

# Public Document Pack

## Local Plan Working Party

---

Held at Virtual Meeting  
on Tuesday 29 March 2022

### Present

---

Councillors Paul Andrews, Frank, Goodrick, Mason, Potter, Thackray (Substitute) and Windress

### In Attendance

---

Rachael Balmer, Matthew Lishman, Lizzie Phippard and Jill Thompson

### Minutes

---

#### 32 Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting were proposed by Cllr Goodrick and seconded by Cllr Thackray. The minutes were agreed.

Cllr P Andrews requested and emphasised the importance of having a timetable with regards to procurement of consultants to assist with the Local Plan Review. RB advised that she would be speaking with colleagues from NYCC on April 4<sup>th</sup> regarding the next stages of the process.

#### 33 Distribution of Development Consultation Report and Consultation Responses

Cllr P Andrews and Cllr Goodrick thanked officers for the report.

RB presented an overview of the matters covered by the distribution of development consultation and summarised the report.

Members then discussed the report on a page-by-page basis:

#### Infrastructure

Cllr P Andrews: disagreed with the assertion that housing delivery had aligned with infrastructure delivery, referring specifically to problems in Malton.

Cllr Thackray: agreed with Cllr P Andrews' comment, referring to a lack of delivery of complimentary interventions following Brambling Fields junction scheme. Reiterated that Malton requires further infrastructure prior to any further development.

Cllr Potter: echoed previous comments regarding the need for infrastructure to either match or precede development. Also raised concerns regarding baseline figures for levels of traffic and emphasised need to consider congestion and air quality.

Cllr Thackray: added that forthcoming NYCC-led proposals to change traffic flows in Malton/Norton will be breaking the law on the basis of exceeding air quality levels.

Cllr Frank: raised concerns regarding Kirkbymoorside and a lack of sufficient facilities; referring specifically to the absence of a major supermarket and over-subscribed health/education facilities.

RB explained that we had have meetings with relevant NHS organisations (Clinical Commissioning Groups and surgeries) to seek their feedback and views about the distribution of development and how this could affect service delivery and what additional support may be required.

### Development in Villages

Cllr Goodrick: explained that we need to be brave and accept that housing must go somewhere; be it by expanding existing service villages or developing in other villages.

Cllr Thackray: argued that Service Villages are a misnomer: all villages are inter-connected and inter-dependent and support each other by providing services and providing a customer base utilising those services. Stated that villages should be treated with the same respect as they all serve one another.

Cllr P Andrews: referred to the NPPF's emphasis in revitalising rural communities by grouping smaller settlements and with less reliance on settlements having services of their own.

Cllr Goodrick: pointed-out that no village in her ward has a shop so most go to York or Stamford Bridge for services.

Cllr Windress: raised concerns regarding traffic problems at school pick-up/drop-off times in Beadlam, at Ryedale School, pointing out that Site 127 could provide solutions.

Cllr Mason: raised concerns regarding development along the B1257, with particular concern about coalescence.

### Occupancy Conditions

Cllr Frank: suggested that a Primary Residence condition should be considered; Cllr P Andrews agreed.

Cllr Thackray: echoed the suggestion of a Primary Residence condition, pointing out that any concerns about it de-valuing properties are unwarranted and that it would deliver what the Local Needs Occupancy (LNO) condition has failed to do; enabling people to live in properties as their home. Also stated that LNO curtails healthy organic growth in small villages and blocks housing, rather than facilitates it, and is harmful on that basis. Cllr P Andrews agreed.

Cllr Thackray: requested a definition of self-build; JT provided the legal definition and the glossary definition. Also stated that local planning authorities must make sufficient plots so some land supply provides for self-build and custom housebuilding. Cllr Thackray suggested that promoting self-builders would be a wonderful thing to do and it could be tied into the Primary Residence condition.

### Development Limits

Cllr P Andrews: suggested that development limits should be revised; possibly revising all or some development limits, or setting out principles or criteria.

Cllr Goodrick: agreed with Cllr P Andrews and suggested it could encourage small amounts of growth in villages; suggested that we would need to consider which villages are more likely to be able to provide services.

Cllr Thackray: also agreed but suggested that the most important services was sewers and roads, pointing-out that all villages have access to supermarkets and retail via online shopping.

Cllr Potter: agreed that small villages need limited amount of more organic growth. Queried what mechanisms were available to consider small sites (2-5 units) as part of the Plan Review process, rather than small sites coming forward on an ad hoc basis. RB explained that it is something we can look at, but we need to ensure that we can robustly demonstrate land supply.

