



POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Thursday 24 September 2020 at 6.30 pm

Council Chamber, Ryedale House, Malton

IMPORTANT: The Council fully recognises and respects the role and importance of democratic meetings and is committed to protecting the health and safety of Elected Members and Officers who participate. Risk assessments are undertaken in advance of each meeting, and are reviewed on an ongoing basis. The intention is to hold democratic meetings in-person where it is safe to do so. However, if, as a result of risk assessment it is determined that a physical meeting cannot safely occur, the meeting will proceed virtually and details of this will be made available on the Council's website.

In the event of a physical meeting, social distancing measures will be in place throughout, however it is important that you **do not attend** the meeting if **you or anyone in your household** has symptoms of COVID-19.

For the purpose of public transparency and accountability, the meeting will be live streamed online. Details of how to access the live stream will be made available on the Council's website in due course. For health and safety reasons and in accordance with our risk assessment, members of the public are asked to follow the meeting via this method rather than attending any physical meeting in person. If you are unable to access the meeting this way, please contact us so that we can explore whether any safe alternative option is possible. The media will be able to report on proceedings from the live stream.

Agenda

1 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Chairman to inform Members of the Public of the emergency evacuation procedure.

2 **Apologies for absence**

3 **Declarations of Interest**

Members to indicate whether they will be declaring any interests under the Code of Conduct.

Members making a declaration of interest at a meeting of a Committee or Council are required to disclose the existence and nature of that interest. This requirement is not discharged by merely declaring a personal interest without further explanation.

- 4 **Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 March 2020** (Pages 5 - 12)

5 **Urgent Business**

To receive notice of any urgent business which the Chairman considers should be dealt with at the meeting as a matter of urgency by virtue of Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

TO RECEIVE WORKING PARTY MINUTES

- 6 **Minutes of the Constitution Working Party held on 12 March 2020** (Pages 13 - 22)

- 7 **Minutes of the Local Plan Working Party held on 18 June 2020** (Pages 23 - 24)

- 8 **Minutes of the Local Plan Working Party held on 15 September 2020** (Pages 25 - 26)

- 9 **Minutes of the Car Parking Working Party held on 24 August 2020** (Pages 27 - 30)

PART 'A' ITEMS - MATTERS TO BE DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS OR MATTERS DETERMINED BY COMMITTEE

- 10 **HR Policy Revision** (Pages 31 - 50)

- 11 **White Paper Consultation - Planning for the Future** (Pages 51 - 70)

- 12 **Changes to the Current Planning System - MHCLG Consultation** (Pages 71 - 84)

PART 'B' ITEMS - MATTERS REFERRED TO COUNCIL

- 13 **Update on Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Workstream**
(Pages 85 - 114)

- 14 **Homelessness and Rough Sleeper Strategy Summary** (Pages 115 - 134)

- 15 **Exempt Information**

To consider a resolution to exclude the press and public from the meeting during consideration of the following items:

Item 16 (Housing Benefit Debtor Write Offs) as provided by paragraph 1 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to an individual.

Item 17 (Future Support for Leisure Service Provision) as provided by paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Item 18 (Shared Housing Initiative) as provided by paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Item 19 (Development Opportunities and Housing Programme) as provided by paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The public interest test has been considered and, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption is considered to outweigh the public interest in disclosing the information.

EXEMPT PART 'A' ITEMS - MATTERS TO BE DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS OF MATTERS DETERMINED BY COMMITTEE

16 **Housing Benefit Debtor Write-Offs** (Pages 135 - 140)

EXEMPT PART 'B' ITEMS - MATTERS REFERRED TO COUNCIL

17 **Future Support for Leisure Service Provision** (Pages 141 - 152)

18 **Shared Housing Initiative** (Pages 153 - 162)

19 **Development Opportunities and Housing Programme** (Pages 163 - 172)

20 **Any other business that the Chairman decides is urgent.**

This page is intentionally left blank

Policy and Resources Committee

Held at Council Chamber, Ryedale House, Malton
on Thursday 19 March 2020

Present

Councillors Joy Andrews, Delaney, Docwra, Duncan (Chairman), King and Wass

Overview & Scrutiny Committee Observers: Councillors Oxley and Clark

In Attendance

Stacey Bulet, Simon Copley, Phillip Spurr and Louise Wood

Councillors Potter (for items 1-15 and 24), Mason (for items 1-5 and 24)

Minutes

109 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Arnold, Cllr Frank, Cllr Burr and Cllr Thackray.

110 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Delaney declared a personal, pecuniary but prejudicial interest in item 22 as a trustee of the Milton Rooms. Cllr Delaney left the room and did not participate in the vote for this item.

111 Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 February 2020

Decision

That the minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 6 February 2020 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.
--

Voting record

5 For

1 Abstention

112 Urgent Business

There was one item of urgent business regarding the Council's COVID-19 response. The reason for the urgency was the ongoing public health emergency situation.

113 Minutes of the Constitution Working Party held on 12 February 2020

The minutes of the Constitution Working Party held on 12 February 2020 were received.

114 **Minutes of the Car Parking Working Party held on 25 February 2020**

The minutes of the Car Parking Working Party held on 25 February 2020 were received.

PART 'A' ITEMS - MATTERS TO BE DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS OR MATTERS DETERMINED BY COMMITTEE

115 **Recommendations from Grants Working Party held on 9 March 2020**

Cllr Duncan proposed, and Cllr Docwra seconded the following amendment:

That the recommendations be amended to include an award of 25% of total project costs, up to £2,182, for the Hovingham Clock project.

Resolved

Upon being put to the vote the amendment was passed.

Voting record

3 For
2 Against
1 Abstention

Decision

That the recommendations of the Grants Working Party held on 9 March 2020 be approved, subject to the amendment to award 25% of total project costs, up to £2,182, for the Hovingham Clock project.

Voting record

4 For
2 Abstentions

116 **Performance Report**

Considered – report of the Head of Communications, Technologies and Business Transformation.

Decision

The progress report on performance was noted.

Voting record

Unanimous

117 **Ryedale Housing Strategy Review and Action Plan 2015-2021**

Considered – report of the Housing Services Manager

Decision

That the progress update is noted and the revised Action Plan for 20/21 is agreed.

Voting record

Unanimous

118 Draft Ryedale Homelessness and Rough Sleeper Review and Strategy 2020-25

Considered – report of the Housing Services Manager.

Decision

That the draft strategy is approved for further consultation.

Voting record

Unanimous

119 Implementation of the Climate Change Action Plan - Progress Report

Considered – report of the Programme Director for Economic Development, Business and Partnerships

Decision

That the Climate Change Action Plan Progress Report is noted.

Voting record

Unanimous

120 Ryedale Destination Development Plan

Considered – report of the Programme Director for Economic Development, Business and Partnerships

Decision

To endorse the Ryedale Destination Development Plan to promote growth in tourism and increase the value of the visitor economy by 5% over the next three years and support local businesses and attractions via a partnership approach.

Voting record

4 For

2 Against

PART 'B' ITEMS - MATTERS REFERRED TO COUNCIL

121 **Recommendations of the Constitution Working Party held on 12 March 20**

This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

122 **Council Plan 2020-2024**

Considered – report of the Chief Executive

Comments received from the Liberal Group on the Council Plan 2020-2024 document were circulated and discussed.

Recommendation

That the Council Plan 2020-2024 is approved, which is attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

Voting record

4 For

2 Against

123 **Response to Motion to Council and Consultation on Proposed HCV Restriction**

Considered – report of the Programme Director of Economic Development, Business and Partnerships

Recommendation

It is recommended to Council that:

- (i) The Council welcomes the commitment from North Yorkshire County Council to undertake work to develop proposals for a junction that allows for all-direction movements between York Road and the A64, near the western end of the Malton Bypass. It is understood that the intention is to develop proposals to a stage whereby bids for funding the junction could be submitted at short notice.

Further, officers will continue discussions with colleagues at North Yorkshire County Council with the aim of identifying options and developing proposals for a junction or slip roads between Broughton Road and the A64.

- (ii) Council approve a suggested response to the County Council's consultation stating that the only way to solve the HCV problem in Malton is to deliver infrastructure

Voting record

Unanimous

ITEMS TO NOTE

124 Public Service Hub Update

The Chairman provided the following update:

“In February, Officers met with representatives from the One Public Estate team to clearly establish the parameters of the newly agreed Public Services Hub project on the Ryedale House site following the amalgamation of funding originally allocated to two projects – the Malton Public Services Hub (originally proposed for Wentworth Street), and the development of the Ryedale House site.

Available remaining funding and eligibility of spend was confirmed. Funds can be used in any way which will best help RDC to deliver this project, including consultancy and salary costs to allow for additional capacity to develop a scheme. Whilst there are no contractual timescales for spend, we need to be conscious that funding was originally allocated in 2018 and tangible progress towards achieving the agreed key outputs of creating a shared Public Services Hub and delivery of affordable housing needs to be made.

Officers have identified three key pieces of work to proceed with:

- i. Revisit the partnership to redefine the needs of partners for the new PSH and for their existing sites, and to scope out the possibility of incorporating other partners;*
- ii. Preparation of a new brief to commission a piece of work to look at the feasibility of a range of options for the Ryedale House site;*
- iii. Development of an updated project plan with timescales to share with the One Public Estate team.*

Preparation of a brief to secure additional external expertise to support the process is underway.

Decision

That the update is noted.

Voting record

Unanimous

EXEMPT INFORMATION

125 Exempt Information

Resolved

To exclude the press and public from the meeting for discussion of the following items:

Item 19 (Committee Approval for Urgent Capital Works) as provided by paragraphs 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and is in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

Item 20 (Housing and Benefit Debtor Write Offs) as provided by paragraph 1 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to an individual.

Item 21 (To Receive the Minutes of the Milton Rooms Working Party held on 26 February 2020) as provided by paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 as it contains information relating to an individual, information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Item 23 (Update on Railway Tavern, Norton) as provided by paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The public interest test has been considered and, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption is considered to outweigh the public interest in disclosing the information.

EXEMPT PART 'A' ITEMS - MATTERS TO BE DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS OR MATTERS DETERMINED BY COMMITTEE

126 Committee Approval for Urgent Capital Works

Considered – report of the Head of Waste and Environment

Decision

- (i) To replace the roof and re-ducting works totalling £91,152 at Ryedale Swim and Fitness Centre in Pickering and
- (ii) To meet the obligation of the lease at the former waste transfer station on Showfield Lane in Malton that delegated approval is given to the Chief Finance Officer (S151 Officer) in consultation with the Chair of Policy and Resources Committee once the value of the dilapidations claim is agreed, notwithstanding that the Council will seek recompense from the sub-tenant, with an update to be brought to Policy and Resources Committee on the outcome

Voting record

Unanimous

127 **Housing Benefit Debtor Write Offs**

Considered – report of the Chief Finance Officer

Decision

That the item be deferred for consideration at the next meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee.

Voting record

Unanimous

128 **To Receive the Minutes of the Milton Rooms Working Party held on 26 February 2020**

The minutes of the Milton Rooms Working Party held on 26 February 2020 were received.

129 **To Consider Recommendations from the Milton Rooms Working Party on 17 March 2020**

Considered – the recommendations from the Milton Rooms Working Party held on 17 March 2020.

Decision

That the recommendations be approved.

Voting record

Unanimous

EXEMPT PART 'B' ITEMS - MATTERS REFERRED TO COUNCIL

130 **Update on the Railway Tavern, Norton**

Considered – report of the Programme Director for Economic Development, Business and Partnerships

Recommendation

To approve the recommendation as set out in the report.

Voting record

Unanimous

131 **Any other business that the Chairman decides is urgent.**

This item was taken under item 5.

Considered – report of the Chief Executive

Recommendation

It is recommended to Full Council that

- (i) The initial approach to service delivery, prioritising support to local people, be noted and endorsed, as set out in Appendix 1;
- (ii) Further measures to support local people will be put in place as the situation emerges and the government issues more guidance;
- (iii) The delegated powers held by the Chief Executive for use in an emergency be noted;
- (iv) The Council make available from Strategic Reserve a sum of £250k to support the Council's response;
- (v) To agree that where resources are required above this amount on an urgent basis, that the s.151 officer discusses this with the Leader before authorising any spend;
- (vi) To note that we will also work with other organisations and government to assist where we can, and await further guidance from central government on a number of issues, including business rates and the payment of benefits. This may require creating a further contingency.

Voting record

Unanimous

Constitution Working Party

Held at Ryedale House, Malton, North Yorkshire YO17 7HH
on Thursday 12 March 2020

Present

Councillors Clark, Arnold, Burr MBE, Cleary and Duncan (Chairman)

In Attendance

Ellen Walker and Simon Copley

Minutes

22 **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Keal.

23 **Minutes of the Meeting of the Constitution Working Party on 12 February 2020**

Cllr Burr advised that she was not in agreement with the minutes of the previous meeting.

It was requested by members that the minutes be amended to reflect that the working party had discussed the motion without making any recommendations. Additional appendices were also requested to clearly denote the specific revisions to the motion as it is now presented.

24 **Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business which the Chairman considered should be dealt with as a matter of urgency by virtue of Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

25 **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

26 **Motion on Council Governance Arrangements**

Members discussed each section of the suggested revised motion relating to the Leader and Deputy Leader, as presented by the Chair, and further revisions were considered. A proposal was put forward that the Lead Members be appointed by the Policy and Resources Committee. It was agreed that this proposal would be discussed at the next meeting of the working party.

It was requested that the suggested revisions be provided as tracked from the original motion and that details of the changes required to the constitution should the motion pass be provided to the working party.

A further meeting of the Constitution Working Party will be convened in order to consider the further suggested revisions, amendments required to the constitution if the motion is passed, and to refer the motion back to Full Council.

The original motion is attached as appendix 1 of the minutes. The suggested revisions to date are indicated in appendix 2. Appendix 3 shows the revised motion as it currently stands, should the revisions be accepted.

27 **Any other business that the Chairman decides is urgent.**

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 8:15pm.

APPENDIX 1 – Original motion

Proposed by Councillor Duncan and seconded by Councillor Arnold:

“This council tasks the Head of Paid Service to update and amend the constitution to reflect the following:

Leader

- *The Annual Council Meeting will appoint a Councillor to be the Leader of the Council for the Municipal Year*
- *The Annual Council Meeting will also appoint the Leader to be a member of the Policy & Resources Committee and to act as its Chairman*
- *The Leader will:*
 - *be the Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee;*
 - *provide overall strategic vision and direction to the council;*
 - *coordinate the work of the council’s committees;*
 - *work closely with the Head of Paid Service to ensure member priorities are delivered;*
 - *act externally as the council’s main political representative;*
 - *and be the council’s main spokesman in the media*

Deputy Leader

- *The Annual Council Meeting will appoint a Councillor to be the Deputy Leader of the Council*
- *The Annual Council Meeting will also appoint the Deputy Leader to be a member of the Policy & Resources Committee and to act as its Vice Chairman*
- *The Deputy Leader will:*
 - *be Vice Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee;*
 - *work closely with and support the Leader;*
 - *act and speak on the Leader’s behalf at meetings and in the media when required to do so*

Lead Members

- *The Leader and Deputy Leader will serve as Lead Members, each with a Lead Portfolio*
- *The Annual Council Meeting will appoint up to three other Lead Members, each with a Lead Portfolio relating to areas of council policy, for the Municipal Year*
- *The Annual Council Meeting will agree the portfolio areas for each Lead Member and appoint the Lead Members to be members of the Policy & Resources Committee*
- *Lead Members will:*
 - *provide political oversight and leadership of their portfolio area;*
 - *provide collective oversight and leadership of the authority;*
 - *act as a public spokesman for their portfolio area;*
 - *present relevant reports, as required, to the Policy & Resources Committee and Council;*
 - *and be answerable to the Policy & Resources Committee and Council for service performance in their portfolio areas*

- *The “Administration” of the Council, therefore, comprises the Leader, Deputy Leader and Lead Members, who are drawn from all, or part of, the controlling group’s or controlling coalition’s membership of the Policy & Resources Committee*

Member Champions

- *Subject to the ongoing review into Member Champions, the Annual Council Meeting may appoint Member Champions responsible for promoting general themes in a non-partisan manner.*

Committees

The council will continue to operate under non-executive arrangements i.e. ‘the committee system’, with no individual member wielding executive power.

It will have the following committees:

- **Policy & Resources Committee** with power to establish an Appeals Sub-Committee and an Appointments Sub-Committee
- **Overview & Scrutiny Committee**
- **Planning Committee**
- **Licensing Committee** with power to establish a Licensing Sub-Committee
- **Audit, Governance & Standards Committee** to carry out the Audit Committee and Corporate Governance Standards Committee functions currently exercised by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee

The size of committees shall be determined each year by Annual Council.

Members may be appointed to the membership of on one or more committees of the council, except members of Policy & Resources Committee cannot sit on Overview & Scrutiny Committee, and vice versa.

Accountability

- *The Leader will continue to present a written report to each Full Council*
- *In addition to questions on notice to the Chairman, Leader and Committee Chairmen currently allowed, members may also ask a question on notice to a Lead Member on an issue relating to their Lead Portfolio*

The changes should come into effect as of the Annual Meeting of Council 2020, when council will appoint a Chairman, Vice Chairman, Leader, Deputy Leader, Lead Members, Committee Chairmen, Committee Vice Chairmen and (if required) Member Champions, and allocate members to committees in accordance with political proportionality.”

APPENDIX 2 – Suggested revisions

Considered at the Constitution Working Party Meeting held on 12 March 2020

Following discussion and suggested revision by the Constitution Working Party of the motion proposed by Councillor Duncan and seconded by Councillor Arnold, the proposed motion now reads:

“This council tasks the Head of Paid Service to update and amend the constitution to reflect the following:

Leader

- The Annual Council Meeting will ~~appoint~~ elect a Councillor to be the Leader of the Council for the Municipal Year, who shall:
- ~~The Annual Council Meeting will also appoint the Leader to be a member of the Policy & Resources Committee and to act as its Chairman~~
- ~~The Leader will:~~
 - be the Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee;
 - provide overall political leadership and strategic vision ~~and direction~~ to the council;
 - ~~coordinate the work of the council's committees;~~
 - work closely with the Head of Paid Service to work to ensure member council priorities are delivered;
 - promote cross-party communication, collective decision-making and the flow of information to members;
 - act externally as the council's main political representative;
 - and be the council's main spokesman in the media public spokesperson;
 - be answerable to council, presenting a written statement to each meeting and taking questions on that statement

Deputy Leader

- The Annual Council Meeting will ~~appoint~~ elect a Councillor to be the Deputy Leader of the Council for the Municipal Year, who shall:
- ~~The Annual Council Meeting will also appoint the Deputy Leader to be a member of the Policy & Resources Committee and to act as its Vice Chairman~~
- ~~The Deputy Leader will:~~
 - be Vice Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee;
 - work closely with, and support the Leader, to provide overall political leadership and strategic vision to the council;
 - work closely with, and support the Leader, to ensure council priorities are delivered;
 - promote cross-party communication, collective decision-making and the flow of information to members;
 - ~~act and speak on the Leader's behalf at meetings and in the media deputise for the Leader~~ when required to do so

To be considered at the next Constitution Working Party Meeting

Lead Members

- ~~• The Leader and Deputy Leader will serve as Lead Members, each with a Lead Portfolio~~
- ~~The Annual Council Meeting~~first Policy & Resources meeting of the municipal year will appoint up to three other elect Lead Members, each with a Lead Portfolio relating to ~~areas of council policy~~ key priorities within the Council Plan, for the Municipal Year who shall:
- ~~• The Annual Council Meeting will agree the portfolio areas for each Lead Member and appoint the Lead Members to be members of the Policy & Resources Committee~~
- ~~• Lead Members will:~~
 - be members of the Policy and Resources Committee;
 - provide political ~~oversight and leadership~~ and strategic vision of to their portfolio area;
 - provide collective oversight and leadership of the authority;
 - work closely with, and support, the Leader to ensure council priorities, relevant to their portfolio area, are delivered;
 - promote cross-party communication, collective decision-making and the flow of information to members;
 - act as a public spokesman spokesperson for their portfolio area;
 - ~~• present relevant reports, as required, to the Policy & Resources Committee and Council;~~
 - ~~• and be answerable to the Policy & Resources Committee and Council for service performance in their portfolio areas~~
- ~~• The “Administration” of the Council, therefore, comprises the Leader, Deputy Leader and Lead Members, who are drawn from all, or part of, the controlling group’s or controlling coalition’s membership of the Policy & Resources Committee~~

Member Champions

- ~~• Subject to the ongoing review into Member Champions, the Annual Council Meeting may appoint Member Champions responsible for promoting general themes in a non-partisan manner.~~

~~Committees~~

~~The council will continue to operate under non-executive arrangements i.e. “the committee system”, with no individual member wielding executive power.~~

-

~~It will have the following committees:~~

- ~~• **Policy & Resources Committee** with power to establish an Appeals Sub-Committee and an Appointments Sub-Committee~~
- ~~• **Overview & Scrutiny Committee**~~
- ~~• **Planning Committee**~~
- ~~• **Licensing Committee** with power to establish a Licensing Sub-Committee~~
- ~~• **Audit, Governance & Standards Committee** to carry out the Audit Committee and Corporate Governance Standards Committee functions currently exercised by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee~~

~~The size of committees shall be determined each year by Annual Council.~~

-

~~Members may be appointed to the membership of on one or more committees of the council, except members of Policy & Resources Committee cannot sit on Overview & Scrutiny Committee, and vice-versa.~~

~~Accountability~~

- ~~• The Leader will continue to present a written report to each Full Council~~

~~In addition to questions on notice to the Chairman, Leader and Committee Chairmen currently allowed, members may also ask a question on notice to a Lead Member on an issue relating to their Lead Portfolio~~

~~**Note:** The council operates under non-executive arrangements, with no individual member wielding decision-making powers~~

~~The changes should come into effect as of the Annual Meeting of Council 2020, when council will appoint a Chairman, Vice Chairman, Leader, Deputy Leader, Lead Members, Committee Chairmen, Committee Vice Chairmen and (if required) Member Champions, and allocate members to committees in accordance with political proportionality.”~~

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 3 – Suggested revised motion

Considered at the Constitution Working Party Meeting held on 12 March 2020

Following discussion and suggested revision by the Constitution Working Party of the motion proposed by Councillor Duncan and seconded by Councillor Arnold, the proposed motion now reads:

“This council tasks the Head of Paid Service to update and amend the constitution to reflect the following:

Leader

- *The Annual Council Meeting will elect a Councillor to be the Leader of the Council for the Municipal Year, who shall:*
 - *be the Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee;*
 - *provide overall political leadership and strategic vision to the council;*
 - *work to ensure council priorities are delivered;*
 - *promote cross-party communication, collective decision-making and the flow of information to members;*
 - *act externally as the council's main political representative;*
 - *be the council's main public spokesperson;*
 - *be answerable to council, presenting a written statement to each meeting and taking questions on that statement*

Deputy Leader

- *The Annual Council Meeting will elect a Councillor to be the Deputy Leader of the Council for the Municipal Year, who shall:*
 - *be Vice Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee;*
 - *work closely with, and support the Leader, to provide overall political leadership and strategic vision to the council;*
 - *work closely with, and support the Leader, to ensure council priorities are delivered;*
 - *promote cross-party communication, collective decision-making and the flow of information to members;*
 - *deputise for the Leader when required to do so*

To be considered at the next Constitution Working Party Meeting

Lead Members

- *The first Policy & Resources meeting of the municipal year will elect Lead Members, each with a Lead Portfolio relating to key priorities within the Council Plan, who shall:*
 - *be members of the Policy and Resources Committee;*
 - *provide political leadership and strategic vision to their portfolio area;*
 - *work closely with, and support, the Leader to ensure council priorities, relevant to their portfolio area, are delivered;*
 - *promote cross-party communication, collective decision-making and the flow of information to members;*
 - *act as a public spokesperson for their portfolio area;*

Note: *The council operates under non-executive arrangements, with no individual member wielding decision-making powers*

Local Plan Working Party

Held on Thursday 18 June 2020

Present

Councillors Paul Andrews, Duncan (Chairman), Goodrick, Mason and Windress

In Attendance

Gary Housden and Jill Thompson

Minutes

6 **Local Plan Review**

The Working Party received and noted a report on the Local Plan review

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Plan Working Party

Held at Council Chamber - Ryedale House, Malton, North Yorkshire YO17 7HH
on Tuesday 15 September 2020

Present

Councillors Docwra, Duncan and Windress

In Attendance

Rachael Balmer, Phillip Spurr and Jill Thompson

Minutes

7 Minutes

Decision
That the minutes of the meeting of the LPWP held on 18.06.2020 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

8 Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr Paul Andrews.

