
PART A:	MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS
REPORT TO:	LOCAL PLAN WORKING PARTY
DATE:	29 MARCH 2022
REPORT OF THE:	PLANNING SERVICES MANAGER
TITLE OF REPORT:	LOCAL PLAN REVIEW- DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION
WARDS AFFECTED:	ALL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 For the members of the Working Party to consider the outcomes of the distribution of development consultation.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

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

- (i) note the responses received from the Distribution of Development consultation (appended);
- (ii) identify any key messages concerning the consultation in respect of
 - Overarching spatial principles (Questions 1 to 2)
 - Roles of the towns (3a- 6c);
 - Designation of 'service villages' or equivalent title (Questions 7 to 12)
 - Housing numbers (Question 13)
 - Occupancy conditions Local Needs/ Primary residence (Questions 14-15)
 - Self- build (Questions 16a and 16b)
 - Development Limits (Questions 17a 17b)
 - Responding to climate change (Question 18)
 - Other matters (Question 19)

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

3.1 To give Members the opportunity to start to consider approaches on the plan review,

looking at consultation responses we have received to begin to frame responses.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

4.1 There are no significant risks associated with the recommendations.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

5.1 Work to date has identified that the following areas are going to be primarily influenced by the review:

- Local Housing Requirement- figure to plan for;
- Spatial Distribution Strategy and associated policies concerning housing delivery and employment land (SP1, SP2, SP6, SP21);
- Policy SP18- Renewable low carbon energy;
- Policy SP14 – Biodiversity;
- Policy SP17 –Natural Resources – Air /Water/Soils and flood risk;
(As these policies have a particularly strong relationship to responding to climate change in terms of mitigation and adaptation)

And:

- Allocations- primarily focused on housing land and potentially employment land;
- Some factual updates to policies and monitoring frame works will also be reviewed as part of work on reflecting the NPPF and the sustainability appraisal process.

5.2 Members will be aware that the Distribution of Development consultation finished on the 18 March 2022.

5.4 The results of that consultation are appended. This is so we can start to identify the matters they are raising and identify key themes of concern and opportunity regarding the distribution strategy. As part of the presentation to the Local Plan Working Party we will be providing a 'word cloud' for some of the questions, which is a visual presentation on how many times specific words are used- it can be useful to visualise what have been key areas/themes. This has worked particularly well on questions 1 and 19.

6.0 REPORT

Overarching spatial principles (Questions 1 and 2)

6.1 Question 1 sought to identify what respondents thought were key considerations when looking to distribute development, and in particular housing:

Themes raised as being important in the consideration of the approach to the distribution of development have ranged from the thematic considerations around capacity of settlements in relation to key infrastructure (such as highways, education, environmental qualities) and constraints considerations (such as landscape, flood risk, heritage assets) and protecting the rural character of villages; the ability access services and facilities and provision of services; the views of the local community. There is support for a hierarchy, and a number of submissions have sought to increase the proportion of development going to villages. Whilst these submissions are often made by organisations representing landowners in the villages, there are also some responses from the public who seek to ensure that villages have some housing

attributed to them.

- 6.2 Because the Ryedale Plan Examination identified that either a fully dispersed approach, or a very concentrated approach, would raise sustainability issues for different reasons, that consultation document only identifies essentially two options for the principles around distribution going forward into the review:

Option 1: Continue the existing approach of the Ryedale Plan- a 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 less concentrated, more dispersed approach to distributing growth - with development focussed at the Market Towns and specific villages, including existing 'Service Villages' and selected additional villages

- 6.3 We consulted on these two options because one represents the plan's current approach, and so it needs to be consulted upon as part of the review to obtain views on its current operation and future operation if sustained. The other option still reflects the plan's approach with a change in emphasis by seeking to allocate more land at the villages, with correspondingly less housing land attributed to Malton and Norton in this plan review. We are expecting to carry forward existing allocations, but we will be discussing these sites with their owners to understand planned rates of delivery. Option 2 is about a change in emphasis- and would still allow the rollout of the Ryedale Plan allocations- and then to provide the additional sites to reflect aspirations going forward of a more balanced approach to delivery whereby more development is delivered at the villages.
- 6.4 As the last report to the Working Party of the 22 February it was reported that Members will be able to see that both options have been supported for various different reasons, and it demonstrates that the approach to distribution of development is very much about evidenced choices. The position has not changed: there is strong support for both approaches. This is not surprising- what both option 1 and 2 seek to achieve is a distribution strategy which in principle focuses neither all development at the towns nor disperses it across all settlements. Option 1 has resulted in strong housing delivery, with aligned infrastructure. Discussions with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers and our emerging evidence base would indicate that, despite being a focus for service delivery, Option 1 will present particular challenges to be delivered in a pragmatic review of the Ryedale Plan. This was expected: the evidence base for the delivery of the Ryedale Plan Local Plan Strategy identified that whilst the amount of housing attributed to the two settlements was very much capable of being delivered, and crucially would bring additional infrastructure, it also showed that this was an optimal level. Going beyond this would bring a range of concerns if it was not matched with commensurate infrastructure.
- 6.5 The report to the working party in February 22nd identified that sustaining Option 1 requires a further degree of infrastructure investment at Malton and Norton which is well beyond the scope of being matched by the currently expected housing requirement of c.2000 new homes. Pursuing Option 1 into the future needs to be considered in the development of the new authority's spatial plan/local plan and requires a step-change in housing delivery over a full plan period- and perhaps longer- at these settlements. But, there is a recognition that in the support for option 2 in that

there would still be a focus towards larger settlements, and yet also the ability to consider a broader base for housing delivery. There is, Members will note, strong support for the rolling forward of the approach of the current Ryedale Plan- and it is seen by many consultation responses as being an approach which capitalises on the relative sustainability of places such as the Market Towns in what is a rural and dispersed district, particularly in relation to access to services and employment opportunities. Nevertheless, in choosing Option 2, the allocations of the current Ryedale Plan are still to roll out and so there will still be new housing delivery at Malton and Norton. The question is ultimately which settlements are then prioritised for housing allocations, and what are the factors which are justifying their inclusion as settlements which merit formal allocation of housing land.

- 6.5 In pursuing Option 2, there is a need to explore what this means in terms of increasing the quantum of development for Kirkbymoorside and Pickering as no sites have been submitted in Helmsley.

Role of Market towns Questions 3a-6c inclusive

- 6.6 Whilst responses which have sought to identify where new housing could be delivered in Malton and Norton, there is a recognition that if more housing is to be attributed to Malton and Norton- that infrastructure needs to be aligned accordingly, and that would mean significant amounts of additional housing- and a level of housing greater than the plan's current housing requirement. Members will be aware that at Malton and Norton the Showfield Lane site is being rolled out, and the Norton Lodge planning application is under consideration. Malton and Norton Town Council are concerned about further allocations on top of the implementation of the existing sites.
- 6.7 In terms of areas to avoid, there is a recognition that VIUA designations to the south of Norton and to the north east of Malton/Old Malton and other VIUA areas in combination with high flood risk in parts of the south eastern corner of Norton, mean land to south east of Norton and north west of Malton are less constrained. There is a desire to locate development close to main junctions off the A64 to reduce pressure on the pinch point of the rail crossing.
- 6.8 In terms of opportunities- there is a recognition that additional infrastructure concerning road infrastructure and junctions both off the A64 at Musley Bank and Broughton Road and a full southern bypass, and improvement as Malton Hospital and Derwent surgeries. Also connectivity was mentioned in terms of bridges across the river and railway, including traffic free bridges and a retail park on outskirts of the town. Additional schools. Improving water delivery infrastructure, and visitor offer with more toilets and parking.
- 6.9 There is a general recognition that Pickering is a settlement which has had a manged proportion of development in the Ryedale Plan, and that there is capacity for further development- for a range of sites- subject to infrastructure enhancement. Concerns have been raised regarding traffic infrastructure by statutory consultees, and this will need to be explored.
- 6.10 In terms of areas identified which should be avoided, there is a recognition that the north of Pickering has greater landscape sensitivity, in general. The medieval strip fields which surround significant parts of Pickering have also been identified as being important to retain.

- 6.11 In terms of infrastructural improvements, there was a number of responses which mention of a bypass or a traffic scheme which eased traffic away from the town centre, and through improving public transport provisions. A publically accessible green corridor has been identified on a site submission which links from the community park in the north through the site, and to the existing site which is under construction. There is currently some capacity in education, but improvements are needed in relation health care.
- 6.12 Comments concerning Kirkbymoorside reflect that under the current strategy Kirkbymoorside received a smaller proportion of the development, and that is being rolled out now and that there is some capacity in relation to infrastructure provision.
- 6.13 Concerns were raised about expanding on the edge of the town and general pressure on services.
- 6.14 In terms of additional infrastructure there was reference to a larger supermarket, this is not something that the Local Plan can directly deliver. Other requirements were expansion of Kirkbymoorside primary school (which is something that is being explored by NYCC), and capacity required in relation to health services.

Designation of 'service villages' or equivalent title (Questions 7 to 12)

- 6.15 Concerning attributing development to villages, the amount of housing has not yet been identified, but there are essentially two approaches that Members could adopt: The first is to retain most of the Service Villages and allocate more housing to those villages on top of the existing allocations. The second, broaden out the Service Village designation to other villages. The Village Services Audit has shown that the Service Villages have retained the vast majority of their facilities and services.
- 6.16 The first approach, as a blanket approach to identify more housing to existing service villages alone this would be contrary to the concerns that some of the Service Villages have seen significant levels of development. Whilst some service villages have seen relatively low levels of development. A number of the consultation responses are cautious about additional development at these villages and there is a recognition that it should be about looking at the facilities and services of places and their form and character and identifying opportunities of an appropriate scope. This would mean sites are being considered on a site-specific basis as to whether they can be readily accommodated into the settlement, or bring wider benefits at those current Service Villages.
- 6.17 The second approach is to retain the Services Villages, but seek to identify additional villages which were considered to represent sustainable settlements for the purposes of delivering new housing, and wider place-making objectives. How this is done could be on the basis of having certain key facilities, or be a cluster of settlements which have strong connectivity between them to share facilities and services- particularly those which can do so by active travel (walking and cycling).
- 6.18 The consultation document asked a series of questions about what are viewed as being key facilities, and what facilities and services should be increased. Looking at the consultation responses to date, public transport availability, shops and communal facilities such as a pub/village hall/café/church feature strongly, as does the recognition

that schools, where they are present, may require support. Health services and broadband connectivity area also raised.

- 6.19 In question 9 we asked what specific services and facilities should be in place to allow consideration for housing in a village. Public transport presence is being frequently mentioned as a key facility to provide sustainable transport choices- and this is concerning the ability to access services and facilities in larger or neighbouring settlements- and not necessarily for commuting purposes. Commuting was a key factor in the Ryedale Plan approach to identifying services, and bus services were assessed on their basis that a weekday service could get you to a larger settlement by 9am and leave after 5pm. This, given the rise in homeworking and flexible working, is now not necessarily an absolute requirement.
- 6.20 Officers would welcome Members views on this approach in terms of what facilities would be viewed as being a necessary prerequisite for being viewed as a settlement suitable for further housing. Officers are aware also that some of the settlements could be grouped together to form clusters – this is in national planning policy and indeed some Services Villages were identified on the basis that they effectively shared facilities. However, it is important to carefully consider the connectivity of such clusters- as without a clearly defined basis for their identification, all settlements to a greater or lesser extent could be clustered- and so there needs to be a framework as to how these can be identified.
- 6.21 The consultations responses show that there is support for those promoting sites for them to deliver enhancements to services and facilities at settlements, or support services provided in adjacent settlements, but there is a recognition by Officers that whilst sites may support patronage of existing facilities, unless sites are of a large scale (in excess of 100 houses) they are unlikely to deliver new infrastructure/services in themselves.
- 6.22 A number of responses received to date would prefer to not have new development at their settlement- *even* if it did bring further facilities and services. There is a general lack of support for more housing in the villages- even if they addressed infrastructural deficits and brought public open space and biodiversity enhancements. Officers consider that for the identification of settlements which may receive a housing allocation- it is about looking at the existing facilities as the priority, and where they are accessed and then what new facilities can be delivered. There is also a recognition that public transport is identified as being important to help sustainable access to services and facilities that are otherwise not deliverable in smaller settlements.
- 6.23 When asked if there were settlements where new development should be located, support for settlements was focused on those promoting sites. Although there was support for a scheme at Beadlam and Norton, and Barton le Street and Newton upon Rawcliffe. Terrington was mentioned- but only in relation to conversion.
- 6.24 The consultation document asked ‘Would you like to see development in the smaller villages? If so, what would be your reasons for this?’
Support for this approach is focused on site submitters. There remains some support for meeting local needs at the smaller villages- with some small scale housing. But it is also clear from the responses that it is considered that housing should primarily come forward where there is already the infrastructure to support it. There is also a number of responses which seek to not have development in smaller villages- to protect to their rural character.

- 6.25 Question 12 was concerned with obtaining views on whether land allocations could also be used to help support our local landed estates in conserving important heritage assets and landscapes? A number of Members and Officers are aware that submissions have been recently made within the context of proposals for Castle Howard. This is for an all-encompassing and holistic approach to their delivery of new housing, alongside employment land, and tourist-focused projects. This is to deliver a strategy for investment to address the conservation deficit which is present on the estate, but also to look at how the estate can deliver long term legacy benefits on a range economic, environmental and community matters at villages which are influenced by the Estate. Castle Howard are not alone in this. Other Estates, in particular the Hovingham and Birdsall Estates are also looking to deliver schemes, albeit on a smaller scale. Limited responses were received to this question, and it is likely that had the Castle Howard submissions been made earlier we would have received many more responses to this question. There is some support for the delivery of housing (particularly affordable Housing) and for this to be aligned to the wider responsibilities of the landed estates – but this as far as the responses have gone.

Housing numbers (Question 13)

- 6.26 Concerning housing numbers support for a housing target which exceeds the standard method results firmly, but not exclusively, with the site submitters. Whilst it is clear that for residents they are on the whole less supportive of going beyond our standard method housing target- although there is also recognition that in ensuring there is some flexibility and to provide affordable housing, but there are concerns about delivery becoming too much for settlements to accommodate.

Occupancy conditions Local Needs/ Primary residence (Questions 14- 15)

- 6.27 The local needs occupancy condition has been an effective but contentious policy. There is support for meeting local needs housing, and there is some support for its retention from some parishes and individuals. But there is also a clear lack of support for the policy, and this also comes from parish councils and members of the public as well as developers and those financially impinged/fettered by the condition. There is also a general concern for the application of a primary residence condition from those promoting sites, and there is mixed views on its use by individuals, and parish/town councils.

Self- build (Questions 16a and 16b)

- 6.28 There is general support for the inclusion of sites which are for self-build, but a number of individuals who responded were not in favour of sites which are only for self-build properties, and that they should have a mix of different build scenarios. We asked questions on whether instead of allocation which employ a set of criteria, and what should be the most important factors? Where answered, there was broad support for the identification of a criteria based approach- and one that focused on matters around the self-build criteria (and so meeting NPPF requirements) but also sustainable design/build; consider the setting of the dwelling(s) in the character of the settlement; energy efficient adaptability with good access and green space.

Development Limits (Questions 17a 17b)

- 6.29 There is general support for the retention of development limits as a policy tool. There is also support for the expansion of development limits to reflect allocations being made. There are a small number of responses which seek a more wholesale review of development limits to allow small scale incremental expansions. There are also some responses which are concerned about the principle of expanding development limits in the first place. A number of responses do not support the expansion of development limits in principle, as they see them as then “having no limit”. The extension of development limits to respond to housing and employment land allocations is a long-standing approach to ensuring development comes forward in a managed way. The responses received would indicate that for the majority of the respondents to this question, the development limits should be amended to reflect allocations alone- and this is irrespective of their size- meaning smaller allocations could still be made. Officers are seeking responses from planning consultancies in relation to what would be the implications, timescales and costs of a full review of development limits. This is a standalone piece of work as it would not fit within the review of the Ryedale Plan timeframe, but it could be a piece of work which informs local- site-specific development plan making in the future should Members decide that this is a piece of work they would like to invest in.
- 6.30 We also asked about the specific expanding of development limits for small scale adjustments to take account of self-build proposals which have been submitted to the Council? Whilst there was broad support for this from site submitters, there was mixed support from other responders- some being concerned that this would just incrementally undermine the development limits, but others were supportive- subject to the sites being well related to the settlement and considering other planning aspects. There was also support for not just self-build but also for local builders on small site being treated the same. Please note that self-build does not mean the occupier builds their own property- they can commission it- and that could be from small builders.

Responding to climate change (Question 18)

- 6.31 Feedback on this question has identified that where it was answered, energy efficiency has been considered to be the most important consideration. With carbon neutrality being viewed on a whole as the next most important consideration. Water conservation, active travel, green and blue infrastructure and biodiversity resilience (protection and enhancement) received broadly the same rating. There is a general recognition that the plan will need to explore all these aspects, because they all play an important part in how new development starts to have a significantly more positive impact on the environment, but it is clear that energy efficiency is a priority and whilst this is part of building regulations- concerning built fabric and appliances- energy efficiency is also about building design and orientation and co-locating with other developments and landscaping- which have always been longstanding themes addresses through the planning process. This relates to both climate change mitigation (reducing emissions) but also to adaptation- by making better use of our current energy resources and helping the transition to eventually zero carbon. Officers consider that on that basis the promotion of the energy hierarchy which is currently within the Ryedale plan should be considered to be developed into a policy framework.

Other matters (Question 19)

6.32 The following themes and matters have been raised:

- Landscape considerations- AONB and candidate AONB with the Wolds;
- Space standards in properties- including those around accessible and adaptable properties to be evidenced and justified;
- Long-term implications of covid on the commuting patterns and ability to live more rurally;
- Removing traffic from the centre of Malton and Norton;
- Improve rural network (broadband) connectivity;
- Responding consciously to flood risk and the impacts of climate change;
- Look at a range of site submissions including smaller sites and how they relate to development limits and not discounting them if they are outside of development limits;
- Make meaningful progress and publicise the timescales the of the local plan;
- support the update of SP14 (Biodiversity) to include new information and requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain- and support
- We would strongly support the district's decision to expect greater BNG values
- There is an opportunity to consider Nature Recovery Strategies as part of evidence base- and areas of importance
- Recommend that the update to SP14 explicitly stipulates what level of information is required to demonstrate sufficient net gain
- Policy SP17 could be strengthened, taking account of all sources of flood risk and the emerging information from SFRAs
- The Sequential Test should be applied to identify areas of lowest overall flood risk, taking account of all sources of flood risk, and risk now and in the future- and consider this in relation of caravans, mobile homes, park homes
- Add a policy about 'making development safe', for eg: sequential approach within sites at known flood risk; position on culverting; incorporate flood resilient design; cumulative impacts of development
- Identify functional flood plain
- Specific adjustments concerning protection of Groundwater (potable water supply) protection zones
- Additional considerations of water quality and water resources management, including surface water disposal management which could look at additional policies in these areas;
- The assessment of potential housing sites should be informed by the landscape character approach
- Avoiding harm to the international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity
- Avoiding harm to priority habitats, ecological networks and priority and/or legally protected species populations
- Seeking opportunities to enhance and create Green Infrastructure
- Avoiding harm to nationally and locally designated sites of importance for geological conservation
- Seeking opportunities to contribute to landscape restoration and enhancement
- Avoiding best and most versatile agricultural land
- Seeking opportunities to enhance public rights of way and accessible natural green space.

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.
- c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental and Climate Change, Crime & Disorder)
No direct implications

8.0 NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 In future meetings of the Local Plan Work Party Members will discuss the site submissions at the Market Towns, and existing allocations. They will then discuss policy options which influence the spatial approach.
- 8.2 It is intended that Officers will be working towards a key decisions paper which will be taken to members in June.

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

Background Papers:

Distribution of Development Consultation document

https://www.ryedale.gov.uk/content/uploads/2021/11/Distribution-of-Development-consultation-Nov-consultation-FINAL_.pdf

Summary of responses is Appendix 1.

