

LOCAL PLAN WORKING PARTY 14 October 2021

Commencing at 17:00

Council Chamber at Ryedale District Council, with virtual access also available.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors

Paul Andrews, Mike Potter, Simon Thackray, John Raper, Steve Mason and Caroline Goodrick

Officers

Jill Thompson (JT), Rachael Balmer (RB), Lizzie Phippard (LP), Matthew Lishman (ML)

APOLOGIES

No apologies were received.

ITEM 1 – APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

Cllr Andrews moved that he would continue to be Chair, with Cllr Potter as vice-Chair, having done so on an interim basis in the previous Local Plan Working Party, dated 5 August 2021. This was seconded by Cllr Goodrick and the attending members agreed.

Decision: Cllr Paul Andrews Chair of Local Plan Working Party, with Cllr Potter as vice-Chair.

ITEM 2 – MINUTES

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

Cllr Raper seconded.

Minutes approved.

ITEM 3 – MONITORING LOCAL PLAN REVIEW PROGRESS

Cllr Andrews presented a timeline indicating the work that must be undertaken to ensure that the Local Plan review reaches examination. It was suggested that this document should be used by Councillors to monitor progress and to ensure that there would be no slippage in delivery. As such, officers would provide a progress report at each Local Plan Working Party meeting.

Decision: agreed that officers would routinely provide updates as to the progress of the Local Plan review work

ITEM 4 – DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

Members discussed and debated the thematic issues posed by the consultation document.

Air Quality

Cllr Thackray suggested that new World Health Organisation (WHO) air quality guidelines should be incorporated into forthcoming Local Plan policy and/or included in the details within this consultation document.

Cllr Andrews suggested that, given these new guidelines, the Council should consult on an option that excludes development from Malton and Norton and/or discount Option 1.

Cllr Potter suggested that implementing more active transport, reducing private car usage and effecting emissions from buildings is an appropriate response to the guidelines.

Cllr Mason said that there were positives and negatives relating to both consultation options. Advised the distributing development further afield would still result in pollution due to people commuting to the towns.

Cllr Goodrick advised that WHO guidelines are not law and therefore Council would likely face challenge if they were to be formally adopted. Also advised urgency as to making decisions regarding the Local Plan review, to avoid planning by appeal in the future.

Cllr Raper echoed the concern regarding planning by appeal and advised that matters such as this should not be deliberated over at this time. Suggested the possibility of some prescriptive policy regarding renewable energy and build standards.

JT advised that Council will ultimately make the decision with regards to the distribution strategy. It is important that Option 1 is not removed from the consultation or amended to suggest specific implications on air quality; Option 1 is the current approach in the local plan and so needs to be reviewed on that basis. However, stronger references to air quality implications can be referred to within the consultation document, and the questions posed- and this was reflected.

Helmsley

Cllr Andrews suggested that Helmsley should not be ruled out for further development.

JT advised that Helmsley is heavily constrained and beyond existing allocations there are very few options within the settlement for future development. RB confirmed that, among the 280 site submissions, we have received no site submissions in Helmsley.

Local Needs Occupancy Condition

Cllr Thackray raised concerns about the restrictive nature of the condition and suggested that it should be removed.

Cllr Potter advised that there are issues in other parts of the country that indicate a need for a local needs clause; therefore removing it altogether could present similar issues in Ryedale.

Cllr Andrews suggested that a principal residence condition could be considered as an alternative.

JT advised that the existing condition is current policy and that we must consult with regards to its future before taking the decision to remove it.

Village development limits

Cllr Andrews suggested that village envelopes should be expanded in order to divert major development away from market towns until key infrastructure could be delivered and until WHO guidelines could be complied with.

JT advised that a wholesale review of village development limits is not the most appropriate approach given this a pragmatic review of the plan; however reviewing development limits is naturally undertaken in response to specific site-submission considerations, and then the Development Limits are adjusted if such sites are then identified as allocations.

Cllr Raper asked if it would be possible to consider a brand new village.

RB responded to Cllr Raper by explaining that there would not be sufficient time to take such an approach, given the need to deliver the Local Plan review prior to local government reorganisation.

Renewable energy

Cllr Potter suggested that the document should include specific questions regarding climate change mitigation and adaption to understand what key priorities are. Cllr Andrews made a similar suggestion with respect to including questions about design standards, which was echoed by Cllr Raper.

Cllr Thackray stated that renewable energy policies would likely be supported by both occupiers and developers.

RB advised that we could look at re-phrasing existing questions but also advised that further consultation work will happen in the future, as well as a viability assessment regarding sustainable building technologies.

Next steps

Cllr Andrews suggested that Councillors should put their comments and suggestions in writing to officers by Wednesday 20 October. Officers would then present an amended draft by 12pm on Wednesday 27 October. Members and officers agreed.

Decision: Members to provide comments by Wednesday 20 October. Officer to provide response by Wednesday 27 October.

Meeting closed at 18:55.