

Public Document Pack

Local Plan Working Party

Held as a virtual meeting on Tuesday 22 February 2022 at 6pm

Present

Councillors: Paul Andrews, Frank, Goodrick, Potter and Thackray

In Attendance

Rachael Balmer, Jill Thompson, Matthew Lishman and Lizzie Phippard

Minutes

25 Minutes

Decision

That the minutes of the Local Plan Working Party held on 14th October 2021 be approved and signed as a correct record

Voting Record

3 For

0 Against

1 Abstention

26 Work Programme and Distribution of Development

Local Needs Occupancy (LNO) –

RB: Consultation doc covers interlinked issues but to effectively debate them we're breaking it down into components. This is to look at MTs and SVs and OVs and specific policy choices around LNO and PRC and Dev Limits and other specific policy choices – e.g. self-build – taking place in further meetings. Likely to take place after the current consultation is finished so you can consider all responses together.

Site Selection Method –

RB explained the SSM. Staged process. Stage 1 is initial sieve; relates to size/conformity to settlement hierarchy. Detailed assessments will only take place once settlement hierarchy has been established. It was asked that the Site Selection Methodology be provided as an appendix.

The Consultation is ongoing. We expect to be able to bring to members the full suite of consultation responses before discussing policy choices. The consultation document sets out how the LNO works and runs through the pros and cons of the policy.

Concern about the LNO and lack of public knowledge on this area.

Standard method for housing -

Meeting standard method housing requirement of 184 dwellings, is that using the current governments methodology ahead of the government changing it at some point?

RB: standard method is the government's algorithm approach to identifying housing required in each Local Authority area. White paper has been published and that discusses growth as levelling up agenda; that may well be translated into higher housing requirements, and that will be translated through how the algorithm is changed regarding the standard method. We will have to, in effect, wait and see as to what may happen. It's not ideal. We work business as usual until we receive info that necessitates a different course.

If we chose not to accept changes from government, is it likely that the plan would then fail on inspection?

RB: yes, we would need to follow the government aspirations in relation to meeting the 5 year land supply in line within the levelling up agenda.

If not in line with what the government prescribe we need to understand the consequences. If we fail to meet the new method, this could mean we are back to planning by appeal.

Should not speculate and continue as we are with current legislation for now.

RB: the local plan strategy will remain as the development plan until it is superseded by a plan created by the new authority – within 5 years of the new authority forming. It will continue to have full weight, unless the housing land supply dipped below the five year figure. That being said we have a healthy land supply and significant allocations still to be rolled out.

The levelling up agenda and change to the algorithm would have significant implications for the review of the plan – and could stop it in its tracks effectively – if the levelling up of housing is that significantly different. That's the big unknown.

Moving on to consultation responses- focused on development limits and LNO

We used to have a design statement – which dealt with design/heritage desire for Ryedale. Lots of ref to environmental things people would like to see in housing. I.e. solar panels, electric cars, etc. whether or not we could have a design statement and this would help?

Second thing was not having service villages per say but having clusters of villages with shared services.

Thirdly, specifically a way of allowing for natural growth in smaller settlements. The LNO is not actually a big part of the consultation, but doesn't think it should remain in its current form.

The LNO is preventing development happening in small clusters in the small villages. So some development we could look at smaller villages – as long as there is enough infrastructure, but this is unlikely to be possible with the LNO in place.

Still problem with primary residence, it is not encouraging more second homes. But it is not stopping places becoming commuter belts. Everyone wants to talk about sustainable development, but they don't seem to know much about it. Noted the comments from Hovingham estate / Savills which state sustainable development motivations, which is promising and covers important stuff. Encouraging dev in villages, will not be affordable. And therefore to make it affordable for local people it would need to be social housing as otherwise they wouldn't be able to afford to live there anyway.

Put forward concept of small village's clusters. Cluster of dwellings/villages help support each other. Community building element to building village clusters that could help to create a cohesive way to develop. Develop in villages is really helpful to build community and self-sufficient infrastructure in those places.

Commuter villages – there is undoubtedly going to be some as there is not the employment locally. But many people are now working from home. We are not commuter villages as we are working from home a lot more. And so instead, we can make villages more vibrant communities. Also must consider pupil premium, we need to make sure we keep our rural schools stay open to avoid creating issues with having to send those kids to school further afield – creating commuting issues. How can we enforce primary residence only?

Condition on planning consent that will remain on the local land charge, visible when a house is brought/sold. Some may disregard, but some may actually obey the law. This consultation has thrown up a number of ideas – we have given our feedback, on the basis of the document we have read.

JT: what we are doing here is summaries the response we have had so far. We need to sit these responses with the evidence (technical evidence) – we will draw together the tech evidence as we make recommendations to members.

Cllr Andrews: Action: Please send any other suggestions to the officers based on the responses received so far.

The development limits of the villages are not incorporated on to the maps. Is there are lots of available land within the village envelopes, this land should be assessed.

RB: we do assess the sites against the development limits – they broadly do correspond to the existing build out settlement of the village. We will be assess in terms of their proximity to the dev limits.

JT: most if not all sites are outside the dev limits.

Development limits were set so tightly and so long ago that most things are going to be outside dev limits. But we need to look at whether it is sustainable to look outside the limits. And if government suddenly decide to double our housing limits we need to make sure we have properly look at the sites that have come forward.

We must stick to the current regulations and standard method as it is.

Given that most sites are outside the dev limits, technically these are in open countryside and there subject to LNO?

RB: the allocations would likely be in open countryside, but they would not be subject to LNO as any allocation would then be forming part of our housing delivery.

JT: making the allocations become the new dev limits. That's how we manage growth.

Expanding dev limits like this is very unfair, little developers are still stung by LNO.

The dev limits are unsustainable because they are so old, and the LNO makes them even more unsustainable. Feels most members would probably agree.

Given the figures required by the government, it appears we have no choice but to expand the development limits.

27

Discussion around service village sites submitted

Cllr Andrews: before RB takes us through the maps of Service Villages, I want to make an initial point. We are not making decisions tonight – we are just looking at the sites at the moment. Let's look at the plans.

RB: just want to take Members through the site assessment process first for context –this document will be sent out to members in due course.

This methodology is similar to what we used for the sites allocation previously. But we have updated our SA to be in line with our current environment aspirations. The SA process provides an initial sift of sites through Distribution of Development, site size, biodiversity risk, Flood Risk etc. The methodology works in such a way that, if sites are raising issues in the first stage and are seen as red flags they will then proceed to stage 2. Some of the factors you have been discussing tonight relate to these issues in the methodology site selection. A key aspect is the settlement hierarchy.

The first stage of assessment looks at accessibility, services/facilities, employment areas etc – also could there be neighbouring services.

Then flood risk – the sequential test and undertaking Highway assessment.

Third element of SA process: Biodiversity, geodiversity, special quality landscape and setting, culture and heritage consider greenhouse gas and renewal energy, Sustainable building and waste reductions, Efficient use of land natural resources, Amenity , flood risk in detail, Considerations around community need service and facility and housing need and creating a strong economy.

Councillor Andrews as chair asked for the sites and the site assessment process to be provided as an appendix to the minutes. To conclude I would like to suggest we create an appendix, not in great detail but brief comments from each member and Officers made against various sites. Not to make decisions or recommendations but to capture general points and discussions.

Members viewed and discussed the site submissions for Service Villages.

28 **Any other business**

Members were made aware of the anticipated submission of a collection of sites from Castle Howard.

Action: Members to come back to Officers within a week with comments (agreed) on the consultants brief when it is prepared (meeting on the 1st March).

Date of next meeting – Wednesday 9th March.

Date of further meeting Tuesday 29th March. Both 6pm starts.

Meeting closed: 20:36

This page is intentionally left blank