9 Government Consultation: Planning for the Future. White Paper

10 Government Consultation: Changes to the current planning system

11 Local Plan Review

Members of the Working Party discussed proposed changes to the planning system proposed by Government. It was agreed that the details of the next steps for the Local Plan Review would be considered at the next meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Car Parking Strategy Working Party

Virtual Meeting on Monday 24 August 2020

Present

Councillors Joy Andrews, P Andrews and Duncan

In Attendance

Alan Bardet and Amy Thomas

Minutes

22 **Welcome and Apologies**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Delaney, Keal and Frank.

23 **Minutes from previous meeting held on 25 February 2020**

Members agreed the minutes to the previous meeting.

24 **Discussion of Pickering Recommendations**

Members discussed the Ryedale District Council car parking findings and recommendations for Pickering including the following points:

- Possibility of free short-stay car parking offering to match those discussed for the other towns in Ryedale.
- The recommendation to keep a tariff at the Ropery car park.
- Current use of Lidl car park.
- Unmarked land opposite Lidl, owned by NYCC, currently with no enforcement or charges.
- Other third party parking.
- On street parking in Market Place, recommendation that NYCC apply reduced stay limits. Limited parking with loading bays and disabled parking has been put forward in the past but was rejected by NYCC. Enforcement required to prevent lengthy stays.
- Residential streets and the lack of parking for residents due to use by people working in Pickering.
- The possibility that current time restrictions be extended and enforcement to be focused in Potter Hill.
- Potential for RDC to establish orders on the land adjacent to Train Lane to enable sale of long term parking permits.
- Customer surveys of Eastgate, The Ropery and Market place parkers considered, including time restrictions causing limits to stay time and lack of reasons to keep people in Pickering for a longer time.
- The recommendation to establish Eastgate as main worker and tourist car park with all day low cost ticket, including upgrading the walking

connection between Eastgate and Market Place. Signage and visibility of car park needs improvement.

- The advantages versus costs of post-payment, tap in/out parking as mentioned in previous meetings.
- Vivis lane to possibly offer affordable short/long stay parking.
- Supporting provision of parking at North Yorkshire Moors Railway (NYMR) and Trout Farm
- Possibility of working with NYMR to encourage visitors to spend more time in Pickering
- The recommendation of Formalisation by NYCC of coach drop-off and very short stay parking in lay-by on Park Street, and the issues this may create. Reservations were expressed and consultation with NYMR would be needed. Possibility of Trout Farm as coach park discussed, officers to investigate solutions.
- Ryedale swim and fitness centre, revision of car parking layout, parking on access roads, possible order and 2 hour stay limit. Issues with on-road parking at access to sports centre.
- The leisure centre at Lady Lumleys and issues with on-road parking.
- Pickering War Weekend and the provision of Park and Ride and other distributed temporary car parks to meet demand. Since the report was produced, a Park and Ride service has been trialled, it was queried whether this will be happening again in 2021.
- Impact of new developments including reduction of car use.
- Cllr J Andrews raised that stall holders at Pickering Market are allowed to park in Vivis Lane, although some did not adhere to this, causing issues for traffic and emergency vehicle access. She enquired whether this is still the case. Officers to follow this up and confirm the situation.

25 **Other Issues for Consideration (District-wide and location specific)**

Members discussed the following additional items:

- Wentworth Street car park in Malton has trialled 24hrs opening as discussed in previous meeting, with no issues reported. Electric Vehicle charging funding application in the process of being submitted.
- Blue Badge Holder Parking / Charging –Whether charging is appropriate for blue badge holders. It was agreed that more information on what other councils do in North Yorkshire would be of use.
- Permit pricing policy, range of permits, corporate permits (eg: Post Office in Malton), FOC Permits. The need for better transparency/advertising and simplification of the current offering.
- Use of Car Parks by Third Parties eg: GP Surgery drive through flu jabs. How this is handled for different requests. The need to be dealt with on a case by case by case basis with local consultation when needed.

- Approach to dealing with RDC land on which parking takes place but is not a car park eg: Train Lane in Pickering and Vine Street in Norton etc. Consistency needed across different sites.
- Free parking request received by residents of Kirkbymoorside. This could be incorporated in the suggested provision for free parking in every town as discussed previously.
- Cllr P Andrews raised a concern regarding removing the free parking provision at St Nicholas Street in Norton. The conclusion from previous meeting around low cost permits and time-limited free parking was discussed as well as the possibility of consultation with local residents.

26 **Next Steps and Timescales**

All feedback to be taken by officers to create a draft strategy and action plan policy to be considered by members, for presentation to the Policy and Resources committee in November. Draft to be completed by end of September for consideration in the next working party. Any additional consultation to take place before then.

Funding for the remaining WSP consultation is still available. For remaining budget, they could look at completing a proposed tariffs and regulations report including a forecast of financial impact. This would instead of consultation that is not possible due to Covid-19. Members agreed this should be based on the draft RDC policy being produced, or alternatively WSP give a number of options. Officers to discuss with WSP where this would best fit in bearing in mind how much budget is available. Some elements of the policy could be implemented while pricing is being discussed.

27 **Any Other Business**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank



PART A:	MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS
REPORT TO:	POLICY AND RESOURCES
DATE:	24 SEPTEMBER 2020
REPORT OF THE:	HEAD OF HUMAN RESOURCES ANDREW ELLIS
TITLE OF REPORT:	HR POLICY REVISION
WARDS AFFECTED:	ALL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To approve revised human resources policies

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 It is recommended that

(a) The revised policies are agreed for implementation.

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Many of the current HR policies are outdated and not fit for purpose. The revision of these policies link into the aims and objectives of the People and Culture Plan.

3.2 Policies and procedures are living documents that should grow and adapt with an organisation. Policy review and revision is a crucial part of an effective policy and procedure management plan.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

4.1 There are no significant risks identified with the revised policies. Outdated policies however, can leave an organisation at risk. Old policies may fail to comply with new laws and regulations and may not address new systems or technology, which can result in inconsistent practices.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

5.1 Full trade union consultation has taken place and the revised policies have been approved by Strategic Management Board. Final ratification by Elected Members will complete the consultation process prior to implementation.

REPORT

6.0 REPORT DETAILS

6.1 HR policies are a written description of rights and responsibilities of employers and employees. If a policy is well developed and clearly written, it helps communication with employees, clarifies expectations and makes sure that everyone is treated in a consistent and fair way. These are all important factors for creating a desirable culture for the organisation, and they minimise exposure to legal risk.

6.2 The following policies have been revised in line with up to date legislation and recommended best practice and are attached in full to this report as appendices:

(a) Capability Policy: Purpose and Scope

This policy has been put in place to encourage all employees to achieve and maintain the required standard of performance and to ensure consistent and fair treatment for all.

This policy applies to all employees of Ryedale District Council. Any employee on Chief Officer Terms and Conditions will fall within the guidelines of the Joint Negotiation Committee and therefore this policy will not apply. The policy does not apply to any employees in the following circumstances:

- Employees within their probationary period. Please refer to the probationary policy.
- For dealing with issues of misconduct, attendance or grievance, for which separate policies apply and there may be occasions where employees are subject to more than one process at a time.

(b) Disciplinary Policy: Purpose and Scope

This policy has been put in place to encourage all employees to achieve and maintain the required standard of conduct and to ensure consistent and fair treatment for all.

This policy applies to all employees of Ryedale District Council, other than those on Chief Officer Terms and Conditions.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The following implications have been identified:

- (a) Financial
There are no additional financial implications on the Council from the policy revision.
- (b) Legal
Under the repeal of the statutory procedures in April 2009 and the introduction of a recommended code of practice from ACAS (April, 2009) in managing disciplinary matters, which have a direct link to other policies, employment tribunals will expect that we have dealt with matters fairly, openly and consistently. Also, that employees are clear through the procedures, of the potential action they shall face if found in breach of any singular or group of

policies. Failure to follow due process and procedure, may result in Ryedale District Council incurring additional costs above the statutory awards where the Council has been found to not have carried out its full procedures which are deemed fair and consistent for all employees of the Council.

- (c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental, Crime & Disorder)
None, other than as stated above

Name of Head of Service **Andrew Ellis**
Job Title **Head of HR**

Author: Marie Lomax, HR Project Officer
Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 43395
E-Mail Address: marie.lomax@ryedale.gov.uk

Background Papers:
Appendix A – Capability Policy
Appendix B – Disciplinary Policy

This page is intentionally left blank



Capability Policy and Procedure

Document Control Sheet

Reference Number	HRCAP
Version Number	01
Document Author	Senior HR Business Partner
Lead SMB Member	Head of HR
Ratifying Committee	Policy & Resources Committee
Date Ratified	
Date Policy Effective From	
Next Review Date	

Unless this copy has been taken directly from Ryedale District Council's intranet, there is no assurance that this is the most up to date version.

This policy supersedes all previous issues

1. Purpose and Scope

1.1. This policy has been put in place to encourage all employees to achieve and maintain the required standard of performance and to ensure consistent and fair treatment for all.

This policy applies to all employees of Ryedale District Council. Any employee on Chief Officer Terms and Conditions will fall within the guidelines of the Joint Negotiation Committee and therefore this policy will not apply.

The policy does not apply to any employees in the following circumstances:

- Employees within their probationary period. Please refer to the probationary policy.
- For dealing with issues of misconduct, attendance or grievance, for which separate policies apply and there may be occasions where employees are subject to more than one process at a time.

2. Principles

2.1. The following principles will be applied to all capability matters;

- Employees' performance will firstly be regularly appraised informally through regular supervision, which will involve agreeing objectives and setting targets and identifying training and developmental needs. This will feed into the corporate framework for appraisals within the organisation.
- It will be the joint responsibility of the employee and the employee's line manager to ensure that the duties of the post are carried out to the required standard on an ongoing basis.
- The informal stage of the procedure, as detailed above, must be carried out by the line manager before any further action is taken and every effort should be made to resolve the issue at this stage. This must be clearly documented and evidence needs to be available which clearly demonstrates that the employee is aware of concerns in relation to their performance before matters are progressed to this procedure.
- Where a lack of necessary skills are identified, the manager will take all reasonable steps to provide appropriate training, supervision or support which could help the employee to sufficiently improve their performance. Managers should keep a record of all training and development that is provided.

- Employees are to be clearly notified of their expectations and their responsibilities at all stages of the procedure, including the informal stage. The Action Plan (Appendix 1) may be used during all stages.
- It is in the interests of both the Service and the employee that capability issues are resolved as quickly as possible. Therefore action under the appropriate stages of this policy should be taken promptly and no party should unreasonably delay the process being followed.

3. Procedure/Informal Stage

- 3.1. It is expected that managers would raise any performance issues with an employee as part of the normal supervisory process. All records of these conversations should be kept, including additional training needs and support already provided.
- 3.2. If following this, there continues to be issues with an employee's performance or if it is felt the performance issues cannot be addressed through the normal supervisory process, then the following Capability procedure should be invoked.
- 3.3. During all stages of the informal or formal capability process, communication between parties is key to a successful outcome for all concerned. Notes of discussions should be taken and kept securely, support given should be noted and HR advice should be sought about different options of support that may be appropriate and/or available through wider networks.
- 3.4. It may be necessary during both informal and formal stages to have more regular 1-2-1 meetings between the line manager and employee than normal in order to assess improvements and provide an adequate level of support. This should be agreed in advance and should remain supportive.
- 3.5. Managers should be able to evidence a variety of methods, training and additional support that they have considered/implemented or, if this is not suitable or appropriate, annotate the reasons why this decision has taken place. Employees may also suggest additional support that they would like management to consider in order to improve their performance.

4. Stage 1

- 4.1. When it has been concluded that the formal Capability procedure should be invoked the employee should be spoken to by the manager and informed of this. They will then be invited to an initial capability meeting where the process will be discussed. At this point the manager should reiterate to the employee of the areas of performance that are to be addressed.
- 4.2. The manager should provide a copy of this policy to the employee and ensure they are aware that the purpose of the capability procedure is to support the employee to reach the required level of performance.

- 4.3. The manager should invite the employee to the initial capability meeting in writing, confirming the areas of performance that are to be discussed. The letter should be sent in advance of the meeting, allowing the employee time to prepare and arrange for their Union Representative or work colleague to be in attendance.
- 4.4. The employee will have the opportunity to discuss any difficulties they may be having, and together both parties will try to establish and agree appropriate action to be taken which will help to improve performance to the required standard. Specific targets should be clearly set out including what the employee needs to do to achieve them. At this point the length of monitoring period and the regularity of review meetings should be decided upon and relayed to the employee. A written record of the meeting should be taken and a copy provided to the employee.
- 4.5. Specific attention should be paid to any additional support that may be required to enable the employee to reach the required standard. This may be in the form of additional support either inside or outside of the organisation as appropriate to the expertise available, and may take a number of forms, for example, online training, mentoring, attending courses, conversations with high performing departments/individuals. Like objectives, behaviours should be agreed between managers and staff to ensure they are appropriate to the role and understood and are actioned immediately.
- 4.6. The employee's performance will be monitored for a specified period of time, which will be for a minimum of 4 weeks but should be no longer than 8 weeks from the initial meeting date. During that period, both the line manager and employee should meet at an agreed frequency in order to achieve a satisfactory outcome. A written record of all such meetings and the targets set should be retained by the line manager whilst the matter is in progress, and a copy will be given to the employee.
- 4.7. The employee should be informed that if the expected levels of performance are not be met within the monitoring period that the process will move onto the next stage.
- 4.8. It is hoped that with additional support, the monitoring period should enable the employee to achieve a satisfactory level of performance, thus ending this process. However if at the end of the monitoring period, satisfactory levels of performance have not been met then the process should move onto the next stage. The employee should be told at this point that the next stage of the process has been invoked and why this decision has been taken.

5. Stage 2

- 5.1. When it has been concluded that the initial capability meeting and monitoring period has been unsuccessful and the employee has not sufficiently improved their level of performance, the process should be moved onto the second stage and the manager should inform the employee of this. The employee will then be invited to the second capability meeting where the next

stage of the process will be discussed.

- 5.2. The manager should invite the employee to the second capability meeting in writing, confirming the areas of performance that are to be discussed. The letter should be sent in advance of the meeting, allowing the employee time to prepare and arrange for their Union Representative or work colleague to be in attendance.
- 5.3. The letter should recap the areas of the employees performance that are not satisfactory, the targets previously set and outline the support offered to date to the employee to improve performance.
- 5.4. At the meeting the manager will outline the nature of the underperformance and what measures have already been taken to support the employee as set out in the initial capability meeting and monitoring period.
- 5.5. The employee will be given the opportunity to explain why they have not met the required standards during the initial monitoring period, any issues or concerns that they may have and any further support that they think they may need.
- 5.6. At this point the manager will give consideration to a further period of monitoring and if any further support is needed. As in stage 1, specific targets should be clearly set out including what the employee needs to do to achieve them. At this point the length of the further monitoring period and the regularity or review meetings should be decided upon and relayed to the employee. A written record of the meeting should be taken and a copy provided to the employee.
- 5.7. The employee's performance will be monitored for a specified period of time, which will be for a minimum of 4 weeks but should be no longer than 8 weeks from the initial meeting date. During that period, both the line manager and employee should meet at an agreed frequency in order to achieve a satisfactory outcome. A written record of all such meetings and the targets set should be retained by the line manager whilst the matter is in progress and a copy will be given to the employee.
- 5.8. The employee should be informed that should the expected levels of performance not be met within the monitoring period, that the process will move to a hearing where other employment options will be considered including dismissal on the grounds of capability.
- 5.9. It is hoped that with additional support, the further monitoring period should enable the employee to achieve a satisfactory level of performance, thus ending this process. However, if at the end of the monitoring period, satisfactory levels of performance have not been met then the process should move to a hearing, Stage 3 as outlined below.

6. Stage 3

- 6.1. If the further monitoring period has been unsuccessful and the employee has not reached the required level of performance following the second monitoring period, the manager should meet with the employee to discuss this. The manager should inform the employee that a hearing will now be arranged where the future of their employment will be considered.
- 6.2. At the hearing the Manager will describe the unsatisfactory levels of performance and the support offered to date to assist the employee. The employee will have the opportunity to present their case also. The employee has the right to be accompanied by a trade union representative or work colleague at the hearing. The hearing will be chaired by a Head of Service or above who will be accompanied by a member of HR who, when both parties have presented all of their information fully, will decide the appropriate outcome. This can be, but is not limited to;
- Redeployment into a different post within the Authority
 - An extension to the monitoring period and/or further support/training
 - Demotion into a lower graded post without pay protection
 - A change in working hours or duties
 - Dismissal on the grounds of capability
- 6.3. The outcome of the hearing will be confirmed to the employee in writing. The employee will have the right of appeal against the decision. To do this they must write to the chair of the hearing within 10 working days of receipt of the outcome letter, detailing the reason for appeal.

7. Appeals

- 7.1. An employee may appeal against any of the actions listed above.
- 7.2. Appeals against dismissal will be heard by a Member of Senior Management Board and at least one Elected Member as part of the panel to ensure impartiality.
- 7.3. Appeals against any other sanction will be heard by the relevant member of the Council's Strategic Management Board or their representative, accompanied by a member of HR.
- 7.4. Any appeal must be made in writing within 10 working days of the receipt of the letter confirming the outcome. The appeal should be sent in writing to the Manager.

Capability: Action Plan

Employee Name		Job Title	
Line Manager		Department	
Stage <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>	Informal / Formal	Meeting Date	

	Issue (be clear if this is something that the employee is doing or not doing and what is and isn't acceptable)	Action/Training to take place (is this internal or external, consider mentoring, buddying, visits to other Councils if possible)	Dates of meetings/milestones	People involved	Review period
1					
2					
3					
4					

Actions agreed (Manager signature)		Date	
Actions agreed (Employee signature)		Date	

This page is intentionally left blank



Disciplinary Policy and Procedure

Document Control Sheet

Reference Number	HRDIS
Version Number	01
Document Author	Senior HR Business Partner
Lead SMB Member	Head of HR
Ratifying Committee	Policy & Resources Committee
Date Ratified	
Date Policy Effective From	
Next Review Date	

Unless this copy has been taken directly from Ryedale District Council's intranet, there is no assurance that this is the most up to date version.

This policy supersedes all previous issues

1. Purpose and Scope

- 1.1 This policy has been put in place to encourage all employees to achieve and maintain the required standard of conduct and to ensure consistent and fair treatment for all.
- 1.2 This policy applies to all employees of Ryedale District Council, other than those on Chief Officer Terms and Conditions.

2 Principles

- 2.1 The following principles will be applied to all disciplinary matters;
 - Disciplinary action will not be taken against an employee until the matter has been fully investigated.
 - At every stage in the procedure the employee will be advised of the nature of the complaint against them and they will be given the opportunity to state their case before any decision is made.
 - At all stages the employee will have the right to be accompanied by a trade union representative or work colleague.
 - No employee will be dismissed for a first breach of discipline except in the case of gross misconduct when the penalty will be dismissal without notice or payment in lieu of notice.
 - All sanctions and the reasons for them will be confirmed to the employee in writing.
 - All employees will have the right to appeal against any disciplinary sanction imposed.
 - Before starting a disciplinary procedure, the line manager should first see whether the problem can be resolved in an informal way or has previously considered this and the employee has failed to achieve the required standards or it would be inappropriate in the circumstances.
 - The application of this policy and procedure complies with the ACAS Code of Practice for Disciplinary and Grievance.

3 Procedure

- 3.1 When minor issues with an employee's conduct are raised, they may be dealt with informally but where the matter is more serious or the informal discussions by supervisors have not been effective, the Disciplinary Policy and Procedure will be applied.
- 3.2 As part of the informal process, managers may choose to issue a 'management instruction'. Before issuing a management instruction, the manager must have undertaken an analysis of the situation and be sure that this course of action is appropriate for the situation.
- 3.3 Management instructions should only be used in lower level disciplinary cases, where a full investigation and potential first written warning in the first instance may seem a

little harsh. Some examples of such situation are listed in Appendix 1 (Minor Misconduct).

4 Notification of Allegation(s)

- 4.1 The employee will be notified in writing of the nature of the allegation or issues in question and that they are subject to a disciplinary investigation.
- 4.2 The nature of the allegations may change during the course of the investigation. The employee should receive correspondence notifying them of any changes to the allegations as soon as reasonably practicable.
- 4.3 Notification of the allegations and any relevant evidence will be provided to the employee in sufficient time for them to be able to state their case as part of the investigation process.

5 Precautionary Action/Suspension

- 5.1 Depending on the nature of the allegations the employee may be subject to precautionary action. This can include but is not restricted to redeployment, variation to duties or suspension whilst an investigation is carried out.
- 5.2 Suspension should only be used in situations where the employee is considered to be a harm to themselves, colleagues, clients/service users, members of the public, or where information or evidence which may be needed as part of the investigation may be tampered with.
- 5.3 Suspension may also be deemed appropriate where there is a concurrent policy investigation, however this will also depend on the nature of the allegations and the relevance of this to their employment.
- 5.4 Alternatives to suspension should be considered – for example, alternative duties, garden leave.
- 5.5 Precautionary action is not prejudicial to the outcome of the investigation, it is to ensure a fair process is applied and all parties are protected when necessary.
- 5.6 Any precautionary action that may be taken will be confirmed to the employee in writing and it will be reviewed throughout the investigation.
- 5.7 The need for precautionary action, the type of precautionary action or revoking precautionary action may become apparent at any time during the course of the investigation.

6 Investigatory Interviews

- 6.1 An investigating officer will be appointed to establish facts, interview witnesses, take statements and gather documentary evidence. The Investigating Officer will need to be impartial and may be a manager from a different service area in the interest of impartiality. The Investigating Officer will need to be appropriately skilled to undertake the investigation and should seek advice and guidance from HR as appropriate.

- 6.2 As part of the Disciplinary Investigation an employee will be invited in writing to attend an investigatory interview where they will be asked questions in relation to the allegation(s) of misconduct. This letter should notify the individual of the allegation(s).
- 6.3 Should the employee or their representative be unable to make the suggested meeting date, they should suggest an alternative date and time within 10 working days of the original date, unless there are exceptional circumstances (e.g. planned holiday out of the country). In exceptional circumstances the meeting should be rearranged to be held at the earliest opportunity.
- 6.4 Notes of this interview will also be taken and then provided to the employee to verify and sign to ensure that an accurate record has been taken. These will then be used in the disciplinary investigation and added to the evidence.
- 6.5 Should the allegations change during the course of the investigation, the employee will be notified at the earliest opportunity in writing and be given the opportunity to respond to the change in allegations.
- 6.6 During the course of the disciplinary investigation, other employees may be called to interviews as witnesses as they may have any information that could aid the investigation. The witnesses will also be notified in advance of the date, time and venue of the meeting and will have the right to be accompanied by either a Union representative or work colleague. Notes of this interview will also be taken and then provided to the employee to verify and sign to ensure that an accurate record has been taken. These will then be used in the disciplinary investigation and added to the evidence.