### Climate change matters (Energy efficiency etc.)

Cllr Potter: remarked that the consultation revealed groundswell of interest across the subjects presented in the distribution of development consultation document. Suggested that we could progress with policy suggestions and let national policy 'catch up'.

Cllr P Andrews: suggested that a design guide could be incorporated into the new plan which could include things about energy efficiency.

Cllr Potter: emphasised the importance of considering water consumption.

Cllr Mason: suggested that we need to have a look at what will be sound in terms of aligning with current legislation, suggesting we look at other authorities' progress. Cllr P Andrews remarked that we have officers and eventually consultants to advise us on such things.

Cllr Goodrick: suggested that solutions could be contained within Building Regulations legislation.

Cllr Thackray: suggested that builders should be encouraged to introduce all measures they possibly can; including, perhaps, by reducing or exempting CIL payment requirements to facilitate the inclusion of certain features when building. RB advised that CIL payments are fixed and only specific forms of development are subject to exemption (and building sustainably is not one of them). However, self-build schemes which meet the required tests and occupancy timescales are exempt from CIL.

Cllr Mason: suggested that Cambridge local authority are a good example; Cllr Potter echoed that we should look at what successful Councils are doing and follow.

### Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

General concerns about the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land were raised.

This was in relation to new development, and also in relation to renewable energy schemes where the land-take is significant.

Cllr Potter: emphasised the need to avoid the best and most versatile agricultural land for building, due to its importance for food production; with less good quality perhaps to be used for renewable energy schemes.

Cllr Mason: explained that we should consider relative percentages of land use, when considering land for food production and renewable energy schemes.

Cllr Thackray: suggested that field margins could be considered, and suggested incorporating renewable energy schemes into field margins. Also emphasised the need for applicants to provide reports outlining to soil quality if their schemes would lead to loss of agricultural land. (Cllr Mason advised this was not technically feasible)

Cllr Goodrick: stated that it is paramount that good agricultural land is not wasted and is used for food production, as it going to become increasingly important in the future. Also stressed that field margins are important for biodiversity.

Cllr Frank: stated that food production is a cause of worry and suggested that Grade 3 land shouldn't be built on at all. Echoed Cllr Goodrick's comments about field margins and biodiversity.

## 34 **The Outstanding Other Villages with Submissions**

Continuing from the previous meeting of 9 March 2022, Members were presented with the 20 remaining 'other villages'.

LP provided details on sites submitted, cumulative yields of those sites, as well as an explanation as to their context in relation to policy designations and services.

### **Annexe to Item 3 - Other Villages with Site Submissions**

#### ***Burythorpe***

##### Sites in relation to policy designations

All sites are situated outside the village development limits. Burythorpe is surrounded by the Wolds Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV).

##### Dwellings in the village currently

119 (including Eddlethorpe)

##### Total cumulative yield from submissions

38+

##### Services

Church, village hall, pub, sports field, bus provided by Ryedale Community Transport (RCT)

##### School catchments

Primary: Langton

Secondary: Norton College

Discussion

Cllr Goodrick: it is a small linear village; would support some small scale development, depending on the intended mix.

Cllr P Andrews: settlement of this size could take a small number dwellings, but wouldn't wish to impose any more to avoid spoiling the character.

***Buttercrambe***

Sites in relation to policy designations

All sites are outside the village development limits; with Sites 190 and 199 particularly distant. Site 210 immediately abuts the existing limits to the west. Buttercrambe is constrained by numerous designations, including the Wolds AHLV as well as Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (the River Derwent). There is also a Registered Park/Garden in the form of Aldby Park.

Dwellings in the village currently

44

Total cumulative yield from submissions

6

Services

Church

School catchments

Primary: Sand Hutton

Secondary: Malton

Discussion

Cllr Goodrick: Site 199 is Ellers Farm and is divorced from the village. Buttercrambe has a single track bridge which is very long; cars entering can't actually see over to the Scrayingham side. There should be very limited expansion of this village.

Cllr P Andrews: couldn't see a problem with a small-scale development.

Cllr Thackray: noted that there are permitted development schemes which allows for the conversion of farm buildings to dwellings.

***Cropton***

Sites in relation to policy designations

All sites are outside the development limits though Site 77 is immediately abutting. Cropton is surrounded by the Fringe of the Moors AHLV; meanwhile the boundary to the National Park's authority is immediately west of the village.

