



## **LOCAL PLAN WORKING PARTY**

Thursday 14 October 2021 at 5.00 pm

Council Chamber - Ryedale House, Malton, North Yorkshire YO17 7HH

### **Agenda**

- 1 **Minutes** (Pages 3 - 6)
- 2 **Consultation Document on the Distribution of Development** (Pages 7 - 28)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Local Plan Working Party

---

Held at Council Chamber - Ryedale House, Malton, North Yorkshire YO17 7HH  
on Thursday 5 August 2021

### Present

---

Councillors Paul Andrews, Goodrick, Potter and Raper (Substitute)

### In Attendance

---

Rachael Balmer, Matthew Lishman, Lizzie Phippard, Phillip Spurr and Jill Thompson

### Minutes

---

#### 17 Apologies

Apologies were given by Councillor Clark

Councillor Raper substitutes for Councillor Windress.

Councillor Frank had intended to remotely attend, but was unable to attend

#### 18 Appointment of Chair

The Chairman of the Policy and Resources (P&R) Committee is the chair of the meeting. In Cllr Clarks absence. Cllr. P Andrews moved that he would Chair the meeting and this was seconded by Cllr. Potter. Cllr Andrews was elected to chair the meeting for the evening.

#### 19 Minutes

Councillor Goodrick moved that the minutes of the last meeting showed a true likeness and could be approved.

Councillor Andrews seconded.

Minutes approved.

#### 20 Plan Review Update

Plan Review Update and Questions for the Distribution Strategy Consultation

The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update to members on the review of the plan and explore key options for the distribution strategy following the Call for sites Consultation, with the intention of a steer from members of the preferred course of action.

#### Update

Officers confirmed the intention to take a draft consultation document on a future distribution strategy to the November Policy and Resources Committee.

On-going work includes the compilation of the Sustainability Appraisal framework; evidence gathering; the commissioning of technical evidence; and the collation and mapping of sites submitted following the call for sites.

Approximately 279 sites have been submitted for consideration in the plan process. 240 for residential use. Sites are in 58 parishes. 62 sites are at the Market Towns. 22 sites to provide for one dwelling. 111 for ten or fewer units. 21 large sites for 100 homes. Some sites have been submitted for 100% affordable housing.

#### Distribution Strategy

Officers outlined potential options for a future distribution strategy which would form the basis for consultation.

First option –the more explicit growth strategy focussed on towns and Principal Town in particular –the current approach is sustained.

Second Option –more consolidated approach to accommodating growth across the towns and villages, including potentially additional villages.

Both options are fit the general spatial approach of accommodating development at towns and villages which was considered to be sound.

The merits of both approaches were discussed within the context of LGR, devolution, national changes to the planning system; the delivery of affordable housing and improved build standards.

Officers of the view that the roles of places have not significantly changed since 2012, and that we are not in a position to make step changes to the roles of places given LGR in 2023.

Officers confirmed that the consultation documents would need to identify pros and cons of either approach to help an informed response (based on evidence and changes). The document needs to be clear on what we are trying to achieve in order to inform policy choices e.g. affordable housing delivery, improved environmental standards, development that is within the capacity of infrastructure/infrastructure improvements. Addressing heritage deficits and landscape management were also discussed.

Transport and connectivity, including broadband were considered important within the context of Option 2, together with local services if the trend for working from home increases. The potential for more building by smaller builders/developers who may be more inclined to build to higher environmental standards within this option was also noted.

Officers noted that Option 1 – our existing approach could be difficult to repeat into the future as there is still the existing supply to be built out within this period, and significant delivery beyond this will represent a step-change for Malton and Norton in terms of infrastructure.

The option of a new settlement was raised. It was note that the delivery of a new village is a strategic decision with significant infrastructural requirements. At this stage, on the basis of LGR, this is an option / future decision for the new authority as it prepares the development plan for North Yorkshire. (The new Authority will be expected to prepare a strategic development plan for the area within five years of coming into being).

There was some discussion about the factors that would influence the distribution of development within the towns and how additional villages may be selected as suitable locations for some growth.

The two broad options were considered to be an appropriate basis for the consultation.

#### Level of Development

Level of development to be planned for – minimum of 184 dpa. Extant supply will be taken into account.

#### Detailed matters

The plan will have to provide for a range of affordable housing tenures, including the new First Homes product and self-build. The challenges of affordability and affordable housing delivery were discussed

Cllrs Andrews raised wider matters for the review to cover including the Local Needs Occupancy condition; development limits; capacity of infrastructure; provision for small builders.

Officer confirmed that these matters would be considered as part of the review together with the need to secure improved environmental building standards. Viability assessment will be used to look at the triangulation of CIL, affordable housing, other mandatory requirements and cost to build at differing sustainability standards.

The Development Limits will be naturally adjusted to take account of allocations. The use of a criteria based policy to consider certain types of small scale windfall applications is another option.

The constraints of building in some locations (Helmsley, Staxton and Willerby) were also discussed.

21

#### **Next steps**

Prepare the consultation material –which will set out the potential options for consultation in the autumn-this will be considered by the Working Party and then at 11 November P&R.

Consider findings of that consultation.

Publish a 'key decisions paper' for consultation in spring (April 2022) which will be a Policy and Resources decision.

22 **Date of next meeting**

Members agreed the next working party meeting for 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021.

**Meeting Closed 20:53**

## **Ryedale Plan Review**

### **Distribution of Development Consultation Document**

DRAFT October 2021

Please note:

Accessibility text requirements to be imposed

Images and graphics to be added

A separate form will be prepared

## **Contents**

<b>Section 1: Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Section 2: The Distribution of Development- What are our Options?</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 3: Specific Policy Considerations</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix 1    The Plan Review Process</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix 2    What is our evidence for determining what the levels of housing                   should be to different settlements?                   How effective has the current approach been?</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix 3    What is the Amount of Housing to Plan for</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 4    The Local Needs Occupancy Condition</b>	<b>21</b>

## **Section 1: Introduction**

A Local Plan is expected to express how the area it covers is to respond to changing circumstances for at least 15 years. This is essentially about the right types of development taking place in the right locations, in the right amounts.

It is also expected to provide a settlement-specific response to how growth is delivered, by understanding the capacity of the settlements to adapt/accommodate the amount of development and to understand what new infrastructure may be required to deliver that development. In doing so, it must also take account of historic/cultural and environmental sensitivities that may be present at a place. This then influences choices around how much development should go where: we call this the spatial distribution strategy.

We need to assess whether the current approach to the distribution of development remains fit for meeting our needs going forward; and that in delivering that chosen spatial strategy we make policy identifications of land to meet those different needs. We call this a review, and we have section in Appendix 1 of this document which sets out in general terms how this review is to be undertaken, should you wish to find out more about the general review process.

Section 2 of this document is focused on the distribution of development- and sets out two options which we think are the right options to consider for distributing new development in the district between 2023 and 2038, with a series of questions to gain perspectives and views on which option we should choose, and how we should implement either option.

The distribution of development is made through informed choices that are underpinned by guiding principles. It results in a list of settlements in a particular order known as a Settlement Hierarchy, and to that hierarchy different levels of a development are attributed- this is translated into sites – known as allocations. We are seeking your views on how we do this.

Section 3 of this document asks some specific policy questions, and indicates where there are some other areas of the Ryedale Plan that we will look at as part of the review.

## Section 2: The Distribution of Development-What are our Options?

Some of you may feel that Ryedale does not need more housing. But this is not an option for any Local Planning Authority to take. We are directed by Central Government to deliver new housing, and we can see that housing is needed in a range of forms across the district and we know this from earlier studies and emerging work on housing need.

If we do not investigate and make informed choices about where new housing is to be delivered; our existing land supply of housing will diminish. Then new housing will be delivered through the making of ad-hoc planning applications across the district, and under those circumstances it will be harder for the Local Planning Authority to refuse these applications, or they will be allowed on appeal.

This will bring uncertainty to our communities in Ryedale; not properly reflect the roles of places within our district; and not allow the consideration of potentially strategic issues about how housing delivery could unlock key infrastructure for a place, or support the retention of a key local facility.

The current distribution strategy of the Ryedale Plan is to **concentrate new housing at the Market Towns, with a focus on Malton and Norton, and ten key 'Service Villages'(listed below) with meeting local needs elsewhere in the district**

- Amotherby and Swinton
- Ampleforth
- Beadlam and Nawton
- Hovingham
- Rillington
- Sherburn
- Sheriff Hutton
- Slingsby
- Staxton and Willerby
- Thornton le Dale

Under this strategy, the focus was placed on Malton and Norton, and this was to secure major infrastructural improvements in and at the two towns, and to deliver affordable housing where it was primarily needed. Development was also identified to all the northern market towns. The selection of the service villages was based on having three key facilities: grocery shop, a school, or a regular bus service. In these locations, new housing sites together with infill development and the redevelopment of sites and buildings provide new market housing, of which a proportion is sought as affordable housing. In other villages, infill development is restricted with the use of a Local Needs Occupancy Condition and affordable housing exception sites would be supported as a means of addressing affordable housing need in the wider rural area.

It was an approach that was considered 'sound' by the Planning Inspector in 2013 and viewed to be the right strategy for Ryedale to pursue, in terms of building new housing, provision employment land and buildings, and approach to retail development, and reflecting the roles and character of places.

The approach to the distribution of development is based on evidenced choices, and these choices are influenced by drivers that are considered to be important for the district, and for particular settlements. Such as: affordable housing delivery, delivery of key infrastructure, supporting economic development of an area. It can also reflect other wider aspirations around access to services and facilities, and look at what can be termed 'enabling' development.

Below are the reasons in summary why the current settlement hierarchy was chosen:

- Promoting sustainable patterns of development close to existing towns and villages
- Protecting the countryside from urban sprawl
- Availability of services and facilities being a driver for locating new development
- Making best use of existing infrastructure; and using development as a tool to deliver key elements of infrastructure at Malton and Norton
- Accessibility to other places

This was alongside:

- Prioritising 'brownfield' sites where practical.

These all remain relevant considerations.

Alternative broad options for housing distribution were considered during the development of the Ryedale Plan, such as solely focusing on the towns, or having a fully dispersed approach where all settlements get development were not considered to be appropriate development strategies for Ryedale as they were not sustainable. So we do not consider that it is now suddenly appropriate to significantly depart from the current approach of our plan. We are therefore not proposing to consult on these above broad options, as they are not considered to be reasonable alternatives.

We are also not proposing to consult on the option of a new village. This would be a strategic decision, with wider implications for housing delivery beyond Ryedale's area. It would be more appropriately considered by the new authority post Local Government Reform.

The approach of the Ryedale Plan was to concentrate most of the development requirements at the Market Towns. Evidence prepared to inform this approach identified that the capacity of the towns to accommodate development at this level was deliverable within the Ryedale Plan period (2012-2027).

But the evidence also indicated that going forward it would be more challenging to deliver in Malton and Norton the same extent of housing delivery in future plan periods. This is on the basis that whilst a new evidence base is in preparation to inform the choices, we are aware that in order to deliver a comparable level of growth, major infrastructural investment would be needed. Also, in assessing the form and character of our market towns, and their landscape setting as part of work undertaken for the Ryedale Plan, it was identified that such sustained expansion, particularly that at Malton and Norton, would be difficult to sustain/accommodate this level of development without fundamentally altering their character.

Also, in relation to Helmsley, in effect three quarters of the settlement (and the corresponding land surrounding it) is within the National Park planning area. There are some sites still to be rolled out and beyond these there are known significant constraints on the land which would preclude development. So it is unlikely that new allocations will be made at that settlement within this review of the Ryedale Plan.

We also need to investigate what the capacity of each of the settlements is. This is both in relation to any constraints which might be present, and any opportunities which new development could bring to the wider town area. This will be a key component of the review of the plan, and will be informed by the site assessment work.

Incremental development of a place- where you have lots of smaller sites- might be seen as a more sensitive approach to development, but it only works well if the settlement has the overall

infrastructural capacity to cope with this approach to start with. Whereas one larger site, with additional infrastructure embedded in its delivery, can also bring wider benefits to the place as well as meeting the development's infrastructural needs. We are undertaking specific consultation with those companies and organisations which have a responsibility concerning the provision of utility services, including broadband, highways, education, social care and health services.

We have mapped various services and facilities to see how provision varies across the district. And you can see where facilities and services are concentrated- and this means greater access can be achieved. But the map also shows where in our villages there are key services, which need to be supported and where a service(s) could be shared by other villages.

Development can also enable wider enabling benefits- these could concern heritage, biodiversity and land management improvements. This is likely to involve a greater role of Green/Blue Infrastructure and specific measures regarding how new development responds to Climate Change. It is very important indeed that new development is more resilient to the impacts of climate change, and increases its inherent building sustainability.

We are aware that the communities of our towns of Malton and Norton, Pickering and Kirkbymoorside are concerned about the levels of growth they have recently experienced and there are sites that remain to be delivered. We are also aware that some villages would support some small scale housing, and others have had sizable recent permissions/allocation.

We will need to explore whether the spatial distribution strategy takes into account specific types of housing delivery. Affordable housing will be expected to be delivered as part of our allocations, and these will still be part of the land supply for new housing. They may also come forward in addition to the Plan's housing requirement as Exception Sites.

Since the adoption of the Ryedale Plan, the National Planning policy Framework also now requires Local Planning Authorities to ensure that at least 10% of their housing allocation are on sites which are less than 1ha in size. So this is also something that we will need to factor in.

***Question 1: Which factors do you see as being important reasons concerning where and why we might allocate land? If this relates to a specific settlement- please identify.***

We have set out in Appendix 2 some general information about how the Ryedale Plan has performed to date, and provided information about the types of technical evidence that we commission to help evidence the policy decisions and approaches we make in undertaking the review of the Ryedale Plan.

## **Our Proposed Options:**

Taking into account the above factors, we consider that there are two options to consider regarding the principle of the approach to distributing development in Ryedale:

### **Option 1**

**Continue/sustain the existing approach of the Ryedale Plan- the more explicit growth strategy which focussed on the towns and the Principal Town in particular- concentrate new housing at the Market Towns and key 'Service Villages' with meeting local needs elsewhere.**

### **Option 2**

**A more consolidated approach to accommodating growth across the towns and villages, including potentially additional villages, with less emphasis on focusing growth at the Principal Town.**

Option 2 would see some changes to the approach to the distribution from that within the Ryedale Plan. It would seek to deliver more of the housing requirement at the northern market towns\* of Kirkbymoorside and Pickering with a corresponding lessened amount to Malton and Norton. It would also seek to deliver a greater proportion of housing at the villages. How this is to be achieved is not established yet, and so we are asking about how this could be achieved at different places in the District. This is not an approach which seeks radical change- it is about consolidating the development already delivered and planned; and looking at a change in emphasis and essentially the proportions of housing attributed to settlements.

\*As mentioned earlier Helmsley is constrained due to being predominantly within the National Park, and having a series of site specific constraints (flood risk, heritage designations) on the land which is within the Ryedale District Planning area. It is also not a settlement where any land submissions have been made.

In relation to a greater amount of housing going to the villages, we will be considering:

- Their distance and relationship to neighbouring larger settlements;
- The site specific constraints around some of our villages such as higher flood risk, designated heritage assets, national biodiversity designations;
- What wider opportunities may be presented by specific development for environmental or historic environment considerations;
- Sustainable building considerations;
- What services and facilities they already have or have access to within a walkable distance.

Below we have identified what we think at the main advantages and disadvantages of each option, and there advantages that are common to both approaches:

### **Main Advantages of Option 1:**

- Concentrates new development in the locations which have the greatest affordable housing need
- The majority of market housing would be guided to the more accessible locations which provide transport choices to those who work elsewhere
- Locates a greater level of development in proximity to higher order infrastructure- such as the hospital and train station
- Places development in locations where employers want to be located
- Focuses development where the greatest concentration of services and facilities are provided

- Ensures that affordable housing will be delivered in the more sustainable villages as well as the Towns
- Guiding new housing to those villages with some key service may help to sustain these services in the longer term.
- Provides some market housing in the villages

**Main Disadvantages of Option 1:**

- Would place a step change in the level of development being brought forward in particular at Malton and Norton which has a significant allocation to be brought forward
- Larger sites would be needed to meet the housing requirements, which affects the potential to deliver more smaller housing sites outside of the towns
- Limited supply of sites at the Service Villages
- May involve more incremental sites at the Market Towns with minimum infrastructure requirements being met
- Landscape setting capacity implications at all the Market Towns (and the constraints identified at Helmsley)

**Main Advantages of Option 2:**

- Requires less land to be released at the towns
- Guiding new housing to those villages with some key services may help to sustain these services in the longer term.
- Ensures that affordable housing will be delivered in the more sustainable villages as well as the Towns
- Allows the delivery of more smaller-scale housing schemes which can help support/sustain a greater range of village services
- Acknowledge that commuting trends are reduced- and this is likely to stay- but still delivering a sizable proportion of housing in the market towns because commuting will still occur.
- Allows the development at Malton and Norton to be effectively consolidated with a lessened amount of housing to these settlements going forward, and allow those planned developments to be delivered
- Bring a greater level of choice to the types of allocations we can make in terms of their size and housing type
- Enhance opportunities for small/medium housebuilders to operate as well as the volume housebuilders which tend to operate out of the market towns.

**Main Disadvantages of Option 2:**

- Would involve the expansion of what are inevitably the larger villages, which could put pressure on their character or some of their existing services.
- Would see a greater dispersal of development- this may increase some traveling to access services and facilities at the towns
- Less reliable land supply with small/medium sites as roll out due to greater uncertainties around delivery

**Initial Questions concerning the broad options:**

**Option 1**

Continue/sustain the existing approach of the Ryedale Plan- the more explicit growth strategy which focussed on the towns and the Principal Town in particular- concentrate new housing at the Market Towns and key 'Service Villages' with meeting local needs elsewhere.

**Option 2**

A more consolidated approach to accommodating growth across the towns and villages, including potentially additional villages, with less emphasis on focusing growth at the Principal Town.

***Question 2: Which of these options do you prefer and what are your reasons?***

We understand that this is much more complicated to deliver, than it is to set it out in two options- as there are range of ways this could be done. So to explore these options in more detail we have some more specific questions which we would like to get your views on.

As both options could result in additional development at the market towns we ask the following further questions concerning each of the market towns:

***Question 3a: For Malton and Norton- what further development (other than the existing allocations) can take place, and if so where is this?***

***Question 3b: Do you think that there are any opportunities to grow the Town of Pickering and if so where and why?***

***Question 3c: Do you think that there are any opportunity to grow the Town of Kirkbymoorside and if so where and why?***

***Question 4a: Thinking about Malton and Norton- are there places where you would not want to see development take place- and why?***

***Question 4b: Thinking about Pickering- are there places where you would not want to see development take place- and why?***

***Question 4c: Thinking about Kirkbymoorside- are there places where you would not want to see development take place- and why?***

***Question 5a: Could growth of Malton/Norton in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?***

***Question 5b: Could growth of Pickering in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?***

***Question 5c: Could growth of Kirkbymoorside in a particular way/location deliver wider, key infrastructure?***

**Question 6a: What infrastructural improvements are needed to support development at Malton/Norton?**

**Question 6b: What infrastructural improvements are needed to support development at Pickering?**

**Question 6c: What infrastructural improvements are needed to support development at Kirkbymoorside?**

If Option 2 was pursued, we would be looking at how more development would be attributed to the villages, the questions below are to gain your views on how this could be achieved:

**Question 7: If you live in a village, what would you say are the three most important village services to your community?**

**Question 8: What services and facilities do you consider to be essential/need sustaining, please explain your answer?**

**Question 9: Are there specific facilities that a village should have before we consider allocating land for housing at the village?**

**Question 10: If you live in a village, would you like to see more housing development if it brought wider improvements such as public open space, biodiversity enhancements as well as address as a minimum any infrastructure requirements of the development?**

**Question 10a: Following on from the above question, if you are as an individual or as a community answered yes to the above question what is the village called, and what type (market housing/ affordable housing/ self-build housing) and size of housing development would be likely to be supported?**

**Question 10b: If you answered no, is this in relation to a specific settlement? If so, please identify the settlement and your reasons for why you would not wish to see new housing delivered there.**

### **Housing numbers**

We have included some information about the housing numbers Ryedale will need to plan for, this is set out in appendix 3.

**Question 11: Do you think we should deliver more housing than the Government requires in its 'Standard Method' to deliver other aspirations such as more affordable housing, infrastructure, and support wider economic development in the district?**

### Section 3: Specific Policy Considerations

The Ryedale Plan has some specific policy choices which have a direct and indirect effect on the delivery and distribution of housing. These are

- The Local Needs Occupancy condition;
- Development Limits; and
- Other specific policy considerations

#### The Local Needs Occupancy Condition

We are seeking your views on whether this condition should remain in operation, or whether it is changed, or ceases to operate.

The Local Needs Occupancy Condition (LNOC) is applied only within the 'Other Villages' or in specific conversion schemes in the open countryside (not our Market Towns and Services). The development of new-build housing or that for developed from conversions it was only for 'local needs occupancy' and this was also the case for new dwellings and conversions in the open countryside unless an essential functional need was identified for the dwelling.

Its objective was to ensure that incremental expansion of smaller settlements was carefully controlled, and on the basis of meeting a local need. To restrict the meeting of externally-driven migration i.e. those coming to live in Ryedale from outside of the District unless they had a local connection.

The condition has been shown to be, in principle, an effective means to control housing delivery and still meeting any locally-derived needs. This can be seen in the number of modest housing completions outside of the Service Villages and Market Towns. ([Stats here](#))

However, the application of a local needs occupancy condition is not explicitly identified in national planning policy. It is an approach that is very commonly used within the National Parks, where housing delivery is strictly controlled. Its restrictive tests would also not necessarily be an in alignment with an approach which seeks to deliver more housing to a greater range of villages.

The Local Needs Occupancy Condition is also not concerned with the delivery of affordable housing.

The experience of implementing the condition has raised costs and complexities for the Council when the properties are built or are re-sold- these have been in relation to the valuation of the property, re-sale delays and difficulties in obtaining mortgages.

The removal of the Local Needs Occupancy Condition from the Ryedale Plan would bring about a number of properties as 'windfall applications'. These are houses which we have not been able to plan for, so we would not be able to add/factor them into the supply of allocations. This is because we would not know where and how many applications would come forward, so they would be an unreliable source of housing land supply. They would instead be accounted for in the number of completions when they are built out, so we would be able to add them into our housing delivery test performance.

An alternative to lifting the condition is that we relax the condition's operation- so the time limits spent out of a place can increase, or that the connection is not just to a parish or adjacent parishes. This means we could use a broader geographical area.

Or we could simply not apply the condition in the future.

***Question 12: Do we continue with the operation of Local Needs Occupancy Condition in its current form? y/n please explain***

### **Primary Residence Condition**

We considered in the preparation of this consultation document whether we explore views on a 'primary residence' condition like that used in Northumberland and Cornwall. This would mean if you occupied the property it would have to be your home, where you live the majority of the time, and this is a policy which would remain in perpetuity.

Second homes are where the property is vacant for extended periods of time. Second homes are an issue in Ryedale, and they are in many rural areas. We have nearly 800 second homes on our council tax records- that is the equivalent of four years' worth of our housing land supply. It is also often the smaller, more affordable properties which are being used like this, taking them out of the housing market for would-be buyers.

It is important to be clear that a holiday let which is commercially operated and let to visitors on a regular basis, is not the same as a second home. These holiday lets are an important source of income in Ryedale, and part of our accommodation offer to visitors.

Despite this being an issue, we feel that this is a policy consideration/decision for the new authority given that it would be a new approach for the District to take and could be at odds with the rest of the new authority's area- including that of the two national parks. But we are still consulting on it because it would be good to get the views of local communities on this particular matter now, for future considerations by the new authority.

***Question13: How would you feel about a primary residency occupancy condition in for new dwellings in your community? y/n please explain***

### **Housing Delivery for Specific Tenures**

Tenure is a reflection of how a property is owned. We have established affordable housing policies and these will reflect a range of different tenure types including, affordable housing (affordable rent, social rent, discount for sale, and First Homes) and those sold on the open market as market housing and Self-Build, which is where a property is built for a specific occupant, and they occupy that property for a specified period of time.

We can identify self-build properties because it was a question we asked in our call for sites, and by identifying areas for self-build, we can factor them into the housing land supply. If we use only a criteria based policy we will be unable to demonstrate how these self-build properties could come forward- but we could employ both approaches to provide flexibility. We would welcome your views on this.

***Question 14a: Do we make specific allocations which will be only for Self-Build properties?***

***Question 14b: Do we employ a set of criteria to assess Self-Build homes by?***

## Development Limits

Development Limits are drawn around most of Ryedale's settlements to identify a general area of support for certain types of development, particularly housing, and outside the Development Limits being subject to greater restraint. They are a policy tool used to steer where development could happen, and so do not necessarily reflect the built extent of a settlement.

When allocations are made, the Development Limits are expanded out to accommodate the allocation.

As this is a partial review of the Ryedale Plan, we are not going to be undertaking a wholesale review of the Development Limits of the settlements of Ryedale, but we have the following questions, which we could like to get your views on as to the approach we take concerning Development Limits.

***Question 15a: Do we only adjust Development Limits to respond to any allocations we make? Y/N please explain***

***Question 15b: Do we make small scale adjustments to take account of appropriate Self-Build proposals that have been submitted through the 'call for sites' event? Y/N please explain***

## Changes to other Policies in the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy

We have been applying the policies of the Ryedale Plan over the last nine years, and there are some areas which we are going to review in response to factual changes around the NPPF and the policies general operation. We are finalising our **Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report**, and we will use this document to assess our existing and any emerging policies against.

For some of our policies **SP5 (Gypsy and Travellers)** **SP6 (Delivery and Distribution of Employment/Industrial Land and Premises)** we are looking at technical studies first before we set out what changes, if any should be made.

We are updating our Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and this will be important for any updates to Policy **SP17 (Natural Resources)**. This is around setting out the details of the Sequential Test, this set out in national planning guidance and is how we seek to locate new development in areas of lowest flood risk (Flood Zone 1).

We are going to be reviewing the current policy on **Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (SP18)** to make it more relevant and active in what it is seeking to achieve to help deliver our aspirations to significantly reduce carbon emissions in this Plan period. This will be subject to more technical work and consultation in the coming months.

We will be updating Policy **SP14 (Biodiversity)** in relation to requiring Biodiversity Net Gain, as part of the Environment Act, and Policy **SP16 (Design)** in relation to design codes, and the delivery of Green/Blue Infrastructure.

Recent experiences concerning the loss of community facilities, particularly public houses in villages has prompted a desire to review **Policy SP11 (Community Services and Facilities)**, when assessing alternatives, make it clearer that such facilities need to be available in the village- and not viewed as

being accessible/available if they are in a neighbouring village or further afield, so they can directly serve the local community.

We will be exploring the application of minimum space standards, through **Policy SP4 (Type and Mix of New Housing)** this is in relation to ensuring that any affordable housing provided meets the right transfer values concerning the room sizes and intended occupancy. It is to ensure that all new homes can achieve these space standards. We will also be exploring build standards in relation to accessibility.

***Question 16: Are there any other areas of the Ryedale Plan we should be looking to review at this time, and why?***

### **Next Steps**

Whilst this consultation is taking place we will be undertaking specific consultation with statutory consultees and working on and commissioning more technical evidence/appraisal work. Once the consultation is finished we will be collating together the findings with technical appraisal work that will be going on and specific consultation work. We will be working towards a report and paper to Members of the District Council in which they make what we are terming 'key decisions'. These key decisions will then inform the additional site-specific work, and be subject to consultation around in the spring of 2022.

## **Appendix 1: The Plan Review Process**

### **The Review of the Ryedale Plan**

The Ryedale Plan is Ryedale's Local Plan. It gives direction to how development should happen in Ryedale, and covers the area outside of the North York Moors National Park. It is also known as 'the Development Plan' and is used to provide policies by which to judge planning applications and identify sites for delivering planned growth needs.

The Ryedale Plan was developed in essentially two key stages, with a gap between, where first the general strategic approaches were developed, with amounts of development to different places established. Then in subsequent documents the site allocations were made in accordance with these principles. Before these documents were adopted, sites then came forward as planning applications.

The Ryedale Plan is made up of a series of documents:

Local Plan Strategy- It was adopted by the Council in 2013, after being subject of an independent examination. An overarching, strategic policy document- it sets out in general terms where development is acceptable, and how much development would be delivered in the District over fifteen years- 2012-2027.

Local Plan Sites Document - adopted in 2019- gives site specific policies and the areas of land identified for development known as 'site allocations'.

Policies Map—this shows on a map how the different policy designations operate and was updated to coincide with the Local Plan Sites Document.

Helmsley Plan – Adopted in 2015- this document was prepared jointly with the National Park to look holistically at the settlement of Helmsley and set out approaches to housing delivery and employment land, and to look at any other settlement-specific response needed for Helmsley.

All these documents are subject of the review, although by how much will vary.

### **What do we mean by a review?**

All Local Plans are expected to be reviewed at least every five years, and sooner if there are pressing circumstances which mean a review is needed earlier. Sometimes it is necessary to create a new plan. But the Government does not expect that when plans are reviewed, they are changed completely. Plans are expected to evolve over time and change to meet emerging needs and respond to pressing issues. The extent of a review is subject to a wide range of factors- which can be circumstantial including changes to national planning policy, or a need to respond to a pressing issue, such as climate change. Indeed, the Ryedale Plan was reviewed in 2016. We did this by looking at the evidence around what was our housing need, and how the plan was meeting that need. No changes to any policies were necessary at that time.

Now, in 2021, the Ryedale Plan is in its later stage. There is a need to ensure that the Plan remains relevant and up to date, with a sustained land supply of allocations, so it can continue to have full weight in considering planning applications. It will have a plan-life of 15 years between 2023 and 2038.

There are also some wider circumstances which are influencing this review:

There is anticipated changes to the planning system as a whole in the coming years- as set out in the Government's Planning White Paper.

In spring 2023 a new Combined Authority will be formed within the established North Yorkshire County Council boundary, and a transitional period will begin next year. Therefore, in terms of the extent of changes to the plan- it is considered that any changes need to be both mindful of the timeframes of the Local Government Reform, and to not prejudice the strategic decision making capability of the newly formed authority who will be tasked with making their own local plan within 5 years.

Our background work on the plan review to date has shown that many social, economic and environment trends remain the same as when the Ryedale Plan was being developed. But responding to Climate Change is much more pressing. The District Council has signed the declaration that there is a Climate Emergency. There is a real need to respond to mitigating climate change by reducing emissions of greenhouse gasses, but also how respond to the impacts of climate change that we are experiencing now and deliver actions on the ground.

We are still living with uncertainties around the Covid pandemic and the changes that it has brought to our way of life- particularly in relation to people's working patterns. For many people, the internet has become crucial for working, accessing services and entertainment, and shopping as well as simply communicating with family and friends during the pandemic. It is not expected that this reliance will diminish back to pre-Covid levels. But broadband services are variable across Ryedale. So whilst commuting may be reduced, access to services remains a priority.

#### **What the review will cover?**

The review is therefore, by circumstance, to be targeted and focused on what are considered to be key matters for the review:

- Updating the housing requirement figure (the amount of housing to plan for) based on updated evidence
- The strategic distribution strategy, and within that focusing on the approach to distributing new housing;
- Specific policy matters- around principally, the Plan's response to Climate Change and sustainable building standards and the operation of the Local Needs Occupancy Condition.
- We will also look to update the Plan in light of factual changes around national planning policy and legislation. We will consult on this work at a later date.

Our timetable for the review of the Plan is set out in the Local Development Scheme. We are looking to publish (Publication) the plan review in September 2022 with a view to submitting the plan review for Examination in December 2022.

Given the timescales we are working to, we are treating this review as essentially an update/roll forward. We are not expecting to be reviewing key policy targets such as the overall amount of affordable housing. We are also not updating our Community Infrastructure Levy Charge which was adopted in 2016.

If policies undergo change- then this will be subject to consultation. If they do not undergo any changes- they will be subject to justification by the Council that the policy remains fit for purpose and this too will be subject to consultation.

We will also not be discarding the existing sites allocated in the Ryedale Plan, since they were only adopted in 2019, they will be subject to checking when they are likely to be developed. This means

these sites will be part of the land supply, as well as sites which have planning permission. We will also include any large sites that are currently being built out.

We have undertaken a 'call for sites' earlier this year. Those site submissions can be viewed [here](#). They are under what we have termed a 'general consultation' at this time. We will use the findings of this consultation and that sites consultation, alongside technical information to assess the sites, so we can make decisions on which sites should be allocated in the review.

This means that at the end of the review we would have some policies saved in the existing Ryedale Plan, and new set of policies in the Ryedale Plan Review, and a list of superseded policies. We will also have existing allocations designated as part of the Ryedale Plan and new allocations designated in the Ryedale Plan Review. These will be all displayed in the updated Policies Maps.

## **Appendix 2: What is our evidence for determining what the levels of housing should be to different settlements? How effective has the current approach been?**

For the life of the plan to date, the approach has been successful. Since the Plan's adoption only two years have seen delivery drop by a small amount less than the plan requirement- of 200 homes a year and in other years, delivery has exceeded it:

**ADD TABLE HERE:**

**Housing delivery test performance to add**

We report on how the plan is working in our Authority Monitoring Reports and these can be viewed at [Authority Monitoring Reports](#) .

Housing delivery has been focused on the towns, and these make up the majority of completions with larger sites being built out or under construction at all Ryedale's towns – including Helmsley. A range of sites are either developed, underway or subject of a planning permission in the Service Villages. We only made two housing allocations in the Local Plan Sites Document at the Service Villages, this was to take into account sites which received planning permission from 2012 onwards. One of these allocations now has permission.

The majority of housing delivery was either identified through allocations or was approved by the District Council, and not through planning appeals. We have to date delivered key infrastructure, such as Brambling Fields junction, and the pasture lane junction.

Some of the allocations are larger than others, and so some have taken more time to come forward. A Planning application is now submitted for the large allocation at Norton, known as the Norton Lodge site, which also involves a link road to connect Beverley Road to Scarborough Road and land for a new primary school.

We bring together a range of technical documents, which look at specific issues. We compile studies around the nature and character of places including any site specific constraints, and collate information about services and facilities. We meet with infrastructure providers to discuss what capacity is available for new housing, or what can be undertaken to achieve more capacity. These are considered alongside the responses we gain from communities, including town and parish councils, and statutory consultees who provide specific responses to their areas of responsibility.

Specific areas are:

- Sustainability appraisal scoping framework- to technically assess the 'sustainability credentials' of emerging policies and sites- this will then be used to assess the different options and the potential sites through the Site Selection Methodology. More information in this important area of work can be found **here**. (link to SA scoping consultation)
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and this will essentially provide us with our Objectively Assessed Housing Need
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which we are working on in light of the outcome of the call for sites- which identifies the availability of sites from which to deliver housing requirements
- In each of those scenarios it will be the sites that inform the capacity of settlements. Also, communities may wish to express a desire for specific types of housing delivery at their settlements.

- Views from local communities in terms of concerns raised by sites, but also whether communities would like to see specific types of housing to meet different needs
- Views and commentary from statutory consultees
- Site specific constraints – established through looking at sites individually to identify any barriers to their development in accordance with national policy (such as flood risk)
- Infrastructure capacity- established in connection with service providers
- Landscape setting and impacts on the form and character of the settlement, this will consider heritage and archaeology too
- Villages Service Audit – which looks at the distribution of services and facilities across the district

We will collate all this information together with the findings of this consultation to develop a picture of where housing delivery is best achieved, and we will prepare background papers for each settlement subject of allocations- and a paper of the settlements/sites where we have chosen not to allocate sites.

### **Appendix 3: What is the Amount of Housing to Plan for?**

Our existing Local Plan (Ryedale Plan) identifies that we deliver at least 200 homes per year.

We will be expected to review the amount of housing to be delivered over the plan period. This is subject to technical evidence, and applying national planning guidance. Government guidance requires that we establish our 'housing requirement figure' for our Ryedale Plan area to deliver a level of housing established from a local housing needs assessment. These will be established through our Strategic Housing Market Assessment which is under preparation now.

In terms of the overall amount of housing, National Planning Policy (NPPF) requires that we plan for, as a minimum for our objectively assessed need for housing and other uses- and that is our starting point.

The minimum figure Ryedale is required to plan for is from the Standard Method in national planning practice guidance, which is 184 dwellings a year, with a land supply buffer. But it is the Development Plan which establishes what the Objectively Assessed (Housing) Needs (OAN) are for the District. This consultation is not about precise numbers, as this work is yet to be finalised- and will be eventually set out in the proposed allocations. This is essentially a yardstick-it could go up or down, and could increase significantly if the national method for housing supply changes as a result of using newer household projections. Factoring in the existing housing allocations, it is estimated land for c.2,500 homes needed between 2027-2038

Because the Ryedale Plan was achieved in stages, the Local Plan Strategy also provided a framework of proportions of development attributed to different settlements. It concentrated the majority of new development at the largest settlements, our Market Towns, with c.90% of the housing requirement. This was further broken down into:

Malton and Norton (50%)

Pickering (25%)

Kirkbymoorside (10%).

Helmsley (5%)

With c.10% of the housing requirement going to a collection of larger villages with a section of key facilities- these were known as 'Service Villages'.

The allocations then followed this approach.

Because the review of the plan is considering the allocations as well as the strategy, we will not set precise proportions or percentages. Instead, we will identify the allocations (sites) needed to deliver the housing requirement and land supply buffer. We will demonstrate the level of housing attributed to different settlements through these allocations, as well as any other land uses for which we seek to provide a specific land supply for. We may also identify a broad location (such as that currently identified for employment land at Malton).

## **Appendix 5: The Local Needs Occupancy Condition**

The condition is worded, and applied as a condition to the relevant permissions:

*To meet local housing need in the non-service villages the occupancy of new market housing will be subject to a local needs occupancy condition where this accords with Policy SP2, and will be limited to people who:*

- Have permanently resided in the parish, or an adjoining parish (including those outside the District), for at least three years and are now in need of new accommodation, which cannot be met from the existing housing stock; or*
- Do not live in the parish but have a long standing connection to the local community, including a previous period of residence of over three years but have moved away in the past three years, or service men and women returning to the parish after leaving military service; or*
- Are taking up full-time permanent employment in an already established business which has been located within the parish, or adjoining parish, for at least the previous three years; or*
- Have an essential need arising from age or infirmity to move to be near relatives who have been permanently resident within the District for at least the previous three years.*

This page is intentionally left blank