7 Conclusion of Disciplinary Investigation

- 7.1 Once the Disciplinary Investigation has been concluded and all relevant parties have been interviewed and evidence has been collated, the Investigation Officer will produce a report which will contain the recommendations as listed below:
- Recommend that there is **sufficient evidence** for the case to proceed to a Disciplinary Hearing
 - Recommend that there is **insufficient evidence** for the case to proceed to a Disciplinary Hearing

If there is a recommendation that there is insufficient evidence for the case to proceed to Disciplinary Hearing, the employee will be notified in writing as soon as reasonably practicable, without undue delay.

8 Disciplinary Hearing

- 8.1 Should the case be recommended to proceed to a Disciplinary Hearing, the employee will be required to attend a further meeting. They will be notified in advance of the date, time and venue of the meeting and will have the right to be accompanied by either a Trade Union representative or work colleague. Only in exceptional circumstances will be employee not be permitted to attend. Where there is the potential for the outcome of the hearing to be dismissal, the letter must state this.
- 8.2 The employee will receive all relevant documentation, including the full investigation report and appendices a minimum of 5 working days before the date of the hearing. If there is a significant amount of data, it may be requested by all parties that this timescale be extended and this should be granted if deemed reasonable to do so.

- 8.3 Should the employee or their representative be unable to make the suggested meeting date, they should suggest an alternative date and time within 10 working days of the original date, unless there are exceptional circumstances (e.g. planned holiday out of the country). In exceptional circumstances the meeting should be rearranged to be held at the earliest opportunity.
- 8.4 At the hearing the employee will be notified of the allegations and they will be given the opportunity to answer any of the allegations and set out their case. The meeting will be conducted by an independent Chairperson of sufficient seniority within the organisation, who will normally be advised by someone from HR. The hearing should be recorded for accuracy.
- 8.5 In cases where the outcome of the hearing may result in dismissal, there should be a panel of at least 3 people, one of which may include HR. In all cases, HR should advise the panel.
- 8.6 The employee will be required to attend the meeting whether they are currently in work or not, unless the above mentioned exceptional circumstances apply. In the event that the employee is persistently unable or unwilling to attend the disciplinary hearing or agree an alternative date without good cause, a decision will be made, in their absence, with all the evidence available.
- 8.7 If the employee were to fall sick within this period, they should notify their manager on the first day of absence and then the employee will be required to follow the normal sickness absence reporting procedures.

9 Outcome of Disciplinary Hearing

- 9.1 The possible outcomes from a disciplinary hearing are;
- No further action
 - The meeting is adjourned until a further date, normally pending further information (reason must be given to the employee)
 - Disciplinary action is required
 - Written Warning
 - Final Written Warning
 - Dismissal (with or without notice)
- 9.2 The outcome will be confirmed to the employee in writing as soon as reasonably practicable, without undue delay.

10 Disciplinary Action

- 10.1 The three levels of disciplinary action are detailed below;
- 10.1.1 A Written Warning is given when the employee's conduct has not been of the expected standard. The warning is kept on the employee's personal file for 6 months, but will normally be disregarded for disciplinary purposes following this period of satisfactory conduct.
- 10.1.2 A Final Written Warning is given when the employee's conduct is more serious than a Written Warning, but not serious enough to warrant dismissal. The warning is kept on the employee's personal file for 12 months, but will normally

be disregarded for disciplinary purposes following this period of satisfactory conduct.

10.1.3 Dismissal may happen when the three step process above has been exhausted (Written Warning, Final Written Warning, Dismissal) or where when the employees conduct is so serious that their employment is terminated. Depending on the seriousness of the case will dictate whether the employee receives notice pay following dismissal or is summarily dismissed (without notice).

10.1.4 Contractually the organisation may choose to provide payment in lieu of notice and not require the employee to work their notice period. Any such payment is subject to tax and national insurance deductions in the normal way.

10.2 All disciplinary action will be confirmed to the employee in writing and they will be given the right of appeal.

10.3 Examples of the type of misconduct that would warrant each level of disciplinary action are listed in Appendix 1.

11 Gross Misconduct

11.1 Examples of gross misconduct can be found in Appendix 1. This is not an exhaustive list.

11.2 If the disciplinary investigation concludes that gross misconduct has occurred the outcome will normally be a final written warning or dismissal. Dismissal in cases of gross misconduct may be with or without notice (summary dismissal) where the offence is such that this is deemed appropriate

12 Appeals

12.1 An employee may appeal against any of the levels of disciplinary action listed above.

12.2 An appeal against a Written Warning or a Final Written Warning will be heard by the relevant member of the Council's Strategic Management Board or their representative, accompanied by a member of HR.

12.3 Appeals against dismissal will be heard by a Member of Senior Management Board and at least one Elected Member as part of the panel to ensure impartiality.

12.4 Any appeal must be made in writing within 10 working days of the receipt of the letter confirming the disciplinary action. The appeal should be sent in writing to the Investigating Officer.

Types of Misconduct

Please find listed below the types of misconduct and examples along with probable consequences. Please note this is not an exhaustive list, they are only examples, and they should not be regarded as the only examples of misconduct.

1. Minor Misconduct

- Persistent lateness
- Unauthorised absences
- Failure to follow absence reporting procedures
- Minor conduct issues

These types of misconduct would normally result in a Written Warning. Continued/repeated incidences of misconduct could potentially lead to Final Written Warning or Dismissal.

2. Serious Misconduct

- Verbal assault or threat of violence in the workplace to employees or other people.
- Negligence in carrying out duties in accordance with the Authority's policies and procedures.
- Misconduct occurring outside of the workplace, which is deemed sufficiently serious to affect an employee's position at work.
- Inappropriate use of electronic communications, including email or internet access facilities.
- Failure to abide by professional codes of conduct / standards.
- Repeated minor misconduct where disciplinary action has failed to improve behaviour

These types of misconduct would normally result in a Final Written Warning. Continued/repeated incidences of misconduct could potentially lead to Dismissal.

3. Gross Misconduct

- Unauthorised removal or misuse of the Authority's property
- Stealing from the Authority, it's Members, employees or members of the public and other instances of dishonesty.
- Serious breaches of confidentiality (unless subject to the protection afforded by the 'Speak Out' Policy / Public Interest (Disclosure) Act 1998).
- Serious breaches of safety regulations endangering other people, including deliberate damage to, neglect of and misappropriation of safety equipment.
- Discrimination, bullying or personal harassment of any person including Elected Members, Customers and Colleagues/Co-Workers.
- Being incapable of work, or of working safely due to the influence of alcohol or drugs.
- Behavior which has brought the Authority or its services into serious disrepute.
- The victimization, intimidation or harassment of any co-worker/colleague on the grounds of their gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, race, age, religious beliefs or disability.

These types of misconduct would normally result in dismissal without notice.

This page is intentionally left blank



PART A:	MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS
REPORT TO:	POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
DATE:	24 SEPTEMBER 2020
REPORT OF THE:	HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICES GARY HOUSDEN
TITLE OF REPORT:	WHITE PAPER CONSULTATION - PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE.
WARDS AFFECTED:	ALL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consider the proposals included in the White Paper and to agree this Council's response to the consultation.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that:

- (i) The proposed responses to the White Paper at Appendix 1 are agreed in principle.
- (ii) Authority is delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee to finalise any further detailed changes in line with member feedback.

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 To ensure that this Council's views are forwarded to Government and taken into account as reforms to the planning system are finalised.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

- 4.1 The report covers a consultation response. There are no significant risks associated with the recommendations.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The White Paper was issued by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government on the 6 August 2020 for a twelve week period of consultation ending on 29 October 2020.

- 5.2 The White Paper proposes significant reforms to the planning system which are directly relevant to this Council's role as Local Planning Authority and its corporate priorities: a sustainable, safe and clean place to live; strong, inclusive and attractive communities; harnessing Ryedale's unique economy to deliver growth, homes and jobs.
- 5.3 A further consultation paper, proposing changes to the current planning system has also been issued for consultation. This is the subject of a separate report on this agenda.
- 5.4 The members of the Local Plan Working Party considered the proposals in the White Paper at a meeting on 15 September 2020.
- 5.5 Officers have alerted Town and Parish Council's to the consultation and have suggested that they forward any views that they would like the District Council to consider as it frames its response. Any comments received from the local councils will be reported verbally at the Local Plan Working Party meeting. Clearly, the Local Council's may wish to respond directly and in their own right to the consultation or via the Local Council's Association which usually co-ordinates a response to government consultations on behalf of its members. Officers have also alerted all of the local estates to the consultation.

REPORT

6.0 Planning For the Future - Overview

- 6.1 The paper proposes radical reform of the planning system and the proposals represent one of the most significant set of changes to the system since its inception. This includes a new style of Local Plan, with consequential changes for the development management process. Members are advised that the White Paper can be read in full using the following links

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907647/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907956/Planning_for_the_Future_web_accessible_version.pdf

- 6.2 The Government has made it clear that it considers reforms to the planning system to be necessary and has confirmed that the proposals are designed to:
- Address delay and speed up development; reduce risk for developers; address complexity and political argument
 - Improve public trust and engagement
 - Improve design and build quality
- 6.3 In particular they seek to:
- Streamline the planning process and replacing the 'entire corpus of plan-making law' – moving to a rules based decision making system rather than the current discretionary, case by case system (Emphasis on proactive place-making)

- Introduce a radical, digital first approach to modernise the planning process – driven by data rather than documents
- Bring increased focus on design, sustainability and proactive place-making
- Improve infrastructure delivery through reform of developer contributions
- Ensure more land is available for homes and development and to support renewal of town and city centres

The White Paper is an eighty page document. It includes 24 proposals which are accompanied by a set of twenty six detailed and specific questions. A detailed list of the proposals and a proposed response to the questions posed as part of the consultation (which are of particular relevance to the Council) is at Appendix 1.

Summary of Proposals

6.4 The proposed changes are based on 3 ‘pillars’ :

- Planning for development
- Planning for beautiful and sustainable places
- Planning for infrastructure and connected places

Planning for development

6.5 A new approach to plan-making is central to the proposed reforms. The role and content of plans and the process of production will be simplified with plans identifying three categories of land (across the whole plan area) on a colour coded digital interactive web-based map. :

Growth Areas: areas designated as suitable for substantial development (new settlements, urban extensions, major redevelopment sites).

Renewal Areas: areas which are suitable for development and covering existing built areas. This will include urban and brownfield sites, infill development and small sites on the edges of villages. The phrase ‘gentle densification’ is used in relation to these areas in the White Paper.

Protected Areas; areas where development would be generally and which are on a range of spatial scales, including Green Belt, Nationally Protected Landscapes, Open Countryside, Gardens areas at risk of flooding.

6.6 In Growth and Renewal areas, the plan will be expected to list suitable uses and establish design parameters (eg height and density) – established locally but informed by permitted development flexibilities and National Model Design Code. Sub- area categories can be used in Growth and Renewal areas and Growth Areas will be expected to include sub-areas to promote self and custom build and community-led housing. For Protected Areas, the plan will explain what is permitted by cross reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6.7 To accompany the new style of plan a streamlined and more engaging plan-making process will be introduced, covering five stages:

Stage1 6 Months	Stage 2 12 Months	Stage 3 6 Weeks	Stage 4 9 Months	Stage 5 6 Weeks
LPA calls for suggestions for areas for the 3 categories Public engagement	LPA draws up Plan and produces evidence	Plan submitted for Examination and published for the public to comment on	Inspector considers whether the three categories are sustainable All parties right to be heard Inspectors changes binding	Local Plan map, key and text finalised and come into force

6.8 In addition, to support development, accelerate plan-making and decision making, the package of proposed reforms also propose:

- That development management policies will be established nationally and included in national policy to allow for shorter local plans
- The emphasis of plans will be development parameters/standards – informed by design codes that will ‘twin track’ plan production. If local design codes are not in place, the national design code (expected Autumn 2020) will take precedence
- That plans will be more visual with an ability to be digitally ‘screened’
- A simplified Sustainability Appraisal process
- That the tests of soundness to be replaced with one sustainable development test
- The removal of the Duty to Co-Operate
- A statutory duty to adopt a new Local Plan – no more than 30 months from legislation coming into force or 42 months for those that have adopted a plan in the previous three years
- That Neighbourhood Plans are retained but with content to reflect national proposals for Local Plans (an emphasis on local design requirements)
- That larger development sites to be developed by multiple developers to improve build out rates

6.9 Significantly, the Government is also proposing the re-introduction of ‘top down’ housing requirements in order to distribute the national housing target of 300,000 new homes annually. This will be a binding requirement using a new methodology for calculating need. The methodology will be based on the number of existing homes in an area, projected rises in households and changes in affordability. It is made clear that requirements will be focussed in areas where affordability pressure is highest in order to prevent land being a barrier to new homes being built. It is stated that the methodology will take into account land constraints, such as Green Belt or protected landscapes although it is not clear how this will be achieved.

6.10 The paper indicates that the requirement to maintain a deliverable five year supply of housing may be removed but that the Housing Delivery Test will be retained in order to ensure that housing requirements are delivered.

6.11 To align with reforms to plan-making, a number of changes are proposed which are aimed at streamlining the development management process. These are summarised as follows:

Growth Areas	Renewal Areas	Protected Areas
<p>Automatically given outline permission on adoption of the plan</p> <p>Requirement for a master-plan and site specific design code to be agreed for inclusion in the category.</p> <p>Full permission would then be achieved through one of three streamlined consent routes:</p> <p>a reformed reserved matters process (with decisions potentially delegated automatically to officers);</p> <p>Local Development Order (which could be linked to master plans and design codes);</p> <p>Development Consent Order under Nationally Significant Infrastructure regime (in the case of exceptionally large schemes such as New Towns)</p>	<p>A presumption in favour of development with consent granted in one of three different ways:</p> <p>For pre-specified forms of development set out in a local plan, a new permission route giving automatic consent if design and prior approval requirements are met</p> <p>Faster planning application process for other types of development</p> <p>Use of Local or Neighbourhood Development Orders</p>	<p>Planning Applications as at present (unless permitted development rights are utilised) and assessed against national policies in the NPPF.</p>

6.12 Any proposal in a growth or renewal area which is different to the Local Plan would require a planning application but the Government emphasises that this would be very much the exception to the ‘zoning’, design code, rule-based approach.

6.13 In addition, the White Paper proposes:

- Greater digitalisation of the application process, including case management software to automate routine processes; standardisation of technical information, applications and conditions
- Planning data to be open and digitally accessible
- 8-13 week determination period to be a firm deadline with extensions of time discouraged
- Automatic delegation of decisions to officers where the principle of development is established
- Automatic refund of fees if applications are not determined within time limits and deemed approval if there has not been a timely determination
- Rebate of fees if applicants are successful on appeal
- New approaches to consulting on applications (site notices and neighbour letters seemingly abolished) to better use technology and digital templates. Emphasis given to engagement in plan making and design code preparation)

Planning for beautiful and sustainable places

- 6.14 The headline objective is that Planning should create beautiful and sustainable places. To augment this in decision taking, Local Planning Authorities will be expected to set out detailed design parameters and specific standards for their areas. A national model design code will be produced which will set out how this is to be achieved and will include parameters for development in different types of location. Local Design Codes will be expected to inform plan making and development proposals, providing effective input from local communities can be demonstrated.
- 6.15 A new 'fast-track' for beauty process will be established whereby proposals that comply with pre-established design codes are expedited. In growth areas, master-plan and site specific codes will be required as a condition of permission in principle granted through a local plan. In Renewal areas, the scope of permitted development will be widened and potentially include the replication of local styles of development – much the same as the 'pattern books' of old.
- 6.16 A range of proposals relate to the stewardship and enhancement of the Environment and include:
- Mandatory net gains for biodiversity
 - All new streets tree lined
 - National framework of green infrastructure standards
 - Revisions to Environmental Assessment process
 - Review of planning framework for Heritage Assets to support continued use of listed buildings and to address climate change
 - Improvements in energy efficiency standards with an ambition that all new homes built under the new planning system will not need retro-fitting in the future

Planning for infrastructure and connected places

- 6.17 Under the proposals, the current system of planning obligations would be consolidated under a reformed new 'Infrastructure Levy' Existing Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 arrangements would be abolished. The new Levy would:
- Be a flat rate, value based charge set nationally at a single rate or area specific rate
 - Be based on the principle of capturing land value uplift to fund infrastructure and affordable housing
 - Enable on-site affordable housing to be provided in lieu of levy payments (in kind delivery)
 - Be charged on final value of development
 - Be charged on occupation
 - Include a value based minimum threshold where no charge would apply
 - Ensure that revenue is collected and spent locally
 - Be extended in scope to cover change of use
 - Ensure a neighbourhood share is retained

Commentary/Issues

- 6.18 In operating the current planning system, Ryedale has proactively supported growth and sustainable development in the District. In this respect, a number of concerns that the Government has in relation to the operation of the system are simply not borne out

by outcomes in this District. Notwithstanding this, it is very difficult to dispute the fact that that under the current system, local plans do take too long to prepare; national housing requirements are not being met and that greater attention should be paid to achieving well designed, 'beautiful' places.

- 6.19 The proposals in the White Paper are schematic and are not accompanied by details. In this respect, it should be noted that the extent to which any changes to the system are successful in the long term will depend on the details that are subsequently established in legislation and the subsequent operation and implementation. There have been numerous changes to the system which have been designed to accelerate and simplify the process and increase engagement which have not been achieved as requirements and practice are established over time.
- 6.20 Appendix 1 lists the questions posed as part of the consultation. In many respects, it is difficult to argue against the principles of what is being proposed without a more detailed understanding of how the new system will work in practice or evolve over time. The proposed responses at Appendix 1 are framed against this context and draw on some of the issues, challenges and opportunities that the proposals present.
- 6.21 Before these are considered in detail below, it should be noted that a theme running through the document is an inherent tension between a centralising tendency of some of the proposals and localism. This is largely driven by the need to increase speed in the system and to provide more certainty. For example, under the proposals housing requirements will be 'top' down and set by Government, development management policies will be established nationally and the use of different consent regimes can all restrict local influence and engagement in the process. It is also notable that the proposed reforms focus very much on perceived failings of the planning system. There is nothing in the package of proposals to encourage broader involvement to support housebuilding or to ensure that developers build the development that they secure permission for.

Plan-making and decision taking

- 6.22 The proposed change in style of local plans should result in a simpler document which is more readily understood and the inclusion of generic development management policies in national policy should not be problematic. However, it is less clear on how local objectives or circumstances can influence development in each of the identified categories or zones. Local Design codes will address these in part. However, unless these are wide enough in scope to cover specific local ambitions for places or unless specific local policies can be included within the plan across all three local plan zones, the role of the plan in successful place-making could be limited. The way in which a place functions is as equally important as how it looks if it is to be successful. It is also important that any increased use of the permitted development/prior approval process applied in renewal or protected areas does not undermine local place-making ambitions.
- 6.23 The Government has made it clear that protected areas can be identified as sub-areas within renewal areas. It is not clear how some areas which require protection can be easily mapped. The settings of heritage assets are an example. The appreciation of an asset varies across a place and is a matter of judgment. National or local policies will need to be in place to ensure this is capable of being considered alongside the binary category/zonal approach.
- 6.24 The most significant problem with local plans in their current form is undoubtedly the time in which it takes to produce them. The proposed statutory timetable for the plan-

production appears optimistic in the absence of any details of the work that will no longer be required to support and evidence plan preparation. The reduction in the number of tests of soundness will only make a difference if the evidence required under the new sustainable development test is rationalised accordingly. There is no explanation in the document of how the new system will, if at all, result in a reduced evidence base to support a plan.

- 6.25 The proposed reforms to the plan making process do not focus on the examination which is resource intensive and time consuming. A move to a more rule based approach provides an opportunity to fundamentally rethink the examination/scrutiny process.
- 6.26 The reforms as a whole front load public engagement in planning to the plan-making process. From experience, much engagement in planning takes place as planning applications come forward. Under the new system, unless local people are actively engaged in the preparation of the plan (and design codes) and understand the implication of the different consent regimes which will operate alongside it, the opportunity to influence development at the point at which it does come forward will be limited.

Housing

- 6.27 The introduction of a binding, nationally set housing requirement is a significant element in the proposals. Whilst this is will be a matter of principle for many authorities, it is evident that in many areas, authorities have failed to plan for and meet housing requirements – often with implications for neighbouring authorities.
- 6.28 The national method aims to ensure more homes are built in areas where affordability is most acute and demand is high. It confirms that constraints will be taken into account in establishing the figure but there is no explanation of how this is intended to work in practice and there is a danger that this is applied in too simple terms. The growth of the City of York is constrained by the York Green Belt. That constraint also impacts upon this district, with household projections reflecting past trends in the movement of displaced households. The cross boundary impacts of constraints should be a factor in any methodology. Household projections and affordability ratios for Ryedale are also presented for the District as a whole despite the fact that over a third of the land area of the District is covered by nationally protected landscapes.
- 6.29 The approach is predicated on the assumption that the market will deliver a step increase in numbers and that this will in turn improve the affordability of housing in high demand areas. It is unclear whether evidence exists to support this broad proposition.
- 6.30 The implications for the delivery of affordable housing through the Infrastructure Levy are not immediately clear or specific. Under current Section 106 arrangements provision is secured by a legal agreement and it is unclear how the certainty which comes with the legal agreement can be replicated. It is also unclear whether the level of affordable housing to be provided in kind on sites is to be established through a national or local standard. The ability for local authorities to work with a nominated affordable housing provider is to be welcomed as is the ability for local authorities to spend Infrastructure levy receipts on the provision of additional affordable housing.

Technology and Equality

- 6.31 The emphasis on the use and application of data rather than documents is not fully

explained in the paper. In terms of plan making, data requires collation, analysis and interpretation which results in documents. Whilst the increased use of data in the administration of the process is more easily envisaged, this element of the proposals is not clear and further explanation of what this is intended to mean in practice would be helpful.

- 6.32 The proposed increases in the use of technology is positive although the extent to which radical change in the use of technology can be introduced quickly will be a challenge. For some areas of the country the ability to optimise the use of new technology remains limited. In addition, engagement in the planning system through technology will always present a challenge to some members of the community. Data, information and participation will need to be in a range of formats if everyone in a community is to be provided with the opportunity of engaging in the process.

Design

- 6.33 The emphasis placed upon design is notable and welcome. It is essential however, that the rhetoric is met with reality as the new system is implemented. The Government recognises that local design codes are integral to the new reforms. It recognises that these will take time to prepare, in part due to resource and skills constraints. There is a danger that local character and preferences would be over ridden by the National Model Design Code and a revised manual for streets. This would have the opposite of the Government's intention and would risk the creation of standardised places.
- 6.34 For the system to work as a proposed rule based approach it is imperative that developers are required to adhere to them and that national policy does not provide for departures from established and agreed local design codes.
- 6.35 In addition, if the Government is committed to building beautiful places it should reflect upon the outcomes of changes to permitted development rights which have resulted in less than attractive changes of use and extensions to many buildings. The ambition to create beautiful places is undermined by the increased use of permitted development rights. For the package of proposals to be successful as a whole, this is a tension and a contradiction which should be addressed.

