

Public Document Pack

Local Plan Working Party

Held at Virtual Meeting
on Tuesday 24 May 2022

Present

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

In Attendance

Rachael Balmer, Matthew Lishman, Lizzie Phippard and Jill Thompson

Minutes

41 **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Thackray, P 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 P 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'. Blenheim 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 not 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 to accommodate the volume of developments 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, 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 Councillor 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 park otherwise they 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 the village post office is situated within a private dwelling. The village is also subject to flooding and lacks 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