

Public Document Pack

Local Plan Working Party

Held at Virtual
on Monday 13 June 2022

Present

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

In Attendance

Rachael Balmer and Lizzie Phippard

Minutes

46 **Apologies**

Apologies received from Cllr Cleary

Jill Thompson and Matt Lishman

47 **Minutes of meeting of 24 May 2022**

The Chair asked if any Cllrs had any matters arising from the minutes in which they wished to discuss.

Matters Arising of Minutes from 24 May meeting

Castle Howard Submissions

There was discussion around the Castle Howard Estates submission of sites at Slingsby. The Chair brought up a section in the previous meeting under the Slingsby section on Page 7 which stated that officers had mentioned that we would ask land owners to demonstrate housing figures and benefits the sites might bring, was this the case?

Officers stated that when we did the call for sites, we asked a series of questions about the site submission and what they would deliver e.g. green infrastructure, how many houses etc. We have that information, but some land owners have been far more detailed than others. That means effectively those who have not submitted the higher level of detail, they will not perform as well in the site assessment. We may well go back to site submitted for further info, and they are able to provide further info should they wish to.

A member asked if for example, a developer was to say they will deliver a specific number of homes or a certain house build standard or energy efficiency, how could we ensure they stick to this figure. RB explained that we would set out a number of development principles when we make allocations. Those principles will need to be deliverable, but that is how we will set out and require certain standards through the development. It was also explained that

larger sites submissions will be expected to quantify infrastructure on and