Environmental Protection

- 6.36 Proposed reforms in relation to the environment are very limited. There are few substantive details in relation to the Government's 'net zero commitment' by 2050. It is unclear whether low/zero carbon build standard will be set nationally (which would align with the rules based approach that the Government is seeking to establish) or, if authorities will have the option of introducing standards via local design codes.
- 6.37 Whilst there is some scope to simplify the environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal process, in some cases it is not clear how this links to other proposals. For example, by omitting the outline planning permission stage, it is unclear how environmental impacts will be screened, scoped and assessed for schemes coming forward in 'growth' areas. The level of detail in relation to land use and development quantum will need to be established in detail at the plan making stage, but this does raise the issue of how flexible the plan could be in responding to changing requirements within its identified growth areas. This is a potential inflexibility of the rules based/ zonal approach which will make it less responsive to the changing requirements of local communities or developers.

Developer Contributions/Infrastructure

- 6.38 In primarily seeking financial contributions, the proposals appear to be seeking to move delivery responsibilities from developers to local authorities. The Infrastructure Levy would be due on occupation of development, which raises issues over the funding of necessary infrastructure. The proposals seek to address this by allowing Local Authorities to borrow against future levy receipts in order to front fund infrastructure.

It is not clear whether contributions secured under highway legislation will continue in their current form.

- 6.39 In principle, the securing of contributions from land value uplift should work well in high value areas. It is not clear how infrastructure is to be funded in areas where land values are low and which would be below the minimum levy threshold. There is a danger in this respect that the approach would perpetuate regional economic disparity unless alternative funding to support growth and renewal is provided. In any area, there is a risk that if development values fall, levy contributions will reduce and this would present a significant risk to Local Authorities and communities in terms of infrastructure and affordable housing provision.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The following implications have been identified:

a) Financial

The proposals place significant emphasis on the use new technology. There is an expectation that digital and geospatial capability and capacity will be created with technology to support public engagement, interactive mapping and digital application services. This will require significant financial investment. The proposed changes to the planning consent regimes may also result in reduced planning application fee income.

b) Legal

The reforms will result in changes to existing primary and secondary planning legislation.

c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental and Climate Change, Crime & Disorder)

The proposed reforms have direct implications for the review of the Local Plan. There will be a need for some additional training for planning staff in terms of IT and design skills. The increased reliance on technology in the operation of a reformed planning system will have implications under the Public Sector Equalities Duty.

8.0 NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 A timeline for implementing reform is not specific in the White Paper although it does indicate that the expectation is that new Local Plans will be in place before the end of the current Parliament.

Name of Head of Service: Gary Housden

Job Title: Head of Planning and Regulatory Services

Author: Jill Thompson, Planning and Development Manager

Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 43327
E-Mail Address: jill.thompson@ryedale.gov.uk

Background Papers:

White Paper: Planning for the Future. MHCLG August 2020

Background Papers are available for inspection at;

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907956/Planning_for_the_Future_web_accessible_version.pdf

Appendix 1 Planning For the Future. List of proposals, Questions and proposed RDC response

Pillar One – Planning for Development

Overview

Q1 What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

Q2(a) Do you get involved in planning decisions in your local area?

Q2(b) If no, why not? (Don't know how to/It takes too long/It's too complicated/ I don't care/Other – please specify)

Q3 Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out more about plans and planning proposals in the future? (Social media/Online news/Newspaper/By post/Other – please specify)

Q4 What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? (Building homes for young people/ building homes for the homeless/Protection of green spaces/the environment, biodiversity and action on climate change/Increasing the affordability of housing/The design of new homes and places/ Supporting the High Street/Supporting the local economy/more or better local infrastructure/protection of heritage buildings or areas/Other – please specify)

A new approach to plan-making.

Proposal 1: The role of land use plans should be simplified

Q5 Do you agree that local plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?

Yes. In part. There is a need to simplify local plans although not in line with the package proposed as a whole. In general, the move to a more visual map-based plan supported by design guides and codes is welcomed. However, there must be some opportunity for a local plan to include policies to reflect local ambitions and circumstances which are more than visual design and appearance. The use of masterplans for growth areas will help although this needs to be accompanied with the ability for a Local Planning Authority to articulate ambitions for renewal areas and the countryside which should not be overridden by an ever expanding suite of permitted development rights or generic national policy. It is unclear where local policy and the local narrative sit if the plan itself is just a map.

A map based plan would not be simplified if a numerous sub-area categories are required in the proposed renewal areas. The mapping exercise could prove overly

complicated. A criteria based national policy could easily and quickly be used to define some categories of protected areas without the need for these to be mapped (eg garden land). There are other constraints which cannot be easily defined on a map, including the settings of heritage assets, for example.

Proposal 2: Development management policies to be established at a national scale with an altered role for Local Plans

Q6 Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?

Yes. In part. There is scope to reduce the repetition of general/generic development management policies in local plans and to include these in national policy. However, the proposals are not clear on the extent to which local policies can be used to address local circumstances and objectives which are wider in scope than matters of design and appearance. This needs to be addressed in the 'standardised' approach which is proposed.

Proposal 3: Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory sustainable development test, replacing the existing tests of soundness

Q7(a) Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test for 'sustainable development', which would include consideration of environmental impact?

Any rationalisation in the soundness tests and the evidence used to demonstrate soundness is welcomed. However, in the absence of any detail of the evidence which would no longer be required to support a local plan, there can be no certainty that a consolidated test would result quicker and less complicated plan preparation. It would help if a definitive list of required evidence and the scope of that evidence was provided in national guidance.

Q7(b) How could strategic cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

The options are limited. Either Local Authorities come together at the point of decision or a national structure is introduced providing a co-ordinated planning framework across regions.

Proposal 4: A standard national method for calculating housing requirements

Q8(a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?

A standard method does have the advantage that it would be consistently applied and it should reduce the time spent in plan-making and decision –taking on argument and debate over housing requirements. Despite the principle of the requirement being binding, there is an advantage to the use of a standard method in terms of reducing delay. However, the way the figure is calculated needs to be transparent. The method should reflect constraints in an area and should also address the implications that constraints in some areas have had and continue to have on household projections/ trends in other areas. There should be no need for Local Authorities to demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of land. The use of the

Housing Delivery Test is sufficient to ensure that housing requirements are being met.

Q8(b) Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?

No. The approach is based on the assumption that by simply increasing the number homes, housing will become more affordable. There is no evidence to suggest that in areas of high house prices and high demand that this will be then case or that the development industry will significantly increase the number of new homes it builds. It is disappointing that the proposed changes focus on perceived problems with land supply releases and the planning system. The opportunity to look at ways in which there could be greater involvement in increasing the type and tenure of housebuilding, including by the public sector has not been explored.

Streamlined Development Management Process with automatic planning permission for schemes in line with plans

Proposal 5: Areas identified as Growth areas would automatically be granted outline planning permission with automatic approvals available for pre-established development types in other areas suitable for building

Q9(a) Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas of substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?

No. The inclusion of land within a growth area would establish the principle of development. An automatic outline permission, without time limits would provide no incentive for developers and land owners to bring land forward. It is also unclear how environmental impacts will be screened, scoped and assessed for schemes coming forward in growth areas over a plan period under this proposal.

Q9(b) Do you agree with our proposals for the consent arrangements for Renewal and protected areas?

No. The proposals do not allay concerns that this would involve a further roll out of increased permitted development rights which have the potential to undermine good place making.

Q9(c) Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?

No. New settlements should be brought forward by Local Authorities or combinations of authorities to ensure local accountability. The Government needs to ensure that it will co-ordinate support from all of the necessary delivery partners including Homes England and Infrastructure companies to ensure schemes come forward.

Proposal 6: Decision making should be faster and more certain with firm deadlines and make greater use of digital technology

Q10 Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?

Yes. Care does need to be taken to ensure that some members of the community are not disadvantaged in engaging in the planning process through the use of digital technology. Extensions of time are often used to support applicants in making revisions to schemes or to provide required information. Schemes which don't meet

design codes or do not provide the required information can be promptly dealt with but this may not provide the approval that applicants/ customers are seeking and would be a less customer friendly, positive and proactive approach. In addition, digital technology needs to be tried, tested and reliable. This Council would question whether sufficient progress has been made in terms technology to fully enable digital and automated planning services at the current time.

A new interactive web-based map standard for all planning documents

Proposal 7: Local Plans should be visual and map based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology and supported by a new template

Q11 Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based local plans?

Yes

A streamlined and more engaging plan-making process

Proposal 8: Legal requirement to meet a statutory timetable for key stages of plan production

Alternative options are also presented for comment. These include:

- Reform of the examination process to remove the right to be heard
- Removal of the Examination stage and replacement with self-assessment

Q 12 Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of local plans?

Yes. Any process which is designed to simplify and expedite plan production is welcome in principle. However, the actual time needs to be realistic and based on the experience of Local Authority practitioners. If the Government is serious about radical reform of the system, the examination process or need for an examination does need to be addressed. In the context of legislation, sanctions for under delivery and binding housing requirements, the self- assessment route would be sufficient. Local Authorities are accountable to their electorates on choices made. Sanctions exist to ensure that sites are deliverable. Assuming housing targets are met there is no requirement for examination time and public money to be spent on the choices made in relation to one developer's site over another.

Proposal 9: Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools

Q13 Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?

Yes. In the context of the proposed reforms there is the potential for Neighbourhood plans to make a significant contribution to the masterplan's and design codes that will operate in an area.

Q13(b) How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

Additional support for Neighbourhood Plan production. Design code templates for places may help provide a focus for Neighbourhood Planning.

Speeding up the delivery of development

Proposal 10: A stronger emphasis on build out through planning

Q14 Do you agree that there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?

Yes. Fiscal sanctions or incentives could be employed to encourage build out. The proposal for automatic outline permission in growth areas does not provide an incentive to bring sites forward.

Pillar Two – Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places

Q15 What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area?

The standard of design varies depending on the developer. Local landed estates and householders and self-builders with a long term interest in the place generally pay considerable attention to matters of design quality and local character. There is room for improvement in the standard of design achieved on sites developed by national housebuilders. If the proposed reforms are aimed at improving both design and increased housebuilding, this needs to be taken seriously by the volume build sector.

Q16 Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?

Energy efficiency, use and generation

Creating Frameworks for Beauty

Proposal 11: To make design expectations more visual and predicable, we will expect design guides and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement and ensure that codes are more binding on decisions about development

Q17 Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?

Yes. However, the proposals need to be more specific about the role of design codes. These need to be more than sets of rules which steer the appearance of development/an area but also need to include ambitions for how places function and how uses interact. Masterplans should not be limited to growth areas. They also need to be in place to ensure that local objectives and ambitions are achieved in renewal areas. Change in existing built up areas must be sensitive to the place and cannot be left to standardised national policy and permitted development legislation.

Proposal 12: Expert body to be established and propose that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making

Q18 Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?

Yes. Investment in the skills required to develop and roll out best practice would be welcomed.

Proposal 13: To further embed national leadership on delivering better places, we will consider how Homes England's strategic objectives can give greater emphasis for delivering beautiful places

Q19 Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?

Yes.

Fast-Track for Beauty

Proposal 14: Changes to national policy and legislation to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences

Q20 Do you agree with our proposal for implementing a fast-track for beauty?

No. The emphasis on design and the use of design guides and codes provides a significant opportunity to improve the standard of design through the planning system. However, there is an inherent conflict between this and the increased use of permitted rights which have the potential to undermine local character and the quality and appearance of places. The increased use of permitted development rights is not supported and are not considered to be necessary if comprehensive local design codes are to be prepared. There is concern that reliance on the national model design code may result in a standardisation of approach as local design codes are in preparation, which would undermine local character.

Stewardship and Enhancement of the Environment

Proposal 15: Amend national policy to ensure that it targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits

Proposal 16: Simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable and important habitat and species

Proposal 17: Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas

Proposal 18: Facilitate ambitious improvements in energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net –zero by 2050

Pillar Three – Planning for Infrastructure and well connected places

Consolidated Infrastructure Levy

Proposal 19: The Community Infrastructure Levy should be reformed and charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally set rate and the current system of planning obligations abolished

Proposal 20: The scope of the Infrastructure Levy could be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights

Proposal 21: The reformed Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing provision

Proposal 22: More freedom could be given to local authorities over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy

Q21 When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?

(more affordable housing/more or better infrastructure/design of new buildings/more shops and/or employment space/Green space)

More and better infrastructure and Affordable Housing

Q22(a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?

No. In principle, an approach which aims to capture uplift in value is attractive. However, this cannot be a one size fits all and alternative mechanisms to support infrastructure delivery in areas with low land values do need to be in place if regional disparities are to be addressed.

The proposals are however, vague and the implications and intentions are not clearly discussed or easily understood. Any proposal which would jeopardise the delivery of affordable housing and the timely provision of necessary infrastructure is not supported. It would appear that under the proposals, the responsibility for ensuring necessary infrastructure is in place lies with the public sector rather than the developer, if levy receipts are received on occupation. Viability issues will come to the fore after a development is built and as values are calculated. If understood correctly, the process would present unacceptable risk for authorities and local communities, particularly if an authority has had to borrow money to front fund infrastructure. It will only be once a development is built that it will be known with certainty that there is sufficient funds to repay infrastructure costs or deliver affordable housing.

Q22(b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally

The implications of a nationally set rate need to be better articulated in order for an informed view to be given

Q22(c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities?

It should aim to capture more value. At present CIL in Ryedale is set at a 'cautious' level to avoid viability impacts.

Q22(d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?

The proposed changes, including the payment of the levy on occupation will require local authorities to front fund infrastructure requirements. In the absence of an ability to borrow against levy receipts, it is unclear how this could be achieved. This is an element of the proposals which presents a significant risk to local authorities if development values fluctuate over time. Any approach needs to build in a way in which this risk can be avoided.

Q23 Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?

Yes

Q24(a) Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy and as much on-site affordable provision as at present?

Yes. At least the same level of provision should be secured. However, at present, a legal agreement secures negotiated levels of affordable housing. There is nothing in the proposal that would legally secure provision and this is a concern which presents a risk to authorities and local communities.

Q24(b) Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities?

Of the choices provided, a mandatory in kind payment would appear to be the only way in which communities would benefit from affordable housing provision with any form of certainty.

Q24(c) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?

The consultation is not clear what the overpayment risk is or how it would be incurred but developers should not have the right to reclaim levy payments if the end value of affordable units exceeds the final levy liability

Q24(d) if an in-kind delivery approach is taken are there any additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality?

Space standards and design specification should be established and adhered to by developers and providers.

Q25 Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?

Local Authorities should have the discretion to spend Levy receipts as they see fit and are best placed to identify priorities for expenditure in their areas. It is considered that it is important that this should relate to the development and growth of places if local communities are to see tangible improvements in their areas. Without this, development and growth become harder for communities to accept.

Q25(a) If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed.

Whilst this should not be necessary if affordable housing is a priority for an area, it would ensure resources are not diverted away from affordable housing provision.

Delivering Change

Proposal 23: Development of a resources and skills strategy for the planning sector which will be developed to include:

Proposal 24: Strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions

Q26 Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the

Equality Act 2010

The reliance on technology may impact upon the ability of some people, particularly the elderly to engage in the planning process.

This page is intentionally left blank



PART A:	MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS
REPORT TO:	POLICY AND RESOURCES
DATE:	24 SEPTEMBER 2020
REPORT OF THE:	HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICES GARY HOUSDEN
TITLE OF REPORT:	CHANGES TO THE CURRENT PLANNING SYSTEM - MHCLG CONSULTATION
WARDS AFFECTED:	ALL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of changes proposed in a consultation published in August 2020 by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) to the current planning system, and to agree a response to the consultation.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that:

- (i) Members agree a response to the consultation as set out in the proposed response sections highlighted within the report.
- (ii) Authority is delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee to finalise any further detailed changes in line with member feedback.

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The proposed changes sought by MHCLG will influence the operation of the Council's Development Plan in terms of housing land supply and the provision of affordable housing, in particular.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

- 4.1 There are no significant risks identified in the Council providing a response to MHCLG in relation to this consultation.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

5.1 This is a national consultation by MHLCG. Responses are required by the 1 October 2020. This consultation has been issued at the same time the Planning White Paper – *Planning for the Future*, which is proposing fundamental reform of the planning system. It proposes interim changes or changes that could be incorporated into the reforms as outlined in the Planning White Paper. The changes proposed relate to:

- Changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need;
- Securing of “First Homes”;
- The temporary lifting of the site threshold at which affordable housing is required (up to 40-50 units);
- Extending the current Permission in Principle to major development (of housing sites)

5.2 The proposed changes have implications for how local plan policies are applied. It also has direct implications for the delivery of Council Plan priorities, including the provision of more affordable homes.

6.0 REPORT

Changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need

6.1 The standard method/formula for the calculation of housing requirements was introduced in national policy in 2018, and updated in 2019. It does not establish the housing requirement, which is set out in a Development Plan, but it is the starting point in terms of the identification of minimum housing requirements and housing land supply requirements.

6.2 The standard method was introduced to help streamline the plan making process and to reduce the amount of variance in approach to calculating housing and housing land supply requirements. It was also introduced to reduce the number of challenges by stakeholders during the Examination of Development Plans, by judicial review, or in planning appeals.

6.3 The overarching context of the proposed change to the standard method for calculating housing need, is the need to boost the supply of new homes to meet the Government’s target of 300,000 new homes across England. It also intends to ensure that where housing affordability has worsened, housing requirements will be factorised to reflect this. The approach is based on the premise that increasing the number of homes built will improve affordability.

6.4 The process for calculating the supply is set out in national planning practice guidance. The revisions are proposed to:

- Use more up to date data in a more agile way;
- Deliver more homes in high demand and emerging demand areas;
- Reduce the amount of volatility in the approach by taking figures over a 10 year period; and
- Be consistent with the Government’s ambition to deliver 300,000 new homes a year.

- 6.5 As a starting point, the proposal seeks to use both a 10 year average of projected household growth, assessed against 0.5% of housing stock (most recent data). Whichever is the higher figure would be used as the baseline.
- 6.6 The proposals include an affordability adjustment factor which takes into account whether an area has become more or less affordable over the 10 year period. The factor adjusts upwards the housing need figure in cases where affordability has worsened and vice versa.
- 6.6 The proposals also involve removing the current cap which artificially suppresses the level of housing identified. This is a contentious element, and is not discussed any more within the consultation.
- 6.7 Using the proposed revised formula, Ryedale's annual housing requirement would increase substantially to between 350-360 homes per year. This increased housing need figure is getting close to twice the requirement established in the Development Plan. It is a level of housing development that goes beyond the planned provision of the Development Plan, and the land supply flexibility which is built into that plan. The ability of Ryedale to demonstrate a five-year deliverable supply of housing land against the figures generated under the proposed method is unlikely to be sustained for long. The release of unallocated land may be required in advance of the review of the Development Plan.
- 6.8 The data used in the calculation stems from local housing completion information and Office for National Statistics (ONS) datasets. The housing need figure is derived for the district as whole, and is not subject to any form of local check by constraints. This is a concern for a District such as Ryedale. Large parts of the District are within nationally designated landscapes (National Park and AONB). Other Local Authorities may have, for example, serious flood risk implications; Green Belt; or areas of urban renewal- all of which can significantly influence the availability of land for housing, and place disproportionate pressure on those areas with less constraint. The ONS data also uses quite a narrow range of figures which are trend-based household projections. Where growth has occurred, the methodology perpetuates that pattern. In essence, the proposed approach currently lacks the ability to consider local circumstances and accordingly, is not based on any form of strategy based on the role of places.

6.9 **Consultation responses:**

Q1: Do you agree that planning practice guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is whichever is the higher of the level of 0.5% of housing stock in each local authority area OR the latest household projections averaged over a 10-year period?

Response:

Welcome the ability to consider the implications of stock levels and household projections. Although requiring whichever is the higher may not reflect a local authority's aspirations in relation to existing stock. The standard methodology currently, and as proposed by this consultation does not take into account significant constraints. This is a deficiency. Over a third of this District is within a National Park and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The current level of housing stock reflects the geography of this district. The proposed approach also is based on a narrow period of delivery.

Those areas where housing delivery has been strong- such as this district- are experiencing this being reflected in their baseline stock figure. Which is then significantly higher than that which is calculated from the existing methodology. In this District, household projections are higher and would be used for the basis of the proposed calculation. However, the projections are a reflection of past trends which have seen in migration into Ryedale, in part due constraints in the delivery of new family housing in some adjacent areas. The methodology is therefore creating further pressure on these areas. The proposed approach currently lacks the ability to consider local circumstances.

Q2: In the stock element of the baseline, do you agree that 0.5% of existing stock for the standard method is appropriate? If not, please explain why.

Response: For some urban authorities with this may not be workable if they have a high rate of demolition, as part of any urban renewal projects. Whilst as a starting point this may be appropriate. The ability consider significant local constraints (such as national landscape designations, and high flood risk) is not factored into this figure.

Q3: Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio from the most recent year for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline is appropriate? If not, please explain why.

Response: Yes, this will be appropriate in principle, but using an average over a sufficiently long period of time.

Q4: Do you agree that incorporating an adjustment for the change of affordability over 10 years is a positive way to look at whether affordability has improved? If not, please explain why.

Response: It is agreed that it is a more positive way to establish a mechanism to reflect higher housing need figure relative to affordability. Housing affordability is both absolute and relative, the latter being viewed as affordability is defined by a ratio of house price to income. In rural areas, affordability ratios are strongly influenced by relatively high house prices when compared to the average wage profile. This could result in a disproportionately higher housing need. But considering the change, rather than a fixed value- would assist in reflecting this. Notwithstanding this, the method is based on the premise that increases in housing numbers will improve affordability in an area, and it is considered that this premise is questionable and not evidenced.

Q5: Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not, please explain why.

Response: Without detailed knowledge of the working of the algorithm this question cannot be responded to with any degree of certainty. However, in applying the revised standard methodology using years where unaffordability decreased makes a small change to the figures, but it would fluctuate year on year. The figure resulting from the calculation will also

change and it is not clear whether this means that housing requirements will change annually - which would be unworkable. Notwithstanding this, the method is based on the premise that increases in housing numbers will improve affordability in an area, and it is considered that this premise is questionable and not evidenced.

Do you agree that authorities should be planning having regard to their revised standard method need figure, from the publication date of the revised guidance, with the exception of:

Q6: Authorities which are already at the second stage of the strategic plan consultation process (Regulation 19), which should be given 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination?

Response: No. Where the methodology results in significant increases in planned housing requirements this would result in pressure for unplanned, sporadic development which would not be in the best interests of local communities. This has real potential to create resistance to growth and distrust in Government.

Q7: Authorities close to publishing their second stage consultation (Regulation 19), which should be given 3 months from the publication date of the revised guidance to publish their Regulation 19 plan, and a further 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate?

If not, please explain why. Are there particular circumstances which need to be catered for?

Response: Authorities at this stage will be best-placed to respond to this particular question.

Securing of “First Homes”

- 6.10 “First Homes” are a new initiative proposed by Government and were the subject of a consultation in early 2020. They are homes with a depressed mortgage and deposit-reduced by a minimum of 30%, or more, and are for those seeking to enter the property market from the locality. Local people will have priority to purchase these homes and they would be discounted for sale and this discount would be kept in perpetuity via a covenant. The Government now seeks to consult on the implementation of the initiative, with a minimum of 25% of all affordable housing contributions secured through planning permissions to be delivered as First Homes. This is irrespective of whether they are on-site/ off-site/ cash contribution. The policy would be applied through the implementation of an existing up-to-date affordable housing policy in a Development Plan. It would primarily focus on being an alternative to shared ownership.
- 6.11 There are current exemptions to affordable housing contributions being required for certain types of housing. These include schemes which:
- a) provide solely for Build to Rent homes;
 - b) provide specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for the elderly or students);

- c) are developed by people who wish to build or commission their own homes; or
- d) are exclusively for affordable housing for example, an entry-level exception site or a rural exception site.

The Government is consulting on whether these exemptions should be sustained, reduced, or expanded in relation to the First Homes.

6.12 Members may be familiar with the term 'Exception Site'. These are sites which come forward outside of the Local Plan to deliver affordable housing. There are two forms of exception site in current national policy. The more recent is known as 'Entry-Level' sites which can be located on the edge of urban area, and are for the formation of housing for first time buyers/renters. They can be up to 1ha or 5% of the size of the existing settlement. Entry Level exception sites can also include other affordable tenures, and some limited market housing, if this is required to make the development viable. They are not supported in principle in areas such as National Parks, AONBs and Green Belt. The Government is proposing to introduce a First Homes exception site policy, which would deliver homes for local (this is not defined), first-time buyers. The policy would replace the existing Entry Level Exception Site policy. The site size threshold would be removed, but it would be expected to be '*proportionate to the size of the existing settlement*'.

6.13 The Government is not proposing to remove the other type of exception site, known as a rural exception site (i.e. in designated rural areas). Rural Exception Sites are a long-standing policy tool for affordable housing delivery in rural areas. They are not allocations, and come forward on an ad-hoc basis, because they are identified to meet (not exceed) a locally identified need.

6.14 **Consultation responses:**

Q8: The Government is proposing policy compliant planning applications will deliver a minimum of 25% of onsite affordable housing as First Homes, and a minimum of 25% of offsite contributions towards First Homes where appropriate. Which do you think is the most appropriate option for the remaining 75% of affordable housing secured through developer contributions? Please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):

i) Prioritising the replacement of affordable home ownership tenures, and delivering rental tenures in the ratio set out in the local plan policy.

ii) Negotiation between a local authority and developer.

iii) Other (please specify)

Response: The remaining 75% should reflect the tenure requirements identified and recommended in a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, to ensure that the tenure profiles reflect identified local needs.

With regards to current exemptions from delivery of affordable home ownership products:

Q9: Should the existing exemptions from the requirement for affordable home ownership products (e.g. for build to rent) also apply to this First Homes requirement?

Response: In terms of the exemptions, in paragraph 64 of the NPPF it is considered that for the most part they should be retained.

Q10: Are any existing exemptions not required? If not, please set out which exemptions and why.

Response: Build for Rent could also be incorporated in to the First Homes Model, to assist those who choose to rent at that time in their lives, but to do so locally and at an affordable level.

Q11: Are any other exemptions needed? If so, please provide reasons and /or evidence for your views.

Response: No further exemptions needed.

Q12: Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above?

Response: No. Past experience would indicate that transitional arrangements are of little help, or relevance, at times of policy change.

Q13: Do you agree with the proposed approach to different levels of discount?

Response: The ability to derive a different discount is welcomed and provides a degree of flexibility.

Q14: Do you agree with the approach of allowing a small proportion of market housing on First Homes exception sites, in order to ensure site viability?

Response: Yes- for a number of years this approach has been implemented via the NPPF although it is not a mechanism that developers have sought to use to date. The approach should help to ensure that design standards as well as affordable homes are secured.

Q15: Do you agree with the removal of the site size threshold set out in the National Planning Policy Framework?

Response: In principle yes, providing that there is an ability to consider the impact of the site on the character of a settlement, in terms of it being proportional to settlement size.

Q16: Do you agree that the First Homes exception sites policy should not apply in designated rural areas?

Response: Yes, and that a general discount for sale model would be preferred, with rent tenures has identified by the housing needs assessment.

The temporary lifting of the site threshold at which affordable housing is required

- 6.15 Current national policy means that in parts of Ryedale (Malton, Norton and Pickering) contributions for affordable housing cannot be sought on schemes of less than 10 dwellings, or sites of less than 0.5ha. In other areas of Ryedale, financial contributions can be sought on schemes of 6-10 units.
- 6.16 The proposal seeks to ensure that affordable housing contributions (on-site or as a commuted sum) would not be sought on sites of less than 40, or less than 50, dwellings. This threshold, in terms of site area, will also proportionally increase. The proposal is sought as a support measure to small and medium-sized builders in light of both the legacy of the recession and in relation to Covid-19. It is proposed as temporary measure for a suggested 18-month period. The proposal would then be subject to review, as the Government acknowledges in that it would have an impact on their objectives for the delivery of First Homes.
- 6.17 To avoid a situation where sites are incrementally delivered to avoid exceeding the threshold, the Government is proposing to introduce guidance to allow local authorities to still secure affordable housing contributions on these sites. However, it is not clear how this is to be achieved.
- 6.18 The Government has recognised that raising the threshold in designated rural areas would be very detrimental to the delivery of affordable housing and as such no changes are proposed. Areas outside of Malton, Norton Pickering are identified as Designated Rural areas, and the approach to securing affordable housing would remain the same. This is welcomed. Had this been changed, the implications for affordable housing delivery in Ryedale would be significant. Notwithstanding this, the increase in the site size threshold has the potential to reduce affordable housing delivery which would otherwise be secured through windfall sites in Malton, Norton and Pickering.
- 6.19 **Consultation responses:**

Q17: Do you agree with the proposed approach to raise the small sites threshold for a time-limited period?

Response: No. There is no evidence that small and medium sized builders are experiencing a reduction in activity in Ryedale. Despite the COVID pandemic the District's property market appears buoyant. There is no evidence to suggest that a raising of the threshold is required specifically to support small and medium sized builders. It should also be noted that affordable housing on sites will often provide certainty in respect of sales, which reduces risk for smaller builders. Unfortunately, this does not appear to be reflected in Government thinking on this matter.

(see question 18 for comments on level of threshold)

Q18: What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold?

i) Up to 40 homes

ii) Up to 50 homes

iii) Other (please specify)

Response: The appropriate level is that which is considered to be viable in an adopted local plan viability assessment/evidence.

Q19: Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold?

Response: No. For a rural district, allocations range in size for non - designated rural areas (market towns) with some allocations not exceeding 40 units. It is considered that this threshold is such that a number of allocations or windfall sites would not deliver any affordable housing in our most sustainable locations. This is not an acceptable policy response in an area with acute affordable housing need.

Q20: Do you agree with linking the time-limited period to economic recovery and raising the threshold for an initial period of 18 months?

Response: No. In this area there is no evidence of stagnation in the property market, or that the policy response is required to support the building industry.

Q21: Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?

Response: No detail has been provided which would indicate how this could be effectively achieved.

Q22: Do you agree with the Government's proposed approach to setting thresholds in rural areas?

Response: No. Thresholds for the delivery of affordable housing should follow those established and evidence in Local Plans.

Q23: Are there any other ways in which the Government can support SME builders to deliver new homes during the economic recovery period?

Response: Fiscal incentives, such a tax relief on the construction of affordable homes delivered on a scheme, affordable units are currently exempt from CIL. Please see the responses on the extension of Permission in Principle.

Extending the current Permission in Principle to major development (of housing sites)

- 6.20 Permission in Principle was introduced in 2017, and allows Local Planning Authorities the ability to grant Permission in Principle to sites which have been allocated on the Brownfield Land Register, and since 2018- for sites of less than 10 dwellings.
- 6.21 The process is designed to separate the decision making process into two stages- the first establishing the principle concerning land use, location and scale of the development – lasting 5 years. The second stage is known as technical details consent, where the details are worked up by the applicant and submitted this is where the detail is assessed and conditions are applied. This two stage process equates to

the granting of full planning permission.

- 6.22 The process means that the principle is established once, and in effect, operates similarly to that of an allocation or an outline planning permission (with all matters reserved). In that respect, the Government is proposing, through its White Paper that allocations made in local plans would be automatically granted a form of permission in principle. But as this will take time, the Government is keen in the interim to accelerate the scope of this process by:
- extending the scope of the current Permission in Principle by application route to major development (not those subject to Environmental Impact Assessment or Habitat Regulation Assessments (HRA));
 - enhancing the information requirements and publicity arrangements for these applications;
 - introducing a revised fee structure, at lower cost;
 - including automatically any Permission in Principle granted onto Part 2 of the local brownfield land register; and
 - strengthening guidance to support implementation.
- 6.23 Major applications which could be considered by this approach could be between 11 and 150 dwellings- and more if no EIA or HRA considerations are identified. Such sites still have the capacity to have cumulative implications, which would then be difficult to consider through this process.
- 6.24 Enhancing publicity around these proposals would be welcomed, as it is important that local communities are made aware of proposals for new development in their locality. However, permission in principle does not grant a planning permission and nor does it consider the site specific, technical context of sites. This will be likely to confuse interested parties.
- 6.25 The current fee for Permission in Principle by application for minor development is £402 per 0.1 hectare (capped at a maximum of 1 hectare), which is to cover the costs incurred in processing the application, as well as the costs of undertaking consultation and assessment against local and national policy. The proposed fee schedule is not set out in terms of costs, it consults on the premise of a tiered fee structure, predicated on site size (as dwelling numbers would not be known). The fee cap is not identified.
- less than 1 hectare (= £x fee per 0.1 hectare)
 - between 1 to 2.5 hectares (= £y fee per 0.1 hectare)
 - more than 2.5 hectares, capped at a maximum (= £z fee per 0.1 hectare, capped)
- 6.26 The Government considers that the fee schedule would be lower because it is about assessing the principle, and that this is favourable and attractive to developers. Officers consider that in reality, it is a mechanism that is likely to be favoured by landowners- especially those who wish to sell a site, and not developers who will seek to build out the site. For example, the technical details consent is the same fee as that for reserved matters, a point at which developers may be then directly involved. The Local Planning Authority would still be consulting with consultees for applications which have greater capacity for impacts, cumulative and site-specific, which could go to the principle of the development, but with a reduced fee. For developers, the permission in principle may cost less than an outline permission, but the outline is a planning permission, which establishes key parameters and therefore costs. It gives developers more certainty in

that regard.

- 6.27 Ryedale's experience of Permission in Principle (PiP) schemes has been non-existent. This is in part, a function of the scope of PiP to date. Instead, Outline Planning applications or Full Planning applications have been used. This is often with pre-application advice being sought to inform those applications. Whilst the principle can be uncertain for some applications, this can often be established, informally, but clearly, through a pre-application enquiry.
- 6.28 Officers consider that (based on a national lack of implementing the PiP highlighted in the consultation) developers are wary of the process, this is because until the technical details consent is granted, there is no permission. It is the evidence reports on the technical matters which need the greatest financial input through the planning process. Technical matters also have the capacity to effect site deliverability, and so have the biggest effect on development costs.
- 6.29 The implications of a PiP may, however, be very different for a landowner. Particularly those who seek to sell the site on, with an uplift in its value based on stage 1 alone. They are not further involved in the site's future development, and the technical details consent. Such a scheme is attractive, and indeed less onerous, than an Outline Planning Permission.

6.30 **Consultation Responses:**

Q24: Do you agree that the new Permission in Principle should remove the restriction on major development?

Response: The concept of the Permission in Principle being extended to a wider range of sites could be positive. But concerns are present about a blanket removal of restriction on major development (irrespective of the matter of whether the scheme is EIA development, or in relation to the Habitats Regulations there is a potential impact on a European Site). There is likely to be a need to consider larger sites for their cumulative impacts on infrastructure/air quality, which would be possible through a development plan allocation, but not possible through this process.

Q25: Should the new Permission in Principle for major development set any limit on the amount of commercial development (providing housing still occupies the majority of the floorspace of the overall scheme)? Please provide any comments in support of your views.

Response: If the commercial is ancillary to the housing then yes, but if a mixed scheme is proposed, then no. The ability to consider matters such as noise do need to be established as part of the principle of the scheme's acceptability.

Q26: Do you agree with our proposal that information requirements for Permission in Principle by application for major development should broadly remain unchanged? If you disagree, what changes would you suggest and why?

Response Please see response to question 24. There is likely to be a need to

consider larger sites for their cumulative impacts on infrastructure/air quality, which would be possible through a development plan allocation, but not possible through this process. Location can cover potentially absolute constraints such as the potential for significant archaeology and high flood risk. Both are present in Ryedale. Evidence is needed to ascertain whether or not these matters render the proposal unacceptable in principle and need to be considered as a matter of principle.

Q27: Should there be an additional height parameter for Permission in Principle? Please provide comments in support of your views.

Response: Yes- to ensure that within the principle, the overall scale of the development can be considered within the context of its surroundings; be that from an amenity or design-led consideration.

Q28: Do you agree that publicity arrangements for Permission in Principle by application should be extended for large developments? If so, should local planning authorities be:

- i) required to publish a notice in a local newspaper?*
- ii) subject to a general requirement to publicise the application or*
- iii) both?*
- iv) disagree*

If you disagree, please state your reasons.

Response: It should be subject to the same publicity and notification as existing planning applications with a clear description about what the permission in principle seeks. This will help the local community to understand that this is the first stage of a planning permission. With extending to cover major applications, then statutory consultees and public should have 21 days in which to provide responses for applications which have the capacity for greater impacts. The determination period should be accordingly extended to 8-10 weeks, based on the fact that major schemes are given 5 weeks more to be determined than non-major applications.

Q29: Do you agree with our proposal for a banded fee structure based on a flat fee per hectare, with a maximum fee cap?

Response: Yes - to ensure that this is administered simply. But reflecting the larger the site, the potential for more consultation and assessment by more experienced officers, and more resources used by the LPA to consider the proposal in terms of cumulative impacts.

Q30: What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?

Response: The fee should be the same as for an Outline Planning Application and the Reserved Matters. The fee is already close to being that for Outline Planning Permission, with the same fee charged for the Technical Details Consent as that for the Reserved Matters.

Q31: Do you agree that any brownfield site that is granted Permission in Principle

through the application process should be included in Part 2 of the Brownfield Land Register? If you disagree, please state why.

Response: No comments.

Q32: What guidance would help support applicants and local planning authorities to make decisions about Permission in Principle? Where possible, please set out any areas of guidance you consider are currently lacking and would assist stakeholders.

Response: Uptake on Permission in Principle is hampered by the fact that sites will only, ultimately, be delivered if they satisfy the Technical Details Consent. So the costs of bringing a site forward do not fundamentally change. The Permission in Principle does not give developers the surety that the site they are investing in, can come forward in the manner their residual land value calculations would indicate. This is why they have not been used significantly.

Q33: What costs and benefits do you envisage the proposed scheme would cause? Where you have identified drawbacks, how might these be overcome?

Response: Uptake on Permission in Principle is hampered by the fact that sites will only ultimately be delivered if they satisfy the Technical Details Consent. So the costs of bringing a site forward don't fundamentally change, and the Permission in Principle does not give developers the surety that the site they are investing in can indeed come forward in the manner their residual land value calculations have been worked up on. This will be even more important on larger schemes.

Q34: To what extent do you consider landowners and developers are likely to use the proposed measure? Please provide evidence where possible

Response: For landowners, the Permission in Principle route brings a satisfactory degree of certainty. But it does not necessarily bring this for the site's developers. They will be keen to ensure that in taking on a site, key constraints, such as archaeology, access, and flood risk are established, combined with any cumulative considerations- such as around air quality, or road network capacity, and in conjunction with any strategic infrastructure delivery such as a new school/roads. In doing so, they will seek to be aware that they have the capacity to be addressed based on the residual land value. In many respects, Local Authorities are also seeking to ensure that sites which are being given a permission in principle (and may form part of a land supply) are capable of being delivered.

Q35: In light of the proposals set out in this consultation, are there any direct or indirect impacts in terms of eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations on people who share characteristics protected under the Public Sector Equality Duty?

If so, please specify the proposal and explain the impact. If there is an impact – are there any actions which the department could take to mitigate that impact?

Response: No specific direct impacts have been identified.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The following implications have been identified:

- a) Financial
The Permission in Principle has the potential to impact on the planning fee income.
- b) Legal
No direct implications identified.
- c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental and Climate Change, Crime & Disorder)
If taken forward, the proposals have implications for the implementation of the local plan and the planning decision-taking process: particularly in terms of housing land supply. The proposals also have implications for affordable housing delivery from sites of relevant sizes at Malton, Norton and Pickering.

8.0 NEXT STEPS

8.1 Responses to the consultation will be forwarded to MHCLG before the expiry of the consultation period.

Name of Head of Service Gary Housden
Job Title Head of Planning and Regulatory Services

Author: Rachael Balmer, Senior Planning Officer
Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 43357
E-Mail Address: rachael.balmer@ryedale.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Changes to the current planning system
Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations August 2020 (MHCLG)

Background Papers are available for inspection at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system>



PART B:	RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL
REPORT TO:	POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
DATE:	24 SEPTEMBER 2020
REPORT OF THE:	PROGRAMME DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, BUSINESS AND PARTNERSHIPS PHILLIP SPURR
TITLE OF REPORT:	UPDATE ON MALTON AND NORTON INFRASTRUCTURE AND CONNECTIVITY WORKSTREAM
WARDS AFFECTED:	DERWENT, MALTON, NORTON EAST & NORTON WEST (DIRECTLY) & OTHER WARDS (INDIRECTLY)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide Members with an update on the various strands of work being developed under the Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity work stream.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that Members:

- (i) note the contents of this update report, including the indicative costs of schemes in the table at 7.1 (a);
- (ii) recommend to Council that up to £100k be allocated within the revenue budget and up to £350k be allocated within the capital budget for contributions to development and delivery of the identified schemes;
- (iii) recommend to Council that approval of expenditure of the above budgets be delegated to the Policy and Resources Committee on a scheme-by-scheme basis.

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 3.1 To enable continued development of a range of projects which aim to reduce congestion and improve air quality and safety within Malton and Norton.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

4.1 The main risks are:

- i) investment in project development or feasibility work at this stage carries no guarantees that projects will proceed to full implementation and so it should be recognised that such investment is 'at risk'. Without this up-front investment, however, projects are unlikely to proceed at all.
- ii) formal prioritisation of major highways infrastructure schemes at this early stage could impact upon the chances of securing support from funders / other partners towards lower priority projects, however, failure to do so could mean that staff resources are spread too thinly, slowing project development of all projects.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

5.1 Council Plan priorities:

- Sustainable Growth
 - Promoting a strong economy with thriving businesses and supporting infrastructure for future generations;
 - Managing the environment of Ryedale with partners.
- Customers & Communities
 - Helping our partners to keep our communities safe and healthy.

5.2 Ryedale Economic Action Plan objective:

- A well connected economy:
 - fast reliable journeys to the key centres, transport that underpins growth, transport that connects employees and visitors to businesses.

5.3 Local air quality management (LAQM) process places an obligation on the Council to regularly review and assess air quality in the district, and to determine whether or not the air quality objectives are likely to be achieved. Where an exceedance is considered likely an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) must be declared and an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) prepared, setting out the measures to be taken in pursuit of the objectives.

5.4 Following a detailed assessment in 2009, the Council declared an AQMA in parts of Malton because the annual mean concentration of nitrogen dioxide exceeded the relevant air quality objective at various relevant receptor locations. Whilst no exceedances of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide objective have occurred within the Malton AQMA for the last three years, increases in queuing related to congestion at the level crossing are anticipated in line with the planned introduction of additional rail services. Ryedale will continue to keep the AQMA under review until it can be demonstrated that compliant concentrations are stable over a sustained period.

5.5 The Council declared a Climate Emergency on 10th October 2019 and has made a commitment to building Climate Change considerations into the Council Plan and decision making processes.

5.6 Various stakeholder and public consultations have taken place throughout development of the initial Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Study as

well as throughout development of work under the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan and the Junction Signalisation and Improvement works.

REPORT

6.0 REPORT DETAILS

6.1 Background

6.2 In June 2018 NYCC and RDC published the jointly-funded 'Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Study' ('the Study') which identified a range of interventions that could potentially be developed and implemented to reduce levels of congestion within the two towns. The interventions identified were those that contributed most significantly to the Study's Strategic Level Objectives set out in **Appendix 1**.

6.3 The Council's specific commitment to build climate change considerations into the decision making process has been made since the study was published, however, it should be noted that the Strategic Level Objectives did cover protecting and enhancing the natural environment (under SO-08). Many of the interventions will contribute towards the Climate Change commitment – for example by supporting more active forms of travel; improving connectivity within the towns; improving access to public transport; and reducing the need for unnecessary car journeys.

6.4 The work was initiated in response to the proposed increase in rail services on the York – Scarborough line (originally proposed to operate from December 2019) and concerns that the resulting increased frequency of level crossing closures would exacerbate existing congestion and air quality issues within the towns – particularly at the level crossing and within the AQMA. The Study identified a range of 'Potential Quick Wins' and a 'Preferred Package' of interventions to help mitigate potential detrimental impacts.

6.5 Considerable joint working, involving RDC and NYCC, on progressing these actions has already taken place. This report provides Members with an update on this work to date.

6.6 Policy and Resources Committee considered a report on 19th March 2020 regarding a Motion relating to traffic levels, A64 junctions and a call for a ban on heavy vehicles using Highfield Road Malton. This also set out details of a formal consultation being carried out by the County Council relating a proposed experimental part-time prohibition of Heavy Commercial Vehicles on Highfield Road, Malton. A consultation, response, reflecting Members' views on the proposal, was subsequently sent to the County Council (included at **Appendix 2**). It is understood that NYCC have decided to progress with the proposed experimental part-time heavy vehicle restriction and are awaiting publication of the appropriate legal notices. The main Motion to Council was considered at Full Council on 10 September 2020 and the Policy and Resources recommendation relating to the Motion to Council was approved.

6.7 Over the last six months progress on all aspects of the above work streams has inevitably been impacted by the need to refocus staff resources to support the Council's emergency response to the coronavirus crisis and the shift in priority to support the lives and livelihoods within the District.

6.8 Rail Service Update

Arriva Rail North (or 'Northern') originally planned to introduce an additional hourly rail service between York and Scarborough in December 2019. This was subsequently postponed until May 2020 but, as a result of the impacts of COVID-19, this is now planned for May 2021. [NB The Department for Transport terminated Arriva Rail North's franchise at the end of February this year and its operations have been taken over by Northern Trains Ltd (a Department for Transport controlled 'Operator of Last Resort')].

6.9 Update on Interventions

- 6.10 A cross-authority officer Working Party was established to coordinate the Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity work streams and the actions arising from the Study. This includes representatives from RDC (Economic Development, Planning, Environmental Health and Community Teams) and from NYCC (local Highways Area Office, Transport Planning, and Public Transport). The Working Party has also overseen production of a detailed Action Plan to inform the work required to progress the various interventions. A copy of this is attached at **Appendix 3** and provides an update on individual interventions.
- 6.11 It is essential that any proposals for significant investment are evidence-based and represent value for money so considerable project development work is required in order to build a strong case for intervention. Project development work undertaken to date on some of the key interventions identified by the Study, includes:
- development of a new computer traffic model for Malton & Norton (including initial data gathering, surveys and traffic counts);
 - identifying and shortlisting options for potential improvements to junctions, signals and traffic flow in the town centre and testing of these shortlisted interventions through the new traffic model;
 - undertaking air quality modelling on identified options (report not yet completed);
 - development of Stage 1 of a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (report nearing completion);
 - commissioning a Ryedale Car Parking Strategy Report (work now being progressed via the Car Parking Working Party);
 - commenced feasibility and project development work for:
 - i) upgrading the A64 Musley Bank junction to enable all directions movement
 - ii) creating a new A64 Broughton Road junction with all direction movement
- 6.12 The majority of this work (with the exception of Ryedale Car Parking Strategy) has been led, and funded, by NYCC with input from RDC officers. In order to commence project development work on other interventions (e.g. a second platform and accessible pedestrian and cycle bridge at the station), or for proposals to progress to the next stage of project development and/or implementation, funding contributions from RDC will be required.
- 6.13 At this stage, the detailed costs of the next stages of work for each work stream are not yet known, however, the table under 7.1 (a) below, sets out some indicative costs, with initial funding allocations from the Council also proposed under 7.1 (a).
- 6.14 Some updates on key elements of work are set out below:
- 6.15 A – Bus Service Connectivity Improvements: Ryedale Community Transport are undertaking a feasibility study into the potential for an electric bus service to run

between Malton and Norton. Should the outcome of this study be positive then funding will be required to purchase the vehicles and charging equipment. Initial estimates indicate that this will cost up to £300,000. An RDC contribution would act as match funding and enable funding bids to be made as opportunities arise.

- 6.16 D – Improved Footpath & Cycle Links via Walking & Cycle Strategy: Production of a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) – Stage 1 report is nearing completion. This will present a range of evidence-based interventions to improve cycling and walking provision in the towns and identify priority interventions for development during Stage 2. The Stage 2 work will develop these proposals to a stage where funding bids for implementation can be made and an RDC contribution will be required to progress this work.
- 6.17. In parallel with this work, Ryedale Cycle Forum have been very active in supporting local residents with the development of proposals for a Malton – Hovingham Cycle Path, via Broughton, Slingsby and Amotherby. Implementation of this route could help to reduce the amount of car journeys between these villages and Malton/Norton and contribute to reduced congestion and improved air quality.
- 6.18 F – Internal Junction Improvements & Traffic Signal Strategy: This piece of work is the highest immediate priority for action. A new computer traffic model was developed during 2019. Consultation has taken place with local stakeholders and NYCC have established a Strategy Steering Group to inform development of, and decisions on, this work. The Steering Group includes the two local County Councillors, one representative each from Malton and Norton Town Councils and a Member representative from RDC, taking account of RDC’s responsibilities relating to the AQMA.
- 6.19 A range of options (including reverting to previous priorities at the level crossing junction and potential one-way systems) have been discussed by the Steering Group and the option considered to offer the best overall solution involves:
- Introducing traffic signals at the Castlegate/Church Street/Welham Rd/Norton Road junction at the level crossing, incorporating improved pedestrian crossing facilities,
 - Making the eastern end of Norton Road one-way westbound
 - Improvements to traffic signals at Butcher corner - including introduction of MOVA system (Micro-processor Optimised Vehicle Actuation – to maximise the efficiency of the junction) and indicative right arrow,
 - Improved pedestrian crossing facilities.
- 6.20 This option was presented to a stakeholder consultation meeting in January 2020 following which the Steering Group agreed that air quality modelling of the preferred option should be undertaken prior to progressing to public consultation and potential implementation. This has been commissioned by NYCC (with a contribution from RDC) and work is nearing completion - outcomes will be reported to the NYCC Steering Group to consider the next steps in the coming weeks.
- 6.21 NYCC submitted an Expression of Interest (EoI) to the DfT’s Local Pinch Points Fund in January 2020 for funding towards implementation – but the DfT’s assessment of EoIs is currently ‘on-hold until further notice’. Indicative costs of £1,350,000, with combined Local Authority funding of £200,000, were included in the Pinch Points bid – detailed estimates will need to be established through further project development work. An RDC contribution towards this is likely to be required – and if the Pinch Points EoI is not successful, the contribution would need to be greater.

- 6.22 I - Provision of second rail platform **AND** C – Walkway & Bridge for cyclists & pedestrians to access Malton Station from the south
- 6.23 Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies are unlikely to consider this a high priority for investment at this stage. Progress is therefore likely to be dependant on local partners (e.g. RDC and NYCC) coordinating initial project development work and securing funding for this work.
- 6.24 It is therefore proposed that the Council seeks to work in partnership with NYCC, Network Rail and Train Operating Companies, as appropriate, to develop an initial Feasibility Study for a combined bridge and second platform project and to develop a Strategic Outline Business Case for the project. Undertaking this work now will greatly assist in developing future bids for further project development and implementation and will also enable greater engagement with the rail industry on the benefits of the project.
- 6.25 A second platform, together with a bridge linking the platforms, is likely to offer benefits to the rail industry by removing a bottleneck on the existing network, contributing to opportunities for greater flexibility, capacity and timetable reliability. As such, it is not anticipated that the Council would have to contribute towards construction of a second platform or bridge – although there may be a need to contribute to provision of a link path between Norton and the second platform. Initial feasibility work on the combined second platform, bridge and link path project could cost in the region of £60,000.
- 6.26 J – Provision of new All-Movements junction between A64 and Broughton Road: **AND** K – Upgrade A64 Musley Bank junction to All-Movements junction
- 6.27 Both projects provide alternative routes for traffic (including HGVs) to/from the A64, reducing traffic through sensitive areas such as Highfield Road or the Town Centre AQMA. This could provide opportunities for more significant measures to encourage walking and cycling within the towns. They would be unlikely, however, to have a significant impact on level crossing congestion.
- 6.28 NYCC have committed to undertaking project development work on both projects to a stage whereby bids for funding for implementation can be made to government at short notice. Consultants have been appointed and initial project development work is underway.
- 6.29 The projects are highly unlikely to attract government funding through the Department for Transport's Roads Investment Strategy as they aim to address local issues rather than issues on the trunk road network. The projects are therefore expected to require a partnership approach to funding and implementation (as used to implement the A64 Brambling Fields junction upgrade) with contributions expected to be required from NYCC, RDC and any other discretionary funding that may become available.
- 6.30 Potential longer-term intervention: Malton – Norton Link Road and Bridge
- 6.31 This project could reduce the numbers of vehicles passing through the two main bottlenecks in the towns: the level crossing and Butcher Corner. This could provide opportunities for more significant measures to encourage walking and cycling within the towns. Together with a pedestrian/cycle bridge at the station, it could help facilitate development of additional parking south of the rail line (reducing the need for cross-town traffic) and remove a significant barrier to future residential development based around the former Woolgrower's site [the Woolgrower's site, being located close to the rail and bus station, provides a significant opportunity for development of sustainable

housing in the District]. The project would not, however, reduce levels of traffic passing the primary schools on Highfield Road.

6.32 NYCC have appointed consultants to consider options for a potential Malton – Norton link road and bridge over the River Derwent and the railway (e.g. from York Road to Welham Road) as one of the County Council's potential 'Major Schemes' projects.

6.33 The relative merits of the scheme are likely to be dependant upon the outcomes of the Local Plan review, as the likely quantum and location of future development in and around Malton / Norton will be key to the Benefit-Cost Ratio of the project.

6.34 Potential Funding Sources

6.35 Significant contributions will be required from local partners' capital programmes towards the interventions outlined in this report - particularly from the District and County Councils (or any successor authority/ies). In order to achieve maximum benefits from this investment, however, funding will also need to be sought from a broad range of other potential funding streams, for example:

- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and/or its proposed replacement;
- Funding via the LEP e.g. Local Growth Deal funding or the proposed Shared Prosperity Fund (due to replace EU Structural Investment Funds);
- Other discretionary grant / funding opportunities (e.g. DfT's Pinch Points Fund, or other funding aimed at improving Air Quality or encouraging active modes of travel;
- Devolved funding programmes (following completion of any devolution deal).

6.36 Officers will continue to work with partners, including the County Council and the LEP to identify and bid for funding as appropriate.

6.37 RDC Funding Contributions

6.38 Initial RDC capital and revenue allocations towards development and implementation of the short – medium term interventions are proposed under 7.1 (a) below. These amounts are not within existing budget provisions and would be new allocations. They are therefore included as Recommendations to Council within this report.

6.39 Initial project development work on several of the medium-longer term interventions has already been commissioned by NYCC. It is likely that very significant local contributions (including from RDC) will be required to deliver these projects: several of which, individually, would represent the most significant investments in capital projects that the Council has ever made. The financing of contributions towards individual projects is therefore likely to be challenging; combining several of them may prove to be unaffordable unless significant levels of discretionary funding can be secured towards implementation.

6.40 Once initial project development work has been completed there is likely to be a need for prioritisation of the major highways interventions set out above in order to focus the Council's resources on interventions with the potential for greatest beneficial impacts. The findings of project development work, and proposals for any RDC contributions towards such projects, will therefore be the subject of a report to Council once initial project development work has been completed and further details are known. Members' initial thoughts on potential prioritisation would, however, be welcomed to inform future discussions with partners.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The following implications have been identified:

a) Financial

Summary of indicative costs of the interventions highlighted above:

Project	Total Indicative Cost
<i>Short to Medium Term interventions:</i>	
Electric Bus Hopper Service – purchase of equipment [* subject to outcomes of feasibility study and provision of detailed business plan]	£300,000
LCWIP – Stage 2 (detailed project development for priority proposals identified via Stage 1 study)	£56,000
Cycling and Walking improvements (e.g. routes identified through the LCWIP and/or Hovingham to Malton Cycle route) #	£750,000
Internal junction & signal improvements – detailed project development & implementation #	£1.35m
2 nd Rail Platform and Pedestrian & Cycle bridge and link path to Norton - Initial Feasibility Study	£60,000
<i>Sub Total (approx.)</i>	<i>£2.5m</i>
<i>Medium to longer-term interventions:</i>	
Second rail platform, bridge and link path to Norton#	£6.5m
A64 Broughton Road – New Junction #	£15m - £25m
A64 Musley Bank – Upgraded junction #	£10m - £20m
Malton – Norton Link Road & Bridge #	£20m - £40m
<i>Sub-total (approx.)</i>	<i>£51.5m - £91.5m</i>
Total (approx.)	£54m - £94m

- Until project development is further advanced, it is impossible to provide estimated costs with any degree of confidence – figures included are **indicative only** at this stage.

Initial funding allocations from the Council of £350,000 (capital) and £100,000 (revenue) are proposed towards the costs of developing and implementing the short-medium interventions highlighted above. These would be new budget allocations and as such are identified as recommendations to Council.

Significant additional capital allocations towards the medium to longer-term interventions are expected to be required. Further details will be reported to Members following completion of initial project development work.

b) Legal

The Council has a duty to fulfil its obligations under Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 Local Air Quality Management and continues to meet these obligations through the joint work with NYCC set out above.

There are not considered to be any other significant legal implications of the recommendations set out in this report – although legal agreements are likely to be required on specific projects as project development progresses.

c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental and Climate

Change, Crime & Disorder)

Environmental & Climate Change:

Investment in major road schemes are often considered to be incompatible with targets to achieve carbon reduction targets. However, in the case of the proposals for Malton / Norton, the situation is not clear-cut. The main aim of the proposals is to provide alternative routes onto and off the A64 to reduce traffic levels and congestion on an already congested and constrained town centre highway network, with significant pinch points at the level crossing and Butcher Corner, and to improve air quality within the declared Air Quality Management Area. Implementation of many of the more significant potential projects from the LWCIP are also expected to be dependant on delivering some of the major highways projects.

There is therefore a need to balance the projects' potential impact on carbon emissions with the aims of improving air quality, safety and encourage more active forms of travel (which in themselves have positive benefits for carbon reduction as well as wider health benefits) within the towns.

All discretionary Government funding sources are likely to place a far stronger emphasis on climate change impacts during the assessment process than has previously been the case. At this stage the likely carbon emission impacts of the proposed schemes are not known and will need to be established via further project development work in order to provide sufficient information to be able to inform a decision that seeks to balance these competing aims.

Major highways schemes are also likely to require Environmental Impact Assessments - particularly the Malton – Norton Link and Bridge – as this impacts upon the River Derwent Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The requirements for this will be established during any detailed project development work

No other implications have been identified.

Phillip Spurr

Programme Director for Economic Development, Business and Partnerships

Author: Howard Wallis, Senior Economy & Infrastructure Officer
Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 43274
E-Mail Address: howard.wallis@ryedale.gov.uk

Background Papers are available for inspection at:

[Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Report](#)

[Malton Air Quality Management Area – Action Plan and Annual Status Reports](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1 – Strategic Level Objectives

Ref.	Strategic Level Objectives
Enhance economic performance of the study area and improve opportunities for its residents	
SO-01	Support the sustainable growth of Malton and Norton, in accordance with national, regional and local policies, plans and strategies
SO-02	Support progress towards building a more resilient economy within the towns, by making it a more attractive place for investment, particularly for high value sectors and tourism related industries
SO-03	Support the aspiration for improvements to strategic east-west connectivity within the north
Improve efficiency and resilience of the transport system	
SO-04	Improve connectivity between Malton and Norton, and also between the towns and the wider Ryedale district
SO-05	Reduce traffic congestion in the towns, particularly at the identified 'hotspots' of Butcher Corner and in the vicinity of the level crossing
SO-06	Encourage modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport
Promote and support a sustainable built and natural environment	
SO-07	Improve air quality in the study area
SO-08	Protect and enhance the historical qualities, and the built and natural environment, of the study area
Improve safety and health for residents and visitors in the study area	
SO-09	Improve safety within the study area
SO-10	Contribute to improved health, wellbeing and quality of life of residents of Malton and Norton, and the wider Ryedale District

This page is intentionally left blank



Richard Marr, Area Manager
Highways and Transportation
Area 4 – Pickering Office
Beansheaf Industrial Park
Tofts Road, Kirby Misperton
Malton, North Yorkshire
YO17 6BG

When telephoning, please ask for:

Howard Wallis

ext 274

howard.wallis@ryedale.gov.uk

02 April 2020

Dear Richard

PROPOSED EXPERIMENTAL PART-TIME PROHIBITION OF HEAVY COMMERCIAL VEHICLES, HIGHFIELD ROAD, MALTON

Thank you for consulting Ryedale District Council on the above matter. This has now been considered by the Council's Policy and Resources Committee and the Council's official response is set out below.

As a consequence of a number of factors (including the constrained historic road network, traffic congestion, air quality issues and the declaration of Malton Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), the limited access points onto and off the A64 and the need to access Showfield Lane industrial estate) there are no quick or easy solutions to concerns relating to heavy vehicles passing through residential areas and past the primary schools on Highfield Road.

However, introducing additional HCV restrictions, such as on HCVs using Highfield Road, will not solve the underlying problem. It is likely to displace traffic onto other routes, exacerbating existing issues within the AQMA (with additional HCVs queuing to pass through Butcher Corner) and creating new issues elsewhere (with HCVs following inappropriate alternative routes, such as Peasey Hills Road, Princess Road, Wentworth Street or Greengate).

The part-time nature of the proposed experimental prohibition may go some way to mitigating displacement, however, it remains unclear what the impact of such displacement might be. If North Yorkshire County Council decide to introduce the proposed experimental part-time restriction on HCVs, the Council suggests that very careful consideration be given to how these impacts could be minimised, including:

- avoiding the restriction being in place when schools are closed;
- careful consideration of signage to avoid displacement onto inappropriate alternative routes;
- working with affected businesses and their suppliers to encourage their HCV drivers to avoid the town centre during the affected times, wherever possible.



The Council strongly considers that the only way to solve the issues of HCVs within the town is to develop additional access points onto and off the A64 (for example in the vicinity of Musley Bank and Broughton Road) in order to minimise the need for such through-traffic. Ryedale District Council is fully supportive of the work being undertaken by North Yorkshire County Council to consider such proposals.

Yours faithfully

Howard Wallis
Senior Economy & Infrastructure Officer

POTENTIAL QUICK WINS – PROPOSED ACTION PLAN – updated 13/08/20

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
QW01	Provision of pedestrian crossing between bus / rail station (e.g. zebra crossing)		NYCC identified potential location on raised table from Norton Rd to Railway St. <i>Initial proposal failed road safety audit (on visibility grounds – no suitable location close to bus/rail station that could be delivered safely)</i>	Implementation likely to be dependant upon alterations to bus station entrance. Alternative arrangements to reviewed as part of ‘Do Medium’ option under ‘F – Internal Junction Improvements & Traffic Signals Strategy’ <i>No further action under ‘Quick Wins’</i>	NYCC - TC	Summer 2020
QW02	Provision of dropped kerb on north side of Norton Road opposite level crossing for wheelchair/accessibility scooters (to cross over Castlegate)		Proposed location identified on County Bridge <i>Works had to be aborted due to the location of services in the shallow bridge deck preventing the footway being lowered.</i>	Alternative arrangements to reviewed as part of ‘Do Medium’ option under ‘F – Internal Junction Improvements & Traffic Signals Strategy’ <i>No further action under ‘Quick Wins’</i>	NYCC - TC	Summer 2020
QW03	Provision of advanced stop lines and filter cycle lanes at key junctions and on routes to schools.		To be considered through modelling work, LCWIP & junction improvements already underway	To be reviewed as part of ‘Do Medium’ option under ‘F – Internal Junction Improvements & Traffic Signals Strategy’ <i>No further action under ‘Quick Wins’</i>	NYCC - TC	Summer 2020
QW04	Provision of safe & secure cycle parking / storage near the station and within the towns of Malton & Norton	<i>RDC contributed £3,000 to additional cycle parking at rail station (with funding from TPE)</i> <i>NYCC has made £4,000 available for additional cycle racks within 2019/20 (alongside additional</i>	<i>Additional cycle parking now delivered at Rail Station, delivered with funding contributions from:</i> <i>Installation of new cycle racks planned for various locations in Malton Town Centre (including at Old Maltongate, Market Place, the Shambles)</i>	<i>Completed</i> Installation of cycle racks planned (slight delay due to availability from provider)	NYCC – TC (via MTC & FME)	Autumn 2020

POTENTIAL QUICK WINS – PROPOSED ACTION PLAN – updated 13/08/20

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
		<i>investment by Malton TC and FME)</i>				
QW05	Improved parking signage to manage traffic flow from different directions and direct traffic to most appropriate car park		<p>NYCC undertaken audit of signage to record signs</p> <p>Identified need to signpost visitors to Wentworth Street as main visitor car park. There are gaps in signage of key routes to certain car parks – a review and programme of improvements is required</p>	<p>Following on from Car Park Strategy work - establish project group (inc NYCC, RDC, MTC, NTC, FME) to identify preferred routing of traffic to car parks and agree necessary signage improvements.</p> <p>Implement improvements</p>	<p>RDC – AT NYCC - TC (& DK)</p> <p>NYCC – TC RDC - AT</p>	<p>Autumn 2020</p> <p>TBC</p>
QW06	Sat Nav to use specific routes avoiding level crossing		Permanent HGV restriction now in place. Garmin, TomTom & some mapping companies now advised of weight restriction to avoid sending HGVs across level crossing	<i>Completed</i>	NYCC - TC	Feb 2020
QW07	Initiatives to encourage safe use of level crossing e.g. education / PR / enforcement		Network Rail have a community team to educate on safe use	Raise issue of safety measures at next Road-Rail Partnership meeting (delayed as a result of the delayed introduction of additional train services to May 2021)	NYCC - GN	Sept 2020
QW08	Measures to improve management / operation of level crossing to reduce down time		<p>Discussions with Network Rail (NR) & TPE have taken place</p> <p>NR indicate only significant improvements to operation of level crossing would be implementation of a 2nd platform</p>	<i>No actions identified that are deliverable as Quick Wins</i>	NYCC - GN	Late 2019
QW09	Implementation of permanent Heavy Goods		NYCC confirmed decision to make HGV restriction permanent (but to keep under review) Jan 2020.	<i>Completed</i>	NYCC	Feb 2020

POTENTIAL QUICK WINS – PROPOSED ACTION PLAN – updated 13/08/20

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
	Vehicle Restriction		TRO Made Permanent 13 th Feb 2020			
QW10	Link traffic signals between Butcher Corner and the rail barrier signals to reduce impacts of barrier down time.		Network Rail confirmed can not link signals	<i>No actions identified that are deliverable as Quick Wins - to be reviewed as part of 'Do Medium' option under 'F – Internal Junction Improvements & Traffic Signals Strategy'</i>	NYCC - TC	Summer 2020
QW11	Provision of signage on the A64 to encourage routes that avoid Butcher Corner / Level Crossing		Existing signage checked and signs generally considered appropriate Some temporary signs on A64 relating to trial level crossing HGV restriction.	Signage on A64 eastbound approach to Musley Bank being reviewed now that level crossing HGV restriction made permanent Complete, no action necessary.	NYCC - TC	Spring 2020

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
A	Bus Service Connectivity Improvements		<i>NB - existing bus services are commercial operations and in competition with other operators to some degree</i>	NYCC to investigate potential actions including consultation with bus operators / Coastliner – although may not be able to progress certain elements of this proposal at this time	NYCC - GN	During 2019
	Short timescale (< 2 years) Unlikely to be significant timeframes involved, consultation with various stakeholders would be required.	<i>RDC has approved £5,000 grant for RyeCAT to undertake Feasibility Study for Electric Hopper Bus Service</i>	Ryedale Community Transport) have submitted a proposal for development of an electric hopper bus service (an initial pilot project using existing buses has also been proposed. An initial feasibility study is underway.	RyeCat undertaking Feasibility Study [Any consideration of potential contributions towards Electric Shuttle Bus / Pilot likely to be dependant upon outcomes of Feasibility Study]	RyeCat Ltd TBC	TBC TBC – (subject to outcomes of RyeCat study)
	Medium cost: £150k – £300k	<i>Govt funding opportunities recently announced for:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Rural Mobility Fund</i> <i>Electric Bus Town Fund</i> 	<i>Rural Mobility Fund - NYCC submitted a bid to establish several Community Hub led demand responsive transport schemes in June. The Hubs will include a vehicle, Uber-style booking app, transport management function and paid driver support.</i>	Dependant on outcome of funding bid/s	NYCC - CK	Dependant on outcome of bids

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
B	<p>Behaviour Change Measures</p> <p>Short timescale (< 2 years) Could be implemented quickly.</p> <p>Very low cost: £10k dependent upon delivery mechanism.</p>	<p>Potential Funding: Govt / DfT funding as appropriate</p>	<p>Education and other measures aimed at local businesses, schools, and new housing developments, to encourage a change in travel behaviour for shorter journeys.</p> <p>NYCC would need to identify and secure funding to employ staff resource to undertake this role.</p>	<p>NYCC to keep watching brief for potential funding opportunities and apply as appropriate.</p>	<p>NYCC – LN / KM</p>	<p>On-going</p>

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
C	<p>Walkway & Bridge for pedestrians and cyclists to access Malton Station from the south</p> <p>Medium timescale (up to 5 years) Planning, approvals, identification of land and construction would make the provision of the bridge a medium timescale measure.</p> <p>High cost: £1.5m - £3m</p>	<p><i>RDC has submitted project (combined with 'I' below) for inclusion in LEP's 'pipeline' of investment project proposals (Jan 2020)</i></p> <p><i>RDC has also requested feasibility funding from LEP to develop initial proposals – bid unsuccessful</i></p> <p>Other Potential Funding: DfT funding (via RNEP process), potential to link to second platform (see 'I' below); Local Growth Deal or Shared Prosperity Fund – via LEP; Govt sustainable transport funding.</p>	<p><i>Progress limited as other actions have taken priority to date</i></p> <p>Could link to future second platform (see 'I' below) and potentially additional parking south of station</p>	<p>Proposal is expected to be included as part of recommended priorities of LCWIP Phase 1 (see 'D' below)</p> <p>Next stages dependant on identifying funding for initial project development work</p>	<p>NYCC - TC</p> <p>RDC – HW NYCC – GN</p>	<p>Summer 2020</p> <p>TBC</p>

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
D	<p>Improved Footpath & Cycle Links via Walking and Cycling Strategy</p> <p>Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Identification and implementation (design and build) of infrastructure would extend timeframes for delivery.</p> <p>Medium cost: Walking and Cycle Strategy including development and design of prioritised schemes: £50k - £60k</p>	<p><i>NYCC Committed funding to undertake LCWIP Phase 1</i></p> <p><i>NYCC & RDC contributions likely to be required to undertake LCWIP Phase 2 (more detailed project development work to enable funding bids for implementation)</i></p>	<p>NYCC appointed consultants to develop LCWIP (phase 1), initial stakeholder consultation undertaken, and draft LCWIP Phase 1 report produced. Draft report identifies opportunities for significant improvements are very limited without delivering major infrastructure projects to remove traffic from town centre</p>	<p>Complete LCWIP Phase 1 study</p>	<p>NYCC - TC</p>	<p>Summer 2020</p>
		<p>Other Potential Funding: future rounds of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) funding; Other Govt sustainable transport funding</p> <p><i>[NB RDC has also committed project development funding and has secured funding to deliver a Malton – Pickering cycle route (this focuses on linking Malton & Pickering rather than general improvements to cycle provision within the town).]</i></p>		<p>NYCC / RDC to consider outcomes of Phase 1 LCWIP report before considering whether to progress with Phase 2 report.</p> <p>Subject to above, NYCC & RDC to consider funding contribution towards development of LCWIP Phase 2 study</p> <p>[Some walking / cycling provision improvements to be incorporated into preferred junction / signal improvements (see 'F below'), subject to Air Quality modelling and public consultation]</p>	<p>NYCC – TC RDC – HW</p> <p>NYCC – TC RDC – PS/HW</p>	<p>Summer 2020</p> <p>Autumn 2020</p>

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
E	<p>Car Parking Strategy</p> <p>Short timescale (< 2 years) Relevant consultations, consents and legal issues required to prepare, design and adopt a parking strategy. Implementation of findings will extend timescales (likely beyond 5 years).</p> <p>Low cost for provision of Car Parking Strategy: £65k - £90k (depending upon level of data collection required)</p>	<p><i>RDC have committed funding to develop Car Parking Strategy</i></p> <p><i>NYCC also making contributing towards strategy</i></p> <p>Funding for implementation to be considered based upon outcome of Strategy findings.</p>	<p>RDC developed Brief, appointed consultants. Consultants have held stakeholder engagement meetings & car park surveys completed. Car Parking Strategy report issued Dec 2019.</p> <p>RDC Member Working Group established to oversee development of strategy following receipt of report.</p>	<p>Development of RDC Parking strategy (informed by Car Parking Strategy Report)</p> <p>Adoption of Strategy & delivery of identified actions</p>	<p>RDC – AT (support from NYCC - DK)</p> <p>RDC - AT</p>	<p>Dec 2020</p> <p>End of 2020 onwards</p>

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
F	<p>Internal Junction Improvements and Traffic Signal Strategy</p> <p>Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Due to time taken to gather data, update / build traffic model and test scenarios in order to identify preferred options, consult and implement changes.</p> <p>Medium cost (for strategy only): £140k – £160k</p>	<p><i>NYCC has committed funding for</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Traffic surveys</i> <i>Development of traffic model</i> <i>Testing of short-listed options</i> 	<p>The following work has been completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic surveys, Initial traffic model development Stakeholder presentation (03/09/19) Validation of model Options / scenario identification Short-listing of options Testing of shortlisted options Stakeholder consultation (20/01/20) 	<p>Air Quality modelling of identified package of interventions</p>	NYCC – TC	Sept 2020
		<p><i>NYCC & RDC have also committed funding to undertake Air Quality modelling of preferred ‘Do Medium’ option</i></p>	<p>NYCC have set up a Malton & Norton Internal Junction Improvement and Traffic Signal Strategy Steering Group to inform this work. Meetings were held in November 2019 and February 2020. The Steering Group agreed that Air Quality modelling of proposals was required prior to proceeding to public consultation.</p>	<p>Next Steering Group meeting</p>	NYCC – TC	Autumn 2020
		<p><i>NYCC has submitted project for inclusion in LEP’s ‘pipeline’ of investment project proposals (Jan 2020)</i></p>	<p>Detailed Air Quality work has been instructed and is nearing completion (this work has taken longer than anticipated)</p>	<p>Public consultation on preferred package of interventions [subject to above]</p>	NYCC - TC	TBC
		<p><i>NYCC has submitted an Expression of Interest to the DfT’s Local Pinch Points Fund for funding towards implementation (Jan 2020). DfT’s assessment of bids is ‘on-hold’ until further notice as a result of COVID-19.</i></p>	<p>[NB – the introduction of new hourly train services by Northern on the York – Scarborough line, previously planned for May 2020, is now planned for May 2021 (postponed due to impacts of COVID-19)]</p>	<p>Decision to implement & consider funding contributions [subject to above]</p>	NYCC – TC RDC – PS/HW	TBC
				<p>Development of detailed scheme designs, followed by implementation of selected interventions [subject to above]</p> <p>[NB - schemes will need to be designed, costed and funding secured prior to implementation. Likely to involve traffic regulation orders, road safety audits – timescales for implementation therefore dependant on complexity of interventions selected & funding availability]</p>	NYCC - TC	TBC

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
<p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 108</p>	<p>Relocation of Livestock Market out of Malton Town Centre</p> <p>Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Time needed for design, consultation and gaining relevant permissions and consents for provision of new market at proposed new location.</p> <p>Medium cost: Dependant upon delivery mechanism – i.e. private or public sector-led</p>	<p>Potential funding (to be confirmed): Likely to require a mix of funding, dependant upon scope of project, business plan & commercial viability</p>	<p>RDC has undertaken work to evaluate options and resolved to look further at a basic cattle market scheme as part of a food hub for Ryedale (including café and abattoir)</p>	<p>RDC to undertake further work to consider development options</p>	<p>RDC – PS/AT</p>	<p>Summer / Autumn 2020</p>

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
H	<p>Transport Hub/Interchange Masterplan</p> <p>Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) for developing masterplan, involving significant consultation.</p> <p>Consents & development timescales longer term.</p> <p>Medium cost for Masterplan: £100k – £150k</p> <p>[Likely High Cost for implementation - could be partially offset by commercial development opportunities]</p>	<p>Potential Funding (to be confirmed): Potential funding mechanisms would likely need to be identified by RDC for development of Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p><i>RDC has secured feasibility funding from LEP to develop a 'Malton / Norton Regeneration Scheme'. This could (subject to budget) potentially consider options for this area</i></p>	<p><i>Progress limited as other actions have taken priority to date.</i></p> <p>Uncertain what appetite there is from landowners for contributing / engaging in this work</p> <p>Scope could also be dependent upon potential changes to traffic flow as a result of traffic modelling work / junction improvement works as well as on car parking strategy.</p> <p>Need to improve linkages / accessibility between rail station and bus station (issues raised by Moorsbus and RyeCAT with use of bus station)</p> <p>[Potential for scope to include neighbouring uses subject to landowner interest]</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of initial masterplan work as part of Malton/Norton Regeneration project</p> <p>Generally keep a 'watching brief' – but to be considered through report to Members at future date</p>	<p>RDC – AT / HW</p> <p>RDC – Econ Dev Team</p>	<p>Sept 2020</p> <p>TBC</p>

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
I	<p>Provision of Second Rail Platform.</p> <p>Long timescale (5 to 10 years) Long timeframes involved in delivery due to identification of appropriate access, land acquisition and gaining relevant permissions.</p> <p>Very High cost: £4m - £5m (footbridge costs not included – see Intervention C)</p>	<p><i>RDC has submitted project (combined with 'C' above) for inclusion in LEP's 'pipeline' of investment project proposals (Jan 2020)</i></p> <p><i>RDC has also requested feasibility funding from LEP to develop initial proposals – bid unsuccessful</i></p>	<p>NYCC have held initial discussions with Network Rail.</p> <p>Network Rail no longer funded to carry out enhancements to rail network. This proposal would be classed as an enhancement and would need to go through DfT's Rail Network Enhancement Programme (RNEP) and Governance for Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) processes/ arrangements.</p> <p>Could link with new accessible bridge (see 'C' above).</p>	<p>Continue discussions with Network Rail (linked to discussions regarding level crossing / potential pedestrian and cycle bridge / additional parking south of railway) to identify how best to progress project.</p> <p>Likely to involve the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feasibility study • Outline design and construction cost estimates • Detailed design / costs • Business Case • Meet the requirements of RNEP/GRIP • Implement through Network Rail framework. <p>Further detail to be included as discussions progress</p> <p>Next stages dependant on identifying funding for initial project development work</p>	<p>NYCC – GN</p> <p>NYCC – GN / TC RDC - HW</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>TBC</p>
		<p>Potential Funding: DfT funding (via RNEP process), potential to link to pedestrian / cycle bridge (see 'C' above); Local Growth Deal or Shared Prosperity Fund – via LEP; Govt sustainable transport funding.</p>				

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
J	<p>Provision of a new All Movements Junction between A64 and Broughton Road</p> <p>Long timescale (5 to 10 years) Time consuming to develop a business case to support this, achieve all relevant consents and permissions and to identify and secure funding, as well as design and build timescales.</p> <p>Very High cost: £10m - £15m +</p>	<p><i>NYCC has submitted project for inclusion in LEP's 'pipeline' of investment project proposals (Jan 2020)</i></p> <p><i>NYCC has committed funding to undertake project development work to stage where bids for Govt funding can be made at short notice</i></p> <p>Potential Funding (to be confirmed): Anticipated that Highways England will expect works to be funded by those seeking to implement project (i.e. NYCC, RDC). Also consider funding via LEP (Growth Deal or Shared Prosperity Fund)</p>	<p>NYCC agreed to undertake project development work so that scheme is 'bid-ready' should funding become available.</p> <p>Consultants appointed and commenced work.</p>	<p>Undertake project development work to stage where scheme is 'bid-ready'</p> <p>Initiate discussions with Highways England under auspices of A64 Growth Partnership</p> <p><i>NB HE is only authority able to take this forward so all actions, timescales and funding mechanisms would be determined by HE. It should also be noted that provision of additional junctions to Strategic Road Network are usually only supported where essential for delivery of strategic planned growth.</i></p>	<p>NYCC – KM</p> <p>NYCC - KM RDC – PS A64 Growth Partnership</p>	<p>Spring / Autumn 2020</p> <p>On-going</p>

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
K	<p>Upgrade A64 Musley Bank Junction - to provide an All Movements junction</p> <p>Long timescale (5 to 10 years) Time consuming to develop the business case to support this and achieve all relevant consents and permissions and to identify and secure funding, as well as design and build timescales.</p> <p>Very High cost: £5m - £7.5m</p>	<p><i>NYCC & RDC have submitted project for inclusion in LEP's 'pipeline' of investment project proposals (Jan 2020)</i></p> <p><i>NYCC considered including project in bid for DfT 'Pinch Point Fund' bid – but timescales too short and ultimately not included</i></p> <p><i>NYCC has committed funding to undertake project development work to stage where bids for Govt funding can be made at short notice</i></p> <p>Potential Funding (to be confirmed): Anticipated that Highways England will expect works to be funded by those seeking to implement project (i.e. NYCC, RDC). Also consider funding via LEP (Growth Deal or Shared Prosperity Fund)</p>	<p>NYCC agreed to undertake project development work so that scheme is 'bid-ready' should funding become available.</p> <p>Consultants appointed and commenced work.</p> <p>Initial discussions and consultation on options held with Highways England – awaiting feedback.</p>	<p>Undertake project development work to stage where scheme is 'bid-ready'</p> <p>Initiate discussions with Highways England under auspices of A64 Growth Partnership</p> <p><i>NB HE is only authority able to take this forward so all actions, timescales and funding mechanisms would be determined by HE.</i></p>	<p>NYCC – KM</p> <p>RDC – PS A64 Growth Partnership</p>	<p>Spring - Autumn 2020</p> <p>On-going</p>

PREFERRED PACKAGE AND INTERVENTION-SPECIFIC ACTION PLAN – UPDATED 13/08/2020

Ref	Intervention Description	Funding Opportunities	Current Position	Proposed Action	Lead Partner / Action by	Indicative Timeline
L	<p>Link Road between Beverley Road and Hugden Way</p> <p>Long timescale (5 to 10 years) Time needed for design, consultation and gaining relevant permissions and consents for provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>High cost: £2.5m - £4.5m</p>	<p>Potential Funding (to be confirmed): Currently expected to be implemented by private sector developers.</p>	<p><i>Strongest likelihood of being delivered as part of Local Plan development to enable delivery of an allocated site. However, could potentially be considered for early delivery through DfT funding streams.</i></p>	<p>Currently expected that a link between Beverley Rd and Hugden Way / Westfield Way will be delivered by developer as part of the proposed Norton Grove development.</p>	<p>Developer</p>	<p>Dependant upon developer (awaiting Planning App)</p>

Page 113

Key to Colour Shading:	
	Little or no progress
	Project progressing – but requires corrective action
	Project progressing well or is complete
	Task complete / no further action

Key to Initials:	
TC – Tim Coyne	HW – Howard Wallis
LN – Louise Neale	PS – Phillip Spurr
DK – David Kirkpatrick	GN – Graham North
AT – Amy Thomas	KM – Keisha Moore
CK – Cathy Knight	

This page is intentionally left blank



PART B:	RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL
REPORT TO:	POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
DATE:	24 SEPTEMBER 2020
REPORT OF THE:	KIM ROBERTSHAW HOUSING SERVICES MANAGER
TITLE OF REPORT:	HOMELESSNESS AND ROUGH SLEEPER STRATEGY SUMMARY
WARDS AFFECTED:	ALL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report provides Policy and Resources Committee with a summary of the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2020-25 Appendix 1 for consideration and comments before the summary strategy is presented to Full Council for approval.
- 1.2 The report summarises the objectives and targets specified within the strategy and sets out any implications for the Council.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Approve the Strategy for submitting to Full Council for approval.

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 3.1 It is a requirement that there be a review of homelessness in the district and that a Strategy is developed and published every five years.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

- 4.1 Section 1(1) of the Homelessness Act 2002 requires Local Authorities to publish a Homelessness Strategy within 5 years of the previous one. Therefore, this is required to be in place for April 2020.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The proposals contained within the Strategy support the Council's priority of Sustainable Growth
- Minimising homelessness, improving the standard and availability of rented accommodation and supporting people to live independently
 - The objectives are monitored through the Housing Service Corporate Plan
- 5.2 The Homelessness Act 2002 requires all housing authorities to produce a Homelessness Strategy based on a review of homelessness within their district. This must be reviewed every five years. The current strategy was developed in 2015.
- 5.3 Since publication of the government's Rough Sleeping Strategy 2018, it is also a statutory requirement to include rough sleeping as a priority within the strategy.
- 5.4 Ryedale's Homelessness and Rough Sleeper Strategy is linked to the Council's Housing Strategy Action Plan 2015/2021. This strategy includes an objective on the prevention of homelessness. Ryedale's Homelessness and Rough Sleeper Strategy will ensure that proposals under that objective have been highlighted and will be developed and monitored at a local level. The Council will continue to work closely with the other local authorities across the LEP area on homelessness issues and share effective practice in the implementation of its homelessness and rough sleeper strategy.

5.5 CONSULTATION

Consultation has already been carried out with staff, customers and partners through the Housing Forum, focus groups and service user's questionnaires in order to inform the review of homelessness and services in the district.

- 5.6 Following the draft Strategy presented to SMB and the Policy and Resources committee, it has been distributed for wider consultation to partner agencies and internal staff. There were limited responses but those that were received were positive and liked the inclusion of case studies. Information from the further consultation with partner agencies and internal staff has been incorporated into the strategy.

REPORT

6.0 REPORT DETAILS

- 6.1 Ryedale's five-year Homelessness and Rough Sleeper Strategy sets out the Council's aim to tackle homelessness across the district over the next 5 years and details how the Council will provide housing options and homelessness services for the residents of Ryedale. This Strategy was due to be presented to committee in March, however due to the pandemic this has been delayed.
- 6.2 An action plan will be used as the work plan for the Housing Options team over the next 5 years in order to achieve what has been set out and identified within the homelessness review and strategy. Officers within the team will take responsibility for involvement in achieving the different actions. Annual progress will be reported to SMB and members. We will also identify specific performance indicators that can be reported back on a quarterly basis, in line with the action plan. These are currently

being agreed as part of the Corporate Plan.

- 6.3 The Strategy has been updated to take account of the current situation with Covid-19 and the complete year statistics for 2019-20 have been inserted due to the delay with the pandemic, rather than part year.

The past 4 months have presented us with a large increase in both the numbers approaching for advice and assistance and homeless, but also because of the reduced housing options available to move people into. The number of enquiries to the service during the first 3 months of 20/21 has increased by 64%, with the number of homelessness assessments increasing by 100%. The number allocated temporary accommodation has risen, with a total of 28 households accommodated between April and June, this is an 87% increase on the previous year. Many of these would not ordinarily come under our duty to provide emergency accommodation for or may have been able to find other short term options with family or friends, but were accommodated as part of the Government's "Everybody in" directive. Whilst the findings in the Strategy are still appropriate for the needs in our area, we are also conscious of the potential need of more temporary accommodation and longer term accommodation for single people over the forthcoming year, should future lockdowns be imposed or the situation with the pandemic alter. Funding opportunities and operational developments will impact on the timescales to achieve the targets.

- 6.4 It is a fact that the prevention of homelessness is more cost-effective for authorities than dealing with its consequences, and resources deployed on the prevention of homelessness ultimately save on costs long-term, and help to alleviate the crisis for the customer. To achieve this the emphasis must continue to be on partnership working, sharing resources and employing creative and innovative solutions.

6.5 **OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS**

Following a review of homelessness within Ryedale and within the national and sub-regional context, the following objectives have been identified as priority areas to work on over the forthcoming 5 years. Within each of the objectives are specific outcomes which Housing Services and our wider partners will aim to achieve. These have altered since the draft strategy was presented to SMB and committee. However, this is largely in relation to altering positioning within the document, rewording and making the outcomes SMART and achievable. Going forward, how we achieve some of them may also differ depending on the changing situation with Covid-19.

6.6 **Objective 1 – Working to prevent and relieve homelessness**

Prior to making a main duty decision, there are a minimum of 56 days in which we will work with a customer to prevent their homelessness or assist them into alternative accommodation. This is achieved through successful case management, identifying why people are approaching for assistance, providing bespoke support and advice and ensuring that prevention tools are in place to give staff and customers the chance to obtain suitable accommodation much quicker.

Outcomes:

1. **Encourage landlords, letting agents and tenants to refer to our service early.**
2. **Continue to review and improve prevention tools to enable customers to**

- sustain and remain in their current accommodation.
- 3. Work with registered social housing providers to address the high number of approaches for rent arrears.
- 4. Increase access to specific and quality advice for customers.
- 5. Ensure customers who want to stay in their own home are given as much opportunity as possible to allow this to happen.

6.7 **Objective 2 – Ensure sufficient and appropriate accommodation is and will be available for people who are homeless or may become homeless**

We must ensure that there is an array of affordable and suitable tenure options and properties available to residents. This can be achieved by working with colleagues and partners to make the best use of existing stock, ensuring it can be adapted if required, ensuring security measures are improved if needed, or being made affordable for the occupant to remain in. Alternatively, it can be achieved through access to new properties, bringing empty properties back into use and working with landlords to increase access to low cost home ownership as well as rented accommodation for customers.

Outcomes:

- 1. To increase access to low cost shared accommodation for customers
- 2. To develop and increase access to move on accommodation from supported accommodation.
- 3. To annually review the temporary accommodation availability and requirements.
- 4. Develop and extend clear and co-ordinated private sector offer to increase private rental options.
- 5. Continue to be an active partner in NYHC to ensure that the properties are made available to as many customers as possible.
- 6. Promote and facilitate access to all types of affordable accommodation options.

6.8 **Objective 3 – Maximise and maintain partnerships to ensure appropriate tailored support**

The strategy recognises the important role that partners and stakeholders have to play in employing skills and delivering sensitive and tailored solutions to some of the issues affecting Ryedale's community.

Outcomes:

- 1. Ensure those with complex or specific needs have tailored support suitable for them and vulnerable customer groups.
- 2. Increase numbers of referrals sent through Duty to Refer from statutory and non-statutory agencies to increase early intervention and prevent homelessness.
- 3. Maintain and develop relationships with organisations providing support to specific groups to prevent and relieve homelessness and improve referrals and signposting.
- 4. Work with agencies, funders and commissioners to increase availability of Drug and Alcohol Services within Ryedale.

5. Increase employment and training opportunities in partnership with DWP, economic development and partner agencies.

6.9 **Objective 4 – Raise awareness of homelessness and housing issues across the District and improve access to the services in the district**

A need to raise awareness and supply information on the services provided within the department has been identified through the consultation process. This includes reviewing all aspects of communication, the information that we make available, how the service is promoted, how customers access the services and how we consult to obtain feedback.

Outcomes:

1. Raise awareness of the Housing Options service within the Council, local community and with local agencies.
2. Increase the use of technology where possible and explore how and where advice is provided.
3. Implement a robust customer feedback and consultation analysis system to continue to develop the service.
4. Review the communication and marketing plan.
5. Enable customers with additional needs to access our services.

6.10 **Objective 5 – Continue to work strategically to maintain services and seek new opportunities for funding and partnership working**

Local authorities and their partners have worked under ongoing financial constraints for a number of years. Working collaboratively, for example by joint funding or joint protocols and processes, on early intervention and prevention is key to success. There are several services being reviewed over the next couple of years through North Yorkshire County Council and ongoing funding opportunities through MHCLG. We must focus on accessing appropriate funding to meet the targets of this strategy.

Outcomes:

1. Work with NYCC in reviewing services that deliver specific young peoples' accommodation and support within Ryedale.
2. Work with partners to provide and increase access to domestic abuse refuge accommodation within North Yorkshire.
3. Ensure that housing support services within the Council are maintained while increasing homeless prevention and supporting households in order to prevent repeat homelessness.
4. Work with NYCC commissioners and successful contractors on the provision of mental health accommodation and offender support services in Ryedale.
5. MHCLG funding and local funding options.
6. Review money advice, income maximisation, financial support and basic living provision available to residents and look at future funding provision from the council and external sources.
7. Develop closer links with Public health and other health services provided within the district.

6.11 **Objective 6 – Ending Rough Sleeping**

Rough sleeping is an area of significant national policy focus within homelessness, attracting funding and a clear aim to reduce and end rough sleeping. Ryedale's annual count figures have remained low, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to find quick housing solutions for all. Following successful interventions over the past 6 months, MHCLG funding has been provided until March 2021 to continue to develop the rough sleeper pathway and provide sustainable tenancy support to ensure individuals do not return to the street.

Outcomes:

- 1. Refresh and implement a 'single service offer' based on the no second night out principles.**
- 2. Develop and embed a rough sleeping pathway across the district.**
- 3. Continue to deliver tenancy sustainment work to prevent rough sleeping.**
- 4. Increase knowledge across the district with both partners and the general population of how to seek help for a rough sleeper.**
- 5. Create a rough sleeping personalised intervention fund.**
- 6. Create an emergency bed space for Rough Sleepers.**

7.0 **ONGOING REVIEW**

- 7.1 Following on from this initial Strategy an annual update be provided to detail what work has been achieved in the previous year and what will be done to achieve the specific outcomes for the upcoming year. A plan will be used by the team as a working document to monitor how we have met the targets. Performance indicators are being developed through the Corporate Plan to provide data quarterly.
- 7.2 The homelessness review and strategy will be used to consider where funding is required for investment and gaps in services that need to be explored with commissioners or other agencies. These gaps are expected to be funded using current monies within the homelessness budget and any future funding sources that become available.

8.0 **IMPLICATIONS**

(a) Policy

The Homelessness Act 2002 requires that all local authorities must have adopted a Homelessness Strategy which is reviewed on an annual basis.

The provision of housing advice and support for homeless people forms a core element of the Council's Homeless Strategy and supports legal obligations around the prevention and relief of homelessness.

(b) Financial

The recommendations within this report do not require 'growth' within the Councils homelessness budgets. Housing are working closely with finance to monitor any Covid-19 spend and additional funding bids will be submitted for any ongoing

Government funding. Below is an overview of the current financial information for the service.

	2019/20	2020/21
Prevention Budget	£85,000	£85,000
Flexible Homelessness prevention grant	£40,000	£40,000
Preventing Homelessness grant	£8,275	£0
New Burdens Funding		£21,000

Of the above funding the following allocations were made for 2019/20

- Training - £1,500
- North Yorkshire Home Choice administration and co-ordination - £5,000
- Positive activities - £1,800
- Homelessness Prevention Fund - £19,000
- Ryedale Citizens Advice (money and debt advice) - £12,000
- Ryedale Foodbank - £5,000
- Staffing – £40,000
- Temporary accommodation spend between £428 and £4374 over the past 5 years (budget 10K). This is likely to be much more for 20/21 though due to Covid-19 and data is provided directly to finance on a monthly basis.

In addition to the Government funding above we received £65,000 in funding from MHCLG for the Pathway Co-ordinator (Rough Sleeping and Mental health) and the supported lettings officer. This funding has been extended to cover the cost of both posts until the end of March 2021.

There has been additional funding provided by MHCLG for Housing departments to deal with the pandemic crisis. This is being assessed and monitored through finance.

(c) Legal

The Council is meeting its legal obligations by producing this strategy.

(d) Equalities and Diversity

The provision of services for homeless people will have a positive impact in terms of Equalities and Diversity issues. An equalities impact assessment has been completed.

(e) Staffing Issues

There will be no additional staff resource required.

(f) Climate Change

In April 2018 the Housing Options and Homelessness service introduced a new case management system and stopped printing application forms. This has led to a very large reduction in printing and paper use and an increase in the use of digital communication and document storage. Staff are not travelling to meetings due to the current situation, however many of these meetings are continuing remotely through video and conference calling and will likely continue this way moving forward. Also, staff are more dynamic and flexible in their engagement with customers, reducing home visits and community based support and instead opting for drop-ins and more

phone advice. Since social distancing measures were introduced, there has been a further significant increase in the use of digital and telephone interviews. This will continue to be reviewed alongside the Council's Climate Change Strategy.

(g) Planning

Depending on the further development of Shared Houses to increase Affordable Housing in line with the Council's development plan, there may be planning implications for these depending on ownership and current use.

10.0 Next Steps

10.1 The finalised draft Strategy summary will be presented to Full Council.

Kim Robertshaw
Housing Services Manager

Author: Kim Robertshaw
Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 43383
E-Mail Address: kim.robertshaw@ryedale.gov.uk

Annex 1: Summary of the Homelessness and Rough Sleeper Strategy 2020-25

Working Together to End Homelessness

Ryedale Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2020- 2025

Summary document of the strategy

Foreword

Our new Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2020-2025 sets out the Council's plan to prevent homelessness and reduce rough sleeping throughout the district over the next five years. This document contains key facts relating to homelessness and rough sleeping in our district; levels of demand, key trends and how effective our previous strategy was in reducing homelessness across the district. Our Housing Options Team are proud to have achieved Gold Standard status and we are determined to adopt good practice and adapt in order to respond to new challenges as and when they arise. Our strategy is based on evidence and has been devised in consultation with local partner agencies.

Collaborative and partnership working is vital in preventing and reducing the impact of homelessness on local people. Prevention of homelessness has been at the forefront of the work carried out by Ryedale District Council and our Housing Forum partners for over 10 years; it will continue to be our main goal and we would like to take this opportunity to thank the people and organisations who have contributed to this important work and have helped shape this strategy.

Despite the challenging landscape that we work within, the Council and its partners have made significant progress in tackling homelessness throughout the lifetime of our last homelessness strategy (2015-2020). Housing supply, affordability, welfare reform, economic and social factors all play a part in the challenges faced both nationally and locally addressing homelessness.

Whilst Ryedale residents enjoy the benefits of its beautiful location, property prices to rent or buy are beyond the reach of many; this creates demand for affordable housing. The council has been successful in developing affordable housing, but demand outstrips supply. This results in some households with a low income having to seek accommodation in less expensive areas outside of Ryedale. Alternatively, finding themselves unable to afford independent accommodation so that they have to live in the homes of friends or relatives, this can put pressure on personal relationships and lead to homelessness due to relationships breaking down. Some residents need support to find accommodation or manage their tenancies and we will continue to work with local specialist support agencies to provide the best service we can for Ryedale residents.

With the new duties placed on councils under the Homeless Reduction Act 2017 and by working together to provide advice, support and assistance, we aim to prevent homelessness whenever we can. Together we aim to end rough sleeping and help everyone to find a suitable home to call their own. The Council is committed to ensuring that Housing is a corporate priority in coming years in order to support our residents and help our local economy to thrive.

Councillor Keane Duncan

Leader of the Council

Introduction

Welcome to Ryedale District Council's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2020-2025 summary. The strategy details how the Council will prevent and relieve homelessness and work with partners throughout the district and sub-region to provide the most suitable accommodation and support for those facing homelessness. The strategy has been written to comply with legal requirements in the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 and Section 1(4) of the Homelessness Act 2002. Also, with regard to national and sub-regional policy, with input from stakeholders, partners and following Ryedale District Council's review of the service in 2018 and 2019. The strategy will take into account the significant changes over the past 5 years since the previous strategy was developed. Review and consultation has been undertaken and the findings of which have detailed what the strategy aims to deliver over the next five years. This is all available in the full strategy document '[Working Together to End Homelessness - Ryedale Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Review and Strategy 2020-2025](#)'.

Ryedale's 'Gold Standard' Homelessness Service



In July 2017 Ryedale District Council was only the 9th local authority of 326 in England to achieve a Gold Standard award. At the time this showed that the local housing options service was in the top 3%.

Objectives

This summary will focus on the six objectives within our strategy, which are to:

1. Prevent and relieve homelessness
2. Ensure sufficient and appropriate accommodation is and will be available for those in housing need and for people who are homeless or may become homeless
3. Maximise partnerships and improve access to support services
4. Raise awareness of homelessness and housing issues across the district, improving access to the services
5. Continue to work strategically to maintain services and seek new opportunities for funding and partnership working
6. End rough sleeping

OUR PRIORITIES

This strategy links to a number of the 9 priorities within the [Council's Housing Strategy](#) that cover all aspects of housing.

OUR VISION

"Homelessness is everyone's business. Across our partnerships we will strive towards ending homelessness and rough sleeping once and for all".

OBJECTIVE 1 - Prevent and relieve homelessness

We want to provide the best service that we can for all of our customers – we will review our casework on a regular basis, ensure our staff are well-trained and consider ways to improve the customer journey. We will try to ensure that customers have one key worker throughout their customer journey, so that they do not have to repeat themselves telling their circumstances multiple times to different people. We will gather feedback from customers to inform our future service planning.

There are many reasons for homelessness within Ryedale that are still apparent and we will continue to work towards preventing homelessness, with a multi-agency perspective. The most frequent reasons people approach the team are **parents/relatives no longer willing to accommodate, relationship breakdowns, loss of Assured Shorthold Tenancy, and loss of Social Housing due to rent arrears.**

In Ryedale we focus on assisting households to maintain their existing accommodation and prevent homelessness wherever possible by early intervention, meaning that we can take action to support them, maximise their income if required, and negotiate with the landlord rather than assisting them to look for alternative accommodation.

Social housing is limited therefore we will continue to make best use of this by considering alternatives such as private rental. There are also options for sharing accommodation in the private sector, which meets the needs of young people or people on a low income who would struggle to sustain an independent flat or house on their own.

We will utilise all of the homelessness prevention initiatives we have at our disposal, including the prevention toolkit and the housing support service, focusing on activities to prevent the main causes of homelessness. Prior to integrating within the housing team, the housing support service has been successful in obtaining charity funding for customers to help clear arrears or debts, purchase essential household items and also to assist with daily living costs.

Outcomes

We will review our protocols and pathways to ensure that we are working in the most efficient way to prevent homelessness. This will include:

1. Encourage landlords, letting agents and tenants to refer to our service early.
2. Continue to review and improve prevention tools, to enable customers to sustain and remain in their current accommodation.
3. Work with registered social housing providers to address the high number of approaches for rent arrears.
4. Increase access to specific and quality advice for customers.
5. Ensure customers who want to stay in their own home are given as much opportunity as possible to allow this to happen.

OBJECTIVE 2 – Ensure sufficient and appropriate accommodation is and will be available for those in housing need and for people who are homeless or may become homeless

Ryedale has a buoyant housing market and it can be difficult for people who are on a low income or disadvantaged to access suitable home ownership or private rented housing.

We will continue to be innovative and look for ways to increase the provision of affordable housing in the district, including low cost home ownership and shared housing to accommodate single people on low incomes who cannot afford independent accommodation.

We will continue to:

- Work with Housing Development to deliver sufficient Affordable Housing Developments as set out in the Ryedale Housing Strategy.
- Support the Private sector team to deliver the Empty Property Strategy and bring empty properties back into use.
- Ensure maintenance of private sector housing stock through Council loans and grants, within the terms of the Private Sector Renewal Strategy.
- Ensure people with a local connection are allocated properties through Shared Ownership, Discount for Sale and the [Help to buy equity loan and Help to buy ISA](#).
- Ensure sufficient Affordable Rent properties continue to be developed throughout Ryedale, which cost 80% of the market rent.
- Maintain four buildings providing rented housing managed by the Council which offers 13 units of affordable shared accommodation for single working people on low income, seeking work and young people in training, education and employment.
- Maintain availability of supported accommodation and the allocation of support workers within Derwent Lodge (owned and managed by the council), Ryedale YMCA (Young Person's Pathway) and the Cornmill in Malton (Impact Living).
- Ensure the best use of social housing through North Yorkshire Home Choice.
- Assess and support customers to access the 85 extra properties built in Ryedale for extra care and older persons supported housing (Micklehill at Pickering and Bransdale View in Helmsley).
- Ensure access to temporary and emergency accommodation, working with Yorkshire Housing, NYCC and Safe and Sound Homes (SASH) and private providers.
- Work with specialist agencies to find suitable accommodation and support for people with complex needs through accommodation led models.
- Ensure maximisation of access to private rental properties to those at risk of homelessness or homeless through things such as landlord incentives.
- Continue the landlord's forum to ensure landlords are aware of changes in legislation, policy and available services, while networking with possible landlords to work with the authority.
- Maintain the Traveller site in Malton which holds 19 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers.
- Work with commissioners for NYCC to ensure the needs of Ryedale residents are identified with regard to specialist accommodation, which is not currently available in Ryedale.

In 2019/20 we exceeded our target of affordable housing again, partly due to a brand new development in Malton. The scheme consists of 56 affordable houses with a choice of rented or shared ownership tenures. The properties include a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed houses and 2 bedroomed bungalows. We are working hard with the landlord to ensure that these properties all go to local people with a housing need.

Outcomes

1. To increase access to low cost shared accommodation for customers.

2. To develop and increase access to move on accommodation from supported accommodation.
3. To annually review the temporary accommodation availability and requirements.
4. Develop and extend clear and co-ordinated private sector offer to increase private rental options.
5. Continue to be an active partner in North Yorkshire Home Choice (NYHC), to ensure that the properties are made available to as many customers as possible.
6. Promote and facilitate access to all types of affordable accommodation options.

OBJECTIVE 3 – Maximise partnerships and improve access to support services

Partnerships and inter-agency working within Ryedale is vital to the prevention of homelessness and ensuring the appropriate support is available for those who are homeless, to prevent them from becoming homeless again in the future. We work alongside over 30 organisations to deliver this strategy, to find the best solutions for customers. This varies from involvement with young people, health and wellbeing, support and other partners. Many provide holistic or focused support for a specific group, with others providing advice for the wider public.

Ryedale District Council Housing Services currently provide £5000 annually to the Ryedale Food bank to support them in the delivery of their voluntary services to provide food for households who are in need. Between April 2019 and March 2020, they redeemed 986 food vouchers for households, ranging from single people to families, with numbers increasing. There is also a free fridge in Malton and Norton and there will soon be another opening in Pickering, which assists those who are struggling financially but aims to reduce food waste.

The money advice service provided in Malton by Citizens' Advice also receives an annual grant of £12,000. This is to provide money advice to those who are facing homelessness, providing them with specialist independent advice and help to access money and debt advice and to assist them to resolve these issues.

The [Homelessness Reduction Act 2017](#) placed a duty on local authorities to provide advice to specific groups of people who may be more vulnerable. For each of the categories of need stated in the Act, tailored advice has been developed and is accessible via our website or can be obtained from the housing team, including support from specialist agencies. We will continue to develop contacts and referral pathways to specialist support providers for the specified vulnerable groups and will add to the list above where local need requires.

We will work with partner agencies to ensure that the advice that we provide is realistic, up-to-date and relevant to local people who are looking for information or facing homelessness in the district whether given face-to-face, on our website or in leaflet form.

We will continue to facilitate Ryedale Housing Forum which meets on a quarterly basis and is a well-established mechanism for monitoring the homelessness strategy, discussing local issues, improving communication and sharing good practice. Membership and contacts will be reviewed.

We will carry out work with partners to ensure duties for referral under the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 are effective and that statutory agencies are aware of their responsibilities. We will also work with other agencies who are not subject to the statutory duty to encourage early referrals. We identify that there will be continued work needed to engage with other referring agencies, which will include further training and awareness raising.

Housing Staff are trained in safeguarding and are aware of how to raise alerts should they have a concern. There is a strong awareness of safeguarding within the department as the Housing Manager is also the Designated Safeguarding Officer and Safeguarding Concerns Manager for the council. There is strong partnership working with community safety partners and this enables timely and appropriate referrals for vulnerable individuals who need specialist support.

There is a need to work more closely with health services in Ryedale to ensure that people can access the support they need when they need it. We have links with mental health services and GPs but will work to strengthen and formalise pathways. We will also regularly review our hospital discharge protocol to ensure it is operating effectively.

Outcomes

1. Ensure those with complex or specific needs have tailored support suitable for them and vulnerable customer groups.
2. Increase numbers of referrals sent through Duty to Refer from statutory and non-statutory agencies, to increase early intervention and prevent homelessness.
3. Maintain and develop relationships with organisations providing support to specific groups to prevent and relieve homelessness and improve referrals and signposting.
4. Work with agencies, funders and commissioners to increase availability of Drug and Alcohol Services within Ryedale.
5. Increase employment and training opportunities in partnership with DWP, economic development and partner agencies.

OBJECTIVE 4 – Raise awareness of homelessness and housing issues across the district, improving access to the services

Unless the public and partners are aware of the services that are provided for those facing homelessness and the information is easily accessible, we will struggle to make further improvements in the way services are delivered and households will not come for help early enough to access help.

We want to raise awareness in the Council, in the local community and with local agencies so that people approach us for advice as early as possible to prevent their homelessness and they also know where else to go directly for specific advice or support. Consultation identified that some members of the public and partners were not aware of many of the tools that we had available to assist people in housing need, such as discretionary housing payments, bond schemes, support services and other prevention options. We will continue to review how we record the work completed, especially with households who approach our service before they are officially classed as threatened with homelessness.

We will review our Communication and Marketing Plan and work with the new Communications Team in order to implement it effectively. We will continue to attend multi-agency meetings and take part in consultations locally to keep housing and homelessness high on the agenda and improve joined up working.

Currently, consultation is completed with customers on an 'ad hoc' basis. It is always completed for those leaving supported accommodation. Feedback has been largely positive, but we will work to improve consultation with customers, partner agencies and the wider

community in order to ensure that we are fully aware of issues affecting homelessness in the district and the demand for our services.

Ryedale is a very large geographical area and transport links to some rural areas are poor and transport can be expensive. We acknowledge that some people find it difficult to access our services which are mostly based at Ryedale House in Malton. Prior to the recent pandemic, we provided a drop-in service in Pickering and attended other agencies to give advice. We will work flexibly providing home visits to people with specific needs if necessary or give advice by the telephone encouraging the use of our customer portal to gather evidence where possible. We will review our service provision and, if there is a need, increase the number of drop-in sessions, once regulations allow, in outlying parts of the district so that people can access housing support. We will explore joint working opportunities in order to provide housing and homelessness advice where and when it is needed.

There are increasing opportunities for customers to contact the housing team via electronic devices and manage their applications via our online system at a time that suits them. We will encourage people to access advice online through our website where possible and use our customer portal if they have internet access.

We will ensure that our housing support staff continue to offer extra support to customers who are not able to access online services in order that they are not disadvantaged, for example making bids for social housing on their behalf and assisting them to maximise their incomes.

There is regular training arranged and delivered to inform and update agencies and partners on changes to legislation, services and to improve working practices. The quarterly Housing Forum provides information to over 30 organisations and this is the main forum for information sharing around housing and homelessness in the district. This information sharing needs to be increased, for example a newsletter that Ryedale District Council and wider agencies can feed into, that will then be available online and sent out to agencies, so information can be shared regularly with a wider audience.

Outcomes

1. Raise awareness of the Housing Options service within the Council, local community and with local agencies.
2. Increase the use of technology where possible and explore how and where advice is provided.
3. Implement a robust customer feedback and consultation analysis system to continue to develop the service.
4. Review the communication and marketing plan.
5. Enable customers with additional needs to access our services.

OBJECTIVE 5 – Continue to work strategically to maintain services and seek new opportunities for funding and partnership working

We will raise awareness with decision makers and budget holders of the issues surrounding demand on service provision locally to safeguard services and funding. We will ensure that elected members and senior management are regularly updated about the work of the team and work with the communication team to ensure that we portray a realistic image of homelessness issues in the district.

We continue to actively seek opportunities to bid for additional funding from MHCLG and other funding streams. We will build on our relationships with neighbouring authorities and partner agencies to facilitate further funding opportunities. We will concentrate in particular on seeking opportunities to work more closely with public health and North Yorkshire County Council Commissioners, with an interest in mental health and substance misuse, as we have identified that many people facing homelessness in the district have mental health needs, some of whom do not engage well with existing services.

Our new in-house housing support service will continue to access charity funding to support individuals to resolve their homelessness and tackle debt issues.

We will ensure that our services represent value for money by monitoring the cost of temporary accommodation and minimising void periods in the accommodation that we manage.

Externally Funded Services

Preventing homelessness and providing support is not just a Housing Authority responsibility. The Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 sets out the importance of enhanced joint working and integration between housing authorities, health and social care in relation to the development and implementation of homeless prevention strategies. The Act further bolsters existing legal requirements on local authorities under the Health & Social Care Act 2012 to take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of the people in its area. This includes people experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness and under The Children Act 1989 to work in partnership to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in need.

The governments' [Code of Guidance for Homelessness Reduction Act 2017](#) highlights the need for close integration between social care, housing and health authorities around this whole agenda, specifically in relation to the development of homeless strategies.

The main statutory responsibility towards homelessness sits with the District Council as the housing authority, however many of the services that are provided locally are funded via the upper tier authority NYCC, such as the Housing Homeless Prevention and Support Service, the Young Persons Pathway, support for victims of domestic violence (provided by IDAS), Offenders housing related support service (provided by Foundation) and Housing Support Service for people with mental health needs (provided by Horton Housing).

There is significant concern that funding pressures across the county council will have an impact in relation to services to reduce homelessness; of particular concern is the Young Persons' Pathway and the recent reduction of support services to those in the community. These services form core elements of the local homelessness strategy. We will continue to monitor this, as there is no certainty over the future of the Young Persons Pathway.

Outcomes

1. Work with NYCC in reviewing services that deliver specific young peoples'

- accommodation and support within Ryedale.
2. Work with partners to provide and increase access to domestic abuse refuge accommodation within North Yorkshire.
 3. Ensure that housing support services within the Council are maintained while increasing homeless prevention and supporting households in order to prevent repeat homelessness.
 4. Work with NYCC commissioners and successful contractors, on the provision of mental health accommodation and offender support services in Ryedale.
 5. MHCLG funding and local funding options.
 6. Review money advice, income maximisation, financial support and basic living provision available to residents and look at future funding provision from the council and external sources.
 7. Develop closer links with Public health and other health services provided within the district.

OBJECTIVE 6 - End Rough Sleeping

Why is this important?

Rough Sleepers are some of the most vulnerable people in society. They may have complex support needs which can be worsened by having no settled suitable accommodation.

The Government have pledged to half rough sleeping by 2022 and end rough sleeping nationally by 2027, as outlined in the [Government's Rough Sleeping Strategy](#).

The Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 increases the responsibilities of the council to all homeless people, regardless of whether they have a priority need for housing.

What are the big issues going forward?

- Without additional intervention at the local level we estimate that rough sleeping levels are likely to increase going forward in line with the national trends.
- We recognise that more needs to be done to both stem the rate of increase in numbers of people sleeping rough and reduce rough sleeping overall. To monitor progress against this we have set ourselves ambitious targets over the lifetime of the strategy to reduce rough sleeping on an on-going annual basis.
- Rough sleeping is much more than a housing problem. Tackling this issue requires a close and co-ordinated multi-agency response to ensure that anyone sleeping rough or at risk of sleeping rough in the Ryedale is aware of the services available and is able to access the necessary support to help them off the streets and to address the problems that led to them becoming homeless.
- The council needs to strengthen partnership arrangements to tackle rough sleeping jointly and ensure that the different agencies are working towards a common goal.
- We have identified during consultation that the general public in Ryedale are not aware of how the council can help rough sleepers or who to contact if they come across someone who is sleeping rough.

What are we going to do?

- It is our intention to relaunch the ‘Single Service Offer’ approach based on the Government’s ‘No Second Night-Out’ Principles, which can be found on our website - [Help for rough sleepers - No Second Night Out](#).
- They will be referred to a relevant agency for some form of help. This approach acknowledges that various agencies have a different role to play but will work in partnership to tackle this problem.
- We will engage with all relevant agencies in the district and particularly concentrate on improving links with mental health and drug and alcohol services.

Outcomes

1. Refresh and implement a ‘single service offer’ based on the no second night out principles.
2. Develop and embed a rough sleeping pathway across the district.
3. Continue to deliver tenancy sustainment work to prevent rough sleeping.
4. Increase knowledge across the district with both partners and the general population of how to seek help for a rough sleeper.
5. Create a rough sleeping personalised intervention fund.
6. Create an emergency bed space for Rough Sleepers.

DELIVERING AND MONITORING THIS STRATEGY

It is recognised that delivering the Homelessness & Rough Sleeping Strategy is the responsibility of many organisations working together in partnership and not just the Council. The quarterly Housing Forum, provides ongoing information sharing and updates which feed into the Strategy and action plan reviews, significant updates and progress will be shared with this group.

Ryedale Housing Strategy Steering Group

The aim of the Steering Group is to ensure that this work is co-ordinated in an effective way with all partners influencing and contributing to a coherent agreed strategy.

The Ryedale Housing Strategy Steering Group will monitor the Homelessness & Rough Sleeping Action plan on a regular basis and the group will drive forward delivery and progress in meeting the objectives set out in the strategy. The action plan will be reviewed annually to ensure that any new changes in legislation and policies are reflected within the strategy.

We welcome your comments which will help to shape future reviews of this policy and associated action plans.

Email: housing@ryedale.gov.uk

Tel: 01653 600666

Further information is available at <https://www.ryedale.gov.uk/homelessness>

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank