



## **LOCAL PLAN WORKING PARTY**

Monday 13 June 2022 at 6.00 pm

Virtual

### **Agenda**

- 1 **Apologies**
- 2 **Minutes of meeting of 24 May 2022** (Pages 3 - 16)
- 3 **Report: Local Plan Review - Scope** (Pages 17 - 24)
- 4 **Any Other Business**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Local Plan Working Party

---

Held at Virtual Meeting  
on Tuesday 24 May 2022

### Present

---

Councillors Frank, Goodrick, Mason, Potter, Windress and Cleary

### In Attendance

---

Rachael Balmer, Matthew Lishman, Lizzie Phippard and Jill Thompson

### Minutes

---

#### 41 **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Thackray, Andrews and Docwra.

#### 42 **Minutes of the meeting of 12 May 2022**

Cllr Potter proposed the Minutes as a true record, which was seconded by Cllr Frank. The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

#### 43 **Officers' Briefing Note: Enabling Development and the role of Policy SP12**

RB explained to Members that this was a document requested by Cllr. Andrews, who wanted to establish where enabling development sat within the existing policy framework and in the context of the Castle Howard Estate (CHE) site submissions.

CHE have chosen not to go down the route of formal Enabling Development in their approach, and to explore enabling development through the plan-making process. Acknowledging that there is a heritage deficit that needs to be addressed, CHE have sought to consider the transformation of estate management in a more broad application than that prescribed in the guidance.

Policy SP12 is therefore not being regarding these proposals- and it is not a policy that has been identified as considered being under review as part of the review of the Ryedale Plan.

#### Member's Questions and Discussion

One member raised some questions surrounding affordable housing and enquired about how the estate would look to provide this.

Affordability needed to be considered from what was truly affordable and could be calculated from resident's average incomes rather than as a % discount of house price.

Officers stated that CHE are looking to increase and refine their portfolio, and they had meetings with Ryedale's Housing department and Blenheim Estate, about how have been providing affordable housing and 'real affordability'. Belham is quite a comparable estate and they have been delivering new approaches to affordable housing and CHE have stated that they do want to look at proactively incorporating affordable housing and exploring the approach undertaken by Blenheim.

Members asked if there would be any change to housing targets set by the government, for the amount of houses required to be provided by each council. It was asked if we are bound by the targets and if they are removed, what the implications might be.

Officers explained that we are not aware of housing targets being removed or altered to any great extent. They remain a strong priority for government and are measured through the Standard Method calculation for housing requirement.

Members asked if Policy SP12 in the Ryedale Plan on Enabling Development (ED) was so worded to support CHE.

Officers confirmed that CHE had put forward a series of submissions in 2009 as had other estates and whilst as a policy it was not directed towards CHE alone, it was very much informed by the context of the various landed estates in Ryedale and their conservation deficits, and the approach was supported by Historic England as a local approach to considering ED proposals. No ED proposals were made, and the Balk site at Slingsby came forward as an allocated site through the plan-making process.

A Member requested information on the cumulative indicative yield of the combined sites along the B1257, between Broughton and Hovingham. Officers calculated that there had been a total of 31 site submissions in this corridor with an approximate minimum indicative yield of 844 units.

Concerns were raised by members in relation to infrastructure capacity, with suggestions that the roads would not be able to take the volume of traffic the proposed sites would contribute towards.

Health care infrastructure concerns were also raised for other settlements, namely Kirkbymoorside and Pickering. A Member felt that in terms of schools and doctor shortages this is a problem that needs to be tackled through government intervention no through this Plan review.

It was suggested that infrastructure lags rather than leading it. Whereas Infrastructure should really lead the development.

Some members felt that the CHE plans should include infrastructure too, it needs to be a holistic approach to the whole lot of the development, and suggested that CHE need to contribute to this infrastructure requirement.

It was raised that CHE had offered to build a school in Slingsby for accommodate for the volume of developed proposed.

Members asked if it would be possible to increase the charges for CIL that might restrict the size of the development and provide better infrastructure funds.

Officers explained that it is not possible to increase the CIL charge at present under the process of a partial review. Enabling development proposals, whether formal or through the plan-making process are still subject to CIL. Members will decide how CIL is spent.

It was suggested that perhaps the easiest way to deal with this and to provide suitable housing would be to create a complete new village with the complement of infrastructure rather than delivery of housing across a number of settlement. Members agree this would be controversial and perhaps one better suited for the new North Yorkshire Council.

#### 44 **Castle Howard Submissions**

Members acknowledged that CHE have prepared a comprehensive and well considered submission.

Concerns around lack of connectivity were raised, and officers explained how CHE have sought to promote an estate strategy which looked to bring greater connections between the formal estate/land/communities.

One Member suggested that in Ryedale we have some very small hamlets and villages. Thornton Le dale has good infrastructure currently, but that this settlement started somewhere and that new infrastructure can come from house building.

It was also noted by a Member that more commonly businesses are developing at bigger villages, as they have the footfall to support them.

Smaller villages will take a smaller quantity of houses and this is less attractive to businesses in some cases.

Officers then went on to present the CHE sites. After each settlement Members discussed the submissions. The information is annexed and the discussions identified below:

### **Site 295 – Land at Easthorpe**

Members asked whether it was taking up good agricultural land- as that is a concern. No other comments were made.

### **Site 299 – Land east of Grange Farm, Bulmer**

One member asked if we have had anything from AONB officer yet. Officers explained that the AONB manager attended the Terrington meeting, but has not yet formed or given a formal view on the proposals.

Some concerns were raised regarding the size of the site in relation to the existing village being about one and half times the size.

There was discussion between members around the existing use of farm stead and the individual building within site 299, they asked if any of these buildings would remain and if the farm was owned by CHE.

Officers explained that CHE have stated in their submission that they will be removing some of the building and confirmed that CHE own the farm.

Members raised concerns about the volume of development proposed for this site. Traffic and employment were raised as key issues. One Member suggested that some of this land should be an area of employment land too, so residents are able to stay and work in the village, rather than having to commute. Another member felt that the community service facilities section indicated on the CHE concept maps may be suggesting that there would be an element of employment included with that.

Other Members agreed with this suggestion, but did suggest that unless the A64 is upgraded, we may struggle to entice bigger businesses to villages.

There was also consideration about internet connectivity and ensure people are able to work well from home from sites like these.

### **Site 297 – Land at Rye Hills, Coneysthorpe**

Members felt this is be a broadly suitable place for commercial development. It doesn't impact hugely on the registered park and garden and surrounding countryside.

Linking up the settlements as an employment offering and provides an indication of their holistic approach.

One asked if we have any indication of figures (number of units/employees).

Officers explained that the submission is high level at the moment and this information has not yet been provided.

## **Slingsby**

There was discussion surround the Slingsby meeting, in which 106 people attended. One Member in attendance suggested that there was significant concern about the scale of the submissions.

One Member admitted that they do like many elements of the plans CHE have put forward, but felt the scale of the schemes particularly for Slingsby, could very easily rip the heart out of the village.

They also suggested that these sites need to be treated the same as all the others.

Officers explained that in terms of the sites we have had the submitted by CHE, we will look at each in an impartial and assessed way. But the choice of the approach to distribution of development will influence site choices. We need a strategy that is seen to be the most sustainable way to deliver the plan's housing requirement.

Officers also stated that we will be asking all land owners who have submitted sites to demonstrate not only the housing figures but the other benefits their sites will bring. We need to find an approach that looks at new and different ways of providing housing, affordable housing and other benefits.

### **Site 298 – Land north-west of Slingsby**

Members stated that they hoped that CHE would look to protect the sports field, and some felt concern that a scheme there would affect the sports and leisure facilities in existence. It was asked whether the sports fields could in fact become an Asset of Community Value.

Members were concerned about the context of the site and Slingsby Castle. There was mention that CHE plan to take access to the south of castle, through Castle Farm and Members discussed the affect development would have on Slingsby Castle's setting. Members recognised the importance of the 'Castle' as folly and former manor house to the character of Slingsby being widely viewable and important to Slingsby as well as being a designated heritage asset.

### **Site 301a, b and c – Land south of Slingsby**

Members raised concern in relation to site 301 and attenuation of surface water flows, in terms of water coming down that hill side. It was acknowledged

as an existing problem, with flooding issues at Fryton. It was noted that CHE should be aware of this risk and the need to address it in their proposals.

Members reported that these submissions to the south did seem to not be quite as contentious in the meeting as the one by the sports field (298).

#### **Site 296a – Land at Ganthorpe**

#### **Site 296b – Land at Ganthorpe**

Some Members explained how the settlement is very small and has only just got broadband. Concerns were also raised regarding the scale of the increase, one Councilor suggested this would be a 600% increase in housing. Concerns were also raised in relation to highways and accessibility given that the road is single track for the most part and the surface is very basic.

Another Councilor was not as worried about the scale of the development but did also share concerns about the road and suggested that highway improvements are necessary for the scheme to come forward either through widening or passing places.

It was suggested that the scheme seemed to be a development which would in fact create a new village; but that this would need lots more facilities. Some members were concerned about the ability to deliver the necessary infrastructure.

#### **Site 300a – Land to the East of Welburn**

#### **300b - Land to the East of Welburn**

Members suggested that there is good access to A64 from the development in terms of distance, however the Welburn junction on to the A64 can be quite dangerous as a right turn. It was suggested that there would need to be input from National highways in relation to the junction. The Barton Hill junction is easier to navigate.

Parking is a significant issue for the settlement, particularly with visitors. They suggested that the Estate would need to provide a car otherwise the felt this scheme would not be viable. One member agreed with this notion.

There was a discussion around the yield figures factoring in an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare and a 0.7 development factor which acknowledges land for roads, landscaping and public open space.

Comments made were in relation to Scrayingham. It was noted that although there is a post office it is in someone's house. The village is also subject to flooding, and they don't have a proper sewage system. The River Derwent in that section has a Special Area of Conservation – an international biodiversity designation. It was considered that development at such a settlement would raise concerns with Members.

### **Item 6: Any other Business**

Members agreed further meetings to be held on Monday 13 June which would focus on the scope and timing of the plan review, with a start on the consideration of the principle of the approach to the distribution of development, and Wednesday 29 June (later changed to the 7 July), in order to discuss the Distribution of Development in more detail (such as a potential settlement hierarchy, Local Needs Occupancy and Primary residency and other policies which influence housing delivery).

Members discussed advertising the review of the Plan, and ensuring that we are making people aware of these sites. And it was agreed that it would be timely for us to reinvigorate the advertising of the sites. It was also noted that we should make it clear that these are not planning applications and that not all these sites will come forward. Members also suggested that we need to make it clear what we are looking to achieve in this review.

It was also mentioned that there is still a lot of work to do with the time frame. Officers then suggested that we are now planning to go to agree publication in January of next year, aiming to publish the Plan before the new council forms.

Officers also advised Members that we are working on the basis that Members want to influence development in Ryedale with a pragmatic approach to get a review done as timely as possible. There is still a new expectation for the new Council to create a new plan within 5 years from vesting and in the meantime there will need to be a steer from the Shadow Authority in terms of how it wants to treat current local plan reviews. Irrespective of this uncertainty the work being undertaken to date will inform a future plan-making

**Meeting Closed 20:07**

## **Annexe Site information**

### **Easthorpe**

#### **Site 295 – Land at Easthorpe**

Site area (ha):

0.8

Yield info:

0 (employment site)

Policy considerations:

Site is entirely within AONB but not within a conservation area or any development limits. There is one Grade II listed building within the existing established business park, whilst Coneysthorpe Banks Wood is a nearby Site of Important Nature Conservation.

### **Bulmer**

#### **Site 299 – Land east of Grange Farm, Bulmer**

Site area (ha):

5.89

Yield according to submission:

123

Current number of dwellings in village:

88

Policy considerations:

Site is entirely within AONB whilst the western-most section of the plot is in the conservation area. There are a number of VIUAs in the village but none within the plot. It is outside development limits. Bulmer Mire Site of Important Nature Conservation is within the parish but not in close proximity to the site. 11 listed buildings proximal to the site, including the Grade I listed church.

Other considerations:

Very low flood risk in terms of fluvial and groundwater; small area of surface water flood risk which is mitigatable.

Services:

Church, village hall, bus stops

### **Coneysthorpe**

Site 297 – Land at Rye Hills

Site area (ha):

0.8 hectares

Yield info:

0 (employment site)

Policy considerations:

The site is entirely within the Howardian Hills Area of outstanding natural beauty, but lies outside of a conservation area, with Coneysthorpe being the nearest. There is a scheduled ancient monument approximately 215 metres from the site, to the north – known as Round Barrow. The boundary of the Castle Howard Historic Park and Garden is located roughly 20 metres to the east of the site, so the site does not fall within this designation, but relatively close to it.

Services:

Church and village hall at Coneysthorpe

### **Slingsby**

**Site 298 – Land north-west of Slingsby**

Site area (ha):

6.15

Yield according to submission:

50

Current number of dwellings in village:

320

Policy considerations:

Site is not inside AONB. Outside but abutting development limits and conservation area. Adjacent to scheduled ancient monument, Slingsby Castle. The sports field, within the site, is designated as a play area. Adjacent to VIUA to the north of the site, which includes Mowbray Oak ancient tree. The Vale of

Pickering is an historical landscape so there are potential archaeological sensitivities.

Other considerations:

Northern-most section of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 due to Wath Beck, but vast majority of the site is very low risk – including surface water and groundwater risk.

Services:

Church, bus stops, primary school, pub, village hall. The Estate has proposed to bring back a local shop and has also offered land for school expansion.

**Site 301a, b and c – Land south of Slingsby**

Site area (ha): (total)

9.76

Yields according to submission:

208 (cumulative total)

Current number of dwellings in village:

320

Policy considerations:

Sites are entirely within AONB. Outside development limits but abuts a section of the conservation area. A scheduled ancient monument, an Iron Age barrow, is on the north side of the B1257 proximal to 301c. A further monument is some distance south of the sites, Linear Dikes within Slingsby Banks Wood. Sites also proximal to a recently allocated site which has outline planning permission; Land at The Balk. Slingsby Bank verges, proximal to the site, are a Site of Important Nature Conservation. Public Right of Way (Centenary Way) within Site 301a.

Other considerations:

All types of flood risk are very low; gravity drainage a possibility due to topography.

Services:

Church, bus stops, primary school, pub, village hall. The Estate has proposed to bring back a local shop and has also offered land for school expansion.

**Ganthorpe**

**Site 296a – Land at Ganthorpe**

Site area (ha): (total)

0.8 hectares

Yields according to submission:

17 units

**Site 296b – Land at Ganthorpe**

Site area (ha): (total)

5.51 hectares

Yields according to submission:

73 dwellings

The following Information applies for both sites A and B.

Current number of dwellings in village:

14 dwellings

Policy considerations:

Both sites fall within the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There are no listed buildings present on either development site, the nearest is Manor Farmhouse and Railings, which is Grade II Listed, approximately 86 metres to the east. Both sites lie outside of a Conservation area, the nearest Conservation Area is Terrington – approximately 1.6 km to the west. This is also the same in terms of development limits, there are none established for Ganthorpe.

Other considerations:

In terms of Flood risk, an assessments was provided by Castle Howard indicating that both sites are entirely within Fluvial Flood risk Zone 1, which is the lowest – with surface water flood risk seen as ‘at very low’ risk. Again the ground water flood risk is seen as low, with no indication of groundwater risk.

In terms of ecology, there are no statutory protected sites within 2km, nor are there any non-statutory protected sites on or immediately adjacent the site.

Services:

Ganthorpe as a hamlet does not have any services at present. In this instance members were presented with the figures for Terrington – in which it was established that they have a number of existing facilities, including bus stop, church, village hall, village shop, café, primary school, Tea Room, Post office, surgey, sports field.

It was also noted that in information submitted by the estate they have suggested developing a new off-road cycling and walking route linking Ganthorpe and Terrington.

## **Welburn**

### **Site 300a – Land to the East of Welburn**

#### Site area (ha): (total)

4.66 hectares

#### Yields according to submission:

98 dwellings

### **300b - Land to the East of Welburn**

#### Site area (ha): (total)

4.06 hectares

#### Yields according to submission:

85 dwellings

The following information applies to both sites

#### Current number of dwellings in village:

At present there are 238 dwellings within Welburn.

The total combined indicative yield for both proposed sites is 178.

#### Policy considerations:

There are no listed buildings on the two development sites, but there are a number of listed buildings within the village, 18 in total. The nearest is Chanting Hill Farmhouse a Grade II Listed property approximately 44 metres to the west. There is then The Grange, which is approximately 47 metres to the south, to the name the closet two.

Both sites fall outside of the Welburn Conversation Area and the Development Limits of the village.

Sites A and B are within the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The nearest statutory protected sites are over 1km to the East comprising SSSI and SAC sites. There is no apparent direct connectivity to these from the

proposed development site and habitats on site would not support species associated with them.

Other considerations:

Welburn is considered to have a fluvial flood risk of low, Flood zone 1. The vast majority of the site is at low risk of flooding, with only one small and localised area potentially at a high risk of surface water flooding. This section of the land is in the most north westerly corner of site 300a. The flood risk assessment submitted suggests that the site is not constrained by surface water flood risk, and that the localised area of high surface water risk would be allocated for strategic landscaping only.

The straight diagonal line running through the middle of the site and continuing off to the north east is an existing footpath that Castle Howard intend to retain.

Services:

Bus stop, Church, Village Hall, Primary School, Pub, Café.

This page is intentionally left blank



---

<b>PART A:</b>	<b>MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS</b>
<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>LOCAL PLAN WORKING PARTY</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>13 JUNE 2022</b>
<b>REPORT OF THE:</b>	<b>PLANNING SERVICES MANAGER</b>
<b>TITLE OF REPORT:</b>	<b>LOCAL PLAN REVIEW- SCOPE</b>
<b>WARDS AFFECTED:</b>	<b>ALL</b>

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 For the members of the Working Party to give their recommendation on the scope and timescales for the review of the Ryedale Plan.

### **2.0 RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 It is recommended that the Working Party consider the report and:

- (i) Note and confirm the key timescales for the review of the Ryedale Plan as set out in paragraph 6.5;
- (ii) Agree the scope in principle of the review of the Ryedale Plan to the elements identified in paragraph 6.11;
- (iii) Agree the areas to be scoped out of the Plan review in 6.13 and 6.14

### **3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION**

3.1 To confirm a way forward regarding timescales that Officers are working to on the review of the Ryedale Plan and to confirm the principles of the scope of the plan review. Decisions will support progress on the review of the development plan during a period of significant uncertainty with LGR. The consideration of spatial principles will assist Members and Officers at the forthcoming LPWP on choices around the distribution of development.

### **4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS**

- 4.1 There are no significant risks associated with the recommendations. It is important that the Council has an up to date Local Development Scheme (LDS) which reflects work programmes. Our LDS is currently up to date, but will need to be updated over the summer. There are no significant risks associated with the recommendations although the decision not to review specific policies in the existing development plan will need to be fully justified as part of the review process.

## 5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The Ryedale Plan (Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan Sites Document) runs to 2027. The Local Plan Strategy was adopted in 2013 and the Sites Document was adopted in 2019. The Plan requires review due to its age, but not currently due to its land supply.
- 5.2 In early 2021 Members agreed a partial review of the Ryedale Plan, work on review commenced in earnest. With adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement (which sets out the key process and stages for consultation) a call for sites in May-July 2021. On-going consultation is taking place on the sites, and this started in November 2021. As Members are aware, the Castle Howard Estate site submissions were received in late March and were published on the website in April. This has generated a significant amount of public interest which is welcomed.
- 5.3 At the end of 2021 and running until March 2022 Members may recall the Council undertook a consultation which principally explored the different approaches we could take to the distribution of development. Members have previously been provided with a compiled details of the distribution of development consultation. They are part of the LPWP agenda 29 March 2022:  
<https://democracy.ryedale.gov.uk/documents/s61404/Appendix%20to%20Report%20-%20All%20Consultation%20Responses.pdf>
- 5.4 At the time of writing the report the website is in the process of being updated to:
- compartmentalise the work areas to make it clearer to find specific projects;
  - make it clearer in terms of our broad objectives; and
  - to also publish all the supporting documentation we have received with the site submissions- and at various points confirming these are no planning applications.

We will be emailing or writing to any parties who are on our local plan circulation list to let them know that this information is now available to view, and that they can make additional comments if they wish to.

## 6.0 REPORT

### *Current and Proposed Plan Timescales (Local Development Scheme)*

- 6.1 The review of the Ryedale Plan is a priority for the Council. A formal timetable (known as the Local Development Scheme (or LDS)) for the review of the Plan was presented and considered by the members of Policy and Resources in February 2021. The timetable covered a three year period from early 2021 to 2023 – to coincide with the potential Local Government Reform time frame. It was agreed at that point that in order to review the plan prior to a point of submission prior to the vesting date for the new North Yorkshire Council the review would need to be pragmatic in its scope, and therefore partial and focused on key areas of work. Officers continue to work within the context of the review being partial.

6.2 Officers remain of the view that it is possible to progress the review of the plan to reach the point that members can agree the publication and intended submission of plan review prior to April 2023. Although it relies on:

- the LGR process allowing the review of the Ryedale Plan to continue;
- no major shifts in government policy;
- no major changes to the scope of the review: i.e. changing affordable housing policy /CIL charge;
- not committing to pieces of work which would in themselves take longer than the time we have before vesting date; which would distract officers from the key work areas to deliver the review; and
- the smooth examination of the Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan and outcomes from that process

6.3 Local Development Schemes (LDSs) are a statutory requirement to demonstrate the broad scope and timescales for plan making. They tend not to go into specific detail about the various consultations undertaken to inform plan making as they can quickly become out of date if they do. However, they are expected to identify key milestones in plan-preparation, and indeed it is a legal requirement that a Plan's Publication and Submission to align with the LDS. Publication is formally known as Regulation 19 and is a key milestone as it is the point at which the Council consults on the Plan that it intends to submit for Examination.

6.4 The current LDS identifies that Publication would be in September 2022/autumn of 2022. Members of the LPWP will appreciate that key elements of the evidence base are outstanding, consultants are to be appointed (see later in the report), and Members are yet to make decisions on the choices regarding distribution of development which is a key step to steering site choices and site assessment work. Prior to publication we also need to do further public consultation, and that will need to take place outside of the summer holidays to maximise the ability of people to respond. This means we are not able to achieve Publication in autumn of 2022.

6.5 What can be achieved instead is that we look to produce a **key decisions paper for Members to consider in the early autumn of 2022** and ensuing consultation would be for 6 weeks. The key decisions paper would cover:

- Chosen approach to the distribution of development;
- Identification of option or proposed site allocations;
- Options for policy choices around sustainable building and accessible buildings
- Approaches to embedding Climate Change

The outcomes of this consultation would then inform the Publication of the Plan Review. A report to Policy and Resources Committee will be accompanied by the Publication Plan, Sustainability Appraisal, Consultation Statement and other supporting documents, with a recommendation to be considered by Council on the **23 February 2023 to agree Publication and Submission.**

6.6 Publication consultation is a prescribed 6-week long consultation. The responses from the resulting consultation are considered and responded to by the Council as part of the Submission of the Plan in a Statement of Consultation. Representations made are

considered in full by the Examiner appointed, who looks at the responses and identifies what they consider to be the matters and issues to explore during the hearing sessions.

- 6.7 Submission would be expected to take place after vesting date- having already obtained RDC Full Council agreement to this. However, Officers also consider that the submission of the Plan Review to the Inspectorate would, crucially, also require the sign off from the Shadow Authority prior to vesting date or the North Yorkshire Council post vesting as the Examination would be funded and the Plan adopted by them.
- 6.8 In terms of overall plan coverage, it is very unlikely that the new council would have a new plan/s in place before 2027, as Government directs that such plans should be prepared within 5 years. Work is on-going to establish the legislative and legal scope of the structure and timing of the New North Yorkshire Council developing its own Development Plan and understanding what form this will take. Counsel has been sought to give advice, and this is awaited.
- 6.9 Work is being undertaken by the various LGR work streams around the process and timing on this taking place for Ryedale and other authorities working on plan reviews. Existing plans would be considered out of date if they are not reviewed, and this could lead to a situation whereby some areas are vulnerable to unplanned development and speculative proposals, particularly for housing development. For example, whilst Ryedale can currently demonstrate a healthy supply of housing land, this is unlikely to be sustained across the medium (5 year) term.
- 6.10 The new executive of the Council is appointed, and later this year it is expected that we will get a direction of which plans will be reviewed and which plans will be left to allow staff to start to work on the new planning policy for the new council.

***Plan Review Scope, Evidence Base Work and Update on Appointment of Consultants***

- 6.11 The following areas of the plan are currently under review and these areas have been scoped by the work of Members and Officers through our Local Plan working party meetings which:

The principal focus is to extend the land supply of the Ryedale Plan by:

- Spatial distribution principles, with links to the Settlement Hierarchy; and
- Land supply for housing, with allocations, and potentially additional employment land
- Policy updates in relation to the NPPF

But discussions with Members and Officers also identified that these aspects would also need to be explored:

- Looking at responding to climate change through the plan in key policies
- Build standards- both in relation to accessibility and energy demand

- 6.12 Officers are collating a range of evidence based documents together to assist Members for making key decisions in the autumn. We will also still need to justify and evidence why some elements of the plan are not being reviewed at this time so this is factored into the work programme.

- 6.13 This means that the following aspects of the plan are not under review:
- Establishing future development requirements for retail space (due to the contraction of the high street and the extension of the town Centre Commercial Limits as part of the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Sites Document.
  - Review of Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule
  - Review of affordable housing policy
  - The preparation of one document and the review/ standardisation of the style of all policies and supporting text
  - Whole-scale review of Development Limits
- 6.14 Discussions during the LPWP meetings have been taking place around the whole-scale review of Development Limits, or adjusting the development limits in all settlements. Members have been previously advised that this is a project which cannot be resourced within the plan review process timeframe and such an approach would also be aligned to a very much more dispersed treatment of the housing requirement. Such an approach would also not deliver on the key objective of the plan which is to identify a robust deliverable and developable set of site allocations which can ensure the sustaining of Ryedale's housing land supply and deliver on wider plan objectives such as the delivery of affordable housing, and have the capacity to respond to changes in planning policy around sustainable building. Development Limits will be naturally reviewed and updated in response to making allocations.
- 6.15 Officers have noted in the preceding Working Party Meetings that Members were keen to explore how some small-scale development could be delivered outside of the Development Limits. Officers would be happy to explore with Members at the forthcoming meeting of the Local Plan Working Party in early July the development of a criteria-based policy in which Members could explore what they see as being important factors to be avoided when looking at small sites and how sites would be expected to be delivered.
- 6.16 Key elements of the evidence base are reaching their conclusion. It is hoped that by the time of this Local Plan Working Party on the 13 June the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) will be finalised and can be presented to Members as part of the meeting. This is a very important document as it evidences what the Local Plan Housing Requirement should be, accepting the fact that we are expected by Government to deliver a level of housing which at least meets the housing land supply figure calculated by the Standard Method which is currently 186 dwellings a year. Which is close to the Ryedale Plan's figure of 200 dwellings per year. It is expected that the SHMA will give the Council a clear steer on what the Local Housing Requirement should be.
- 6.17 It is important that the Local Plan Housing Requirement is carefully calibrated to deliver national policy requirements, and support wider plan aspirations (such as around affordable housing). Whilst also being capable of being realistically delivered in the plan period, based on past rates of delivery and any strategic-level infrastructure capacity and requirements at settlements. This is also within the context of natural resources implications, landscape setting and heritage considerations of places. All these aspects are considered within the overarching context of a pragmatic partial review. In short, it is to not seek such high levels of housing delivery that it becomes difficult to deliver, and challenging to evidence, the level of housing sought.
- 6.18 Site assessment work is well underway with site visits being conducted. Officers are employing the Site Selection Methodology to set out site considerations. Sites are

being evaluated against the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 and other policy and landscape designations. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Part 2) which assess sites that are available for the Local Planning authority to consider for housing is well underway.

- 6.19 Members of the LPWP are aware that we were recently unsuccessful in securing a single consultancy to provide Officers and Members with support in relation to:
- 'Critical friend' role concerning the approach to the distribution of development;
  - Responding to Climate change and sustainable build policies and viability considerations;
  - Technical evidence including the Habitats Regulations Assessment and any highway modelling and air quality modelling.

In response, Officers split the briefs up into these specific areas and the deadline for receiving bids is Monday 6 June at mid-day. This report has been updated to reflect the single bid. At the time of writing this report we have had one bid to work on the Habitat Regulations Assessment. We have had no quotes for the other areas of work.

- 6.20 On that basis we will not be able to commission consultancy support for the critical friend role. This is disappointing, but it is hoped that through the collation of evidence, and the forthcoming local plan working parties Members can start to make recommendations to inform and shape the key decisions consultation, and this will then be considered by Policy and Resources Committee later in 2022.
- 6.21 We have also not attracted any bids regarding our approach to responding to climate change, and the viability work associated with that. In response to this Officers will seek to look at other recently adopted and emerging plans to see how they are responding, and emerging best practise and may seek to commission specific plan viability assessment work in due course to assess options. Thereby disaggregating policy scoping and choices and the financial viability of this into broadly two areas which can be assessed separately, and then the outcomes assessed by Members. A report to a future Local Plan Working Party will be prepared.
- 6.22 We have had just one invitation for the production of a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), and this needs to be subject to our procurement appraisal framework. As a statutory requirement, a HRA is a piece of work which must inform and be informed by spatial options, and site selection and policy choices. Ryedale has a number of internationally designated sites of biodiversity which it needs to scope into the HRA study, but particularly the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which runs through Malton and Norton and the North York Moors Special Protection Area (SPA) and SAC. This has become an increasingly technical and indeed potentially contentious piece of work which requires specialist input. It will also need to be in alignment with the Sustainability Appraisal work which we are undertaking in-house. This is therefore a piece of work which will be in-going and undertaken in tandem with the plan review.
- 6.23 Officers therefore are anticipating that a preliminary in-house scoping HRA report brief may need to be prepared, which will be informed by the distribution of development evidence work and forthcoming work on the site assessment process. We have also already commissioned and actioned bird surveys which are being undertaken in the correct season. Such surveys will be important to ascertain whether sites could impact on breeding birds which are part of the justification for the designation of the North York Moors SPA. This will give more substance to the new brief when it is produced-

and this may assist in consultancy's having a clearer specification of the work.

## **7.0 IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 The following implications have been identified:

- a) Financial  
A budget has been allocated to the review of the Plan
- b) Legal  
The legislation does not prevent partial reviews of plans from being undertaken. Counsel has been sought in relation to the content of the new spatial/local plan for the new authority.
- c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental and Climate Change, Crime & Disorder)  
No direct implications

## **8.0 NEXT STEPS**

- 8.1 The next meeting of the Local Plan Working Party will consider specific housing policies including treatment of Development Limits through the potential for a criteria based policy, and the application of occupancy conditions. Papers will be prepared for Members to consider these areas.
- 8.2 A further meeting of the Local Plan Working Party to consider the plan review's response to climate change.
- 8.3 After the meetings in July there will be a short break in meetings over the summer for Officers to collate the evidence base together to advise members on the relative merits and issues identified with the option choices for the spatial approach in the early Autumn.
- 8.4 Officers will look to bring an updated Local Development Scheme to Policies and Resources Committee in the early autumn. We will place updates on our website in the interim.

**Jill Thompson**  
**Planning Services Manager**

**Author:** Rachael Balmer (Team Leader: Planning Policy and Conservation)  
Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 43357  
E-Mail Address: [rachael.balmer@ryedale.gov.uk](mailto:rachael.balmer@ryedale.gov.uk)

**Background Papers: None**