Dwellings in the village currently

121

Total cumulative yield from submissions

7

Services

Church, village hall, pub, bus provided by RCT

School catchments

Primary: Pickering Primary schools

Secondary: Lady Lumley's, Pickering

Discussion

Cllr Mason: queried whether we should refer to Ryedale Community Transport as a means of public transport; Cllr Thackray made a similar comment in that the frequency of a bus is what is most relevant. Cllr P Andrews stated that availability of school buses is more important than public.

Cllr P Andrews: Seven new houses doesn't sound a lot but cautioned that, if we were to allocate two sites in those fields, we would be questioned as to why not the neighbouring fields were allocated.

Cllr Frank: queried if the submissions were on burgage strips; RB advised that it was possible, pointing to the strong alignment of the field boundaries.

***Gilling East***

Sites in relation to policy designations

Site 207 is outside the development limits but proximal to it given its location near to the crossroads in the centre of the village. The village is covered by the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) designation.

Dwellings in the village currently

102

Total cumulative yield from submissions

4

Services

Church, village hall, pub

School catchments

Primary: Ampleforth and Hovingham

Secondary: Ryedale, Beadlam

Discussion

No concerns were raised regarding the submission.

***Habton***

Sites in relation to policy designations

Both submissions are outside the village development limits, with Site 27 extending significantly north of the village. Site 28 is near to a Visually Important Undeveloped Area (VIUA).

Dwellings in the village currently

143

Total cumulative yield from submissions

Unspecified.

Services

Bus, village hall, pub

School catchments

Primary: Malton Primary schools

Secondary: Malton

Discussion

Cllrs P Andrews and Mason declared interests in this village.

Cllr Mason pointed out that Site 28 has been submitted as one but the aspiration of the landowners is for it to be split into two. Pointed out also that there are school buses to Malton, Pickering and Amotherby.

Cllr P Andrews said that a large housing development could completely change the character of the village, but a small-medium sized site houses could be appropriate. Stated also that the barn area has been advertised for employment for a long time without interest.

***Harome***

Sites in relation to policy designations

All submitted sites are outside the village development limits, though the policy line has been drawn around specifically Sites 3 and 174, which are situated off Back Lane. Site 6 is immediately north of a designated playing area. All sites also fall outside the Harome Conservation Area. Harome is surrounded by the Fringe of the Moors AHLV.

Dwellings in the village currently

126

Total cumulative yield from submissions

36

Services

Church, village hall, pub, bowling club

School catchments

Primary: Helmsley

Secondary: Ryedale, Beadlam

Discussion

Cllr Goodrick stated that Site 6 is too divorced from the village.

Cllr Windress queried if Site 3 had had planning permission refused recently; ML confirmed that there was a scheme for replacement windows refused and dismissed on appeal in 2015.

Cllr P Andrews agreed regarding Site 6. Raised concerns about Site 8 bordering a watercourse; Cllr Goodrick echoed this and suggested there could be a flood risk.

***Marion***

#### Sites in relation to policy designations

All sites are outside but abutting the village development limits. All sites also outside conservation area. Sites 43 and 280 are in the Fringe of the Moors AHLV.

#### Dwellings in the village currently

97

#### Total cumulative yield from submissions

38

#### Services

Church, village hall, bus provided by RCT

#### School catchments

Primary: Sinnington

Secondary: Ryedale, Beadlam

#### Discussion

Cllr Goodrick raised some concerns with sites 4 and 43. Cllr P Andrews agreed, and suggested the boundary of Site 4 could perhaps be amended. There was a discussion regarding a building acting as both a church and a village hall.

### ***Newton-upon-Rawcliffe***

#### Sites in relation to policy designations

Both sites are outside the village development limits and both are in the Fringe of the Moors AHLV. Both are also proximal to the boundary with the National Park planning authority.

#### Dwellings in the village currently

85

#### Total cumulative yield from submissions

51

#### Services

Church, village hall, pub, bus provided by RCT

#### School catchments

Primary: Pickering Primary schools

Secondary: Lady Lumley's, Pickering

#### Discussion

Cllr Goodrick concerns about overdevelopment; Cllr P Andrews agreed and suggested that some houses might be acceptable, but not 40.

Cllr Frank agreed that it would be over-development; with Site 44 being too far out of the village into open countryside.

Cllr Potter queried if we the authority was able to negotiate dividing any sites up to deliver some dwellings rather than the full yield amount as submitted. RB confirmed that we could have such negotiations but it would ultimately require the agreement of the submitter; bearing in mind the need to ensure that sites remain deliverable.

Cllr P Andrews suggested that re-drawing development limits would be worthwhile.

### ***Nunnington***

#### Sites in relation to policy designations

Sites 162 and 165 are within the existing development limits and conservation area. The larger sites, 155 and 157, are outside the development limits and mostly outside the conservation area, but for the northern-most section of 155. Site 165 is immediately abutting a designated VIUA. Meanwhile, the whole village is covered by the Howardian Hills AONB designation.

#### Dwellings in the village currently

118

#### Total cumulative yield from submissions

49

#### Services

Church, village hall, craft shop

#### School catchments

Primary: Nawton

Secondary: Ryedale, Beadlam

#### Discussion

Cllr Windress pointed-out that the northern-most section of Site 155 recently received planning permission for the conversion of an abattoir to dwellings. Cllr P Andrews suggested that the cumulative yield would represent over-development, but 10-20 houses could be acceptable. Cllr Goodrick agreed.

### ***Scackleton***

#### Sites in relation to policy designations

Both sites are outside the development limits, though Site 277 is immediately abutting. The village is covered by the Howardian Hills AONB designation.

#### Dwellings in the village currently

52

#### Total cumulative yield from submissions

13

#### Services

Church, bus provided by RCT

#### School catchments

Primary: Hovingham

Secondary: Malton

#### Discussion

Cllr Goodrick stated that Site 278 is too divorced from the settlement.

Cllr P Andrews stated that Site 277 seemed potentially acceptable.

### ***Thorpe Bassett***

#### Sites in relation to policy designations

Site 173 is outside but immediately abutting the village development limits, but Site 170 is partially within the development limits, though extends beyond them to the west. The village is covered by the Wolds AHLV.

#### Dwellings in the village currently

46

#### Total cumulative yield from submissions

11

#### Services

Church

#### School catchments

Primary: Rillington

Secondary: Norton College

#### Discussion

Cllr Goodrick commented that the development of the farmyard seems contiguous with the rest of the village and is effectively part of the village envelope. Site 173 is a small site.

### ***Wintringham***

#### Sites in relation to policy designations

All sites are outside (but abutting) both the development limits and conservation areas of the village. Site 180 is immediately north-east of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (Wintringham Marsh).

#### Dwellings in the village currently

93

#### Total cumulative yield from submissions

15

#### Services

Church, village hall

#### School catchments

Primary: Rillington

Secondary: Norton College

#### Discussion

Cllr P Andrews commented on the specific character of Wintringham with the white houses, and with houses separated by green areas. Concerns were raised about a loss of these areas to the character of the place.

### ***Eddlethorpe***

Sites in relation to policy designations

Eddlethorpe does not have any development limits. It is surrounded by the Wolds AHLV.

Dwellings in the village currently

8 (according to electoral role, information provided by Cllr Goodrick)

Total cumulative yield from submissions

6

Services

None

School catchments

Primary: Langton

Secondary: Norton College

Discussion

Cllr Goodrick stated that there were very few properties in Eddlethorpe and so to increase even by a small number would fundamentally change the character of the settlement. It is a hamlet.

***Great Barugh***

Sites in relation to policy designations

The site is outside but immediately north of the village development limits.

Dwellings in the village currently

86

Total cumulative yield from submissions

10

Services

Church, village hall, pub (currently closed), bus provided by RCT

School catchments

Primary: Amotherby and Hovingham

Secondary: Malton

Discussion

Cllr Thackray pointed out that there is a pub which is currently closed, and mentioned that there are school buses. The village registered the pub as an asset of community value but unsure if it will open again.

Cllr Thackray had concerns about the dislocated nature of the site, and its current size, as well as being an attractive site and setting to the village.

***Lillings Ambo***

Sites in relation to policy designations

The site is outside the village development limits.

Dwellings in the village currently

70

Total cumulative yield from submissions

30

Services

Bus service

School catchments

Primary: Sheriff Hutton

Secondary: Outwood Academy, Easingwold

Discussion

Cllr Goodrick raised concerns about its scale and undermine the linear setting of the village, and also risk coalescence with Sheriff Hutton.

35 **The Settlements where no Site Submissions have been made**

Sites previously submitted were presented, but Cllr P Andrews as Chair confirmed that this discussion is more to discuss the position of the development limits, and the services and facilities at settlements rather than going through the sites which were previously submitted.

It got to 9:50 and Members agreed to discuss the remaining settlements where no submissions have been received at the next meeting.

**Annexe to Item 4 - Discussing settlements where no submissions have been received**

***Acklam***

Previous submissions

3

Dwellings in the village currently

77

Services

Church and pub

Discussion

There was some support for a very small number of dwellings from Cllrs Andrews and Thackray

***Aislaby***

Previous submissions

4

Dwellings in the village currently

39

Services

Village hall shared with Middleton

Discussion

Cllr P Andrews: limited opportunity for increasing development limits as conservation area is so large.

***Appleton Le Moors***

Previous submissions

1

Dwellings in the village currently

90

Services

Church, village hall, pub, sports field

Discussion

Entirely outside RDC planning authority jurisdiction so cannot be considered.

***Barton Le Street***

Previous submissions

4

Dwellings in the village currently

94

Services

Church, village hall, bus stop

Discussion

Cllr P Andrews: supportive of the principle of very small scale development  
Cllr Thackray commented that access on the B1257 might not be desirable.

***Barton Le Willows***

Previous submissions

8

Dwellings in the village currently

93

Services

Village hall

Discussion

Cllr Goodrick: it would take a little bit of development, but not a lot.  
Cllr P Andrews: you could expand by about 10% but no further. Could be opportunities for growth.  
Brief discussion regarding the Barton Hill on the other side of the A64.

***Birdsall***

Previous submissions

2 (including one in North Grimston)

Dwellings in the village currently

95 (including North Grimston)

Services

Church, village hall

### Discussion

Cllr P Andrews: asked if we want to make a development limit around the village of Birdsall?

Cllr Goodrick: responded that it is a particularly pretty village; whatever comes forward needs to be done sympathetically and not impact on the village itself or its heritage asset. Supportive of a conservation area designation.

Members had a brief discussion regarding heritage deficits, and what this meant and whether other estates had identified this.

### ***Brawby***

#### Previous submissions

None.

#### Dwellings in the village currently

79.

#### Services

Village hall.

#### Discussion

Cllr Thackray: 4 new houses are currently under construction, and some planning apps will be coming forward.

Cllr Thackray: discussed possibility of housing development north of Brawby Park and the possibility of expanding development limits around Garland Farm, as well as the area nearby to the privately owned tennis court.

Cllr Thackray: also discussed the harmful impact of the Local Needs Occupancy condition on the delivery of a particular dwelling with planning permission in the village which he is familiar with.

Cllr Thackray: The development limits could be expanded and provide housing, providing that no planning conditions prevented occupancy.

### ***Cawton***

#### Previous submissions

2

#### Dwellings in the village currently

28

#### Services

None.

#### Discussion

Cllr P Andrews: leave it as it is.

### ***Coneysthorpe***

#### Previous submissions

1

#### Dwellings in the village currently

43

#### Services

Church, village hall

### Discussion

Cllr Goodrick: Queried Castle Howard's intentions; ML confirmed that they do not intend to expand the village.

Cllr P Andrews: leave it as it is.

### ***Coulton***

#### Previous submissions

None

#### Dwellings in the village currently

35

#### Services

None

#### Discussion

Cllr Goodrick: leave it as it is.

### ***Edstone***

#### Previous submissions

2

#### Dwellings in the village currently

69

#### Services

Church, village hall

#### Discussion

Cllr P Andrews queried the formation of the existing development limits.

Discussion regarding the prior notification process, possibility of converting agricultural buildings into dwellings under permitted development.

Cllr P Andrews: would have thought there was some scope for rounding-off the developed area.

Cllr Thackray: site to the east, Mount Pleasant, steeply falls away. Supportive of small scale development.

### ***Fadmoor***

#### Previous submissions

1

#### Dwellings in the village currently

51

#### Services

Village hall, shop

#### Discussion

One submission last time.

51 dwellings.

Andrews: leave it as it is.

### ***Foston***

Previous submissions

None.

Dwellings in the village currently

42

Services

Church, school (in Thornton le Clay)

Discussion

The scheduled monument is applied to the whole village as it is a medieval settlement.

Cllr Goodrick: leave it alone.

***Foxholes***

Previous submissions

4

Dwellings in the village currently

117 (including Butterwick)

Services

Church, village hall, bus stop

Discussion

Cllr Goodrick: support to leave the settlement as it is,

Cllr P Andrews: Suggested that the shape of development limits allows for some areas to be joined up, with small scale development.

***Fryton***

Previous submissions

1

Dwellings in the village currently

20

Services

None.

Discussion

Members agreed that there is a flooding issue in this settlement, so development would be a concern.

Members agreed to discuss the remaining settlements where no submissions have been received at the next meeting.

36

**Any other Business**

Next LPWP dates:

Thursday 14 April 2022 to discuss Market Towns and the settlements not covered by tonight's meeting

Thursday 12 May 2022 Castle Howard Sites and policy choices

Tuesday 24 May 2022

Meeting adjourned at 10pm.