residency Condition

The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Primary Residency condition, set out in the second part of the report. Members discussed the pros and cons of Primary Residency Condition (PRC), to establish whether it would be something they would be keen to explore in the Plan review.

The key points were as follows:

Main disadvantages discussed

- Some members expressed strong desire to provide more affordable housing which was based on earnings rather than market value, and suggested that this should be a key objective in the plan review. Members acknowledged that the PCR will not assist in addressing this affordable housing need. It does depress the value of properties, but not to the extent that they become 'affordable' or indeed meet a local housing need. It was also noted that most change in relation to affordable housing comes mainly from National Policy.
- From the examples of PRC already implement in Cornwall and Northumberland, officers and members remarked on the difficulty to establish how well it is working, as they would need to be in place for at least in excess of 5 years and beyond to gauge how effectively the condition is working in those areas and whether there are an wider, unintended consequences, such as impacts on site allocations delivery where the policy has come in, and price rises in the existing build stock.
- Some Members felt PRC could continue to restrict development.
- Members discussed where a PRC would be imposed and it was concluded that this would not be a condition across board, it would only be in place for 'other villages' and open countryside development, if such a condition was to be applied. Officers referred to the Primary Residency condition currently in place at Northumberland, and noted that the policy is applied in a very settlement specific way. In which only those with 20% or higher proportion of second homes would then have the condition imposed on development approvals. This would mean that only a very limited number of the Ryedale villages would qualify under the condition in place at Northumberland.
- One Member remarked on how the evidence base for housing need through assessments like Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA), is not inclusive of the demand for second homes and holiday homes. It was considered that there is a demand for these but it is not addressed in the evidence.
- On site allocations the implementation of a PRC could affect viability regarding other plan aspirations such as sustainable/accessible build standards, and mandatory requirements such as biodiversity net gain, impending building regulations changes, and CIL and affordable housing contributions.

Main positives discussed

- Some members felt a PRC would not discourage or restrict people from building properties villages
- Some felt the Northumberland policy offered a good example that we should look to implement in Ryedale too.
- Research showed that the PRC would approximately create66 a 5% market value decrease for properties with the condition. This was not deemed an issue by some members.
- One Member felt there would not be issues around enforcing a PRC and felt there were plenty of avenues to prove whether properties are a person's primary residency.

It was asked by one Member if there are any figures available which indicate if there are any settlements within Ryedale with 20% or more second homes. Officers explained that we do not have settlement specific information at present, but that we should note that smaller settlements will have a higher proportion as the overall total is less.

Members took a vote on PRC, not as a formal vote, but for officers to gauge their thoughts on PRC at this stage.

3 members voted for a PRC policy to be included within the review, with two specifying it for Other Villages.

4 members voted against implementing a Primary Residency condition.

57 **Any Other Business**

There was no other business

Meeting closed 19:35

This page is intentionally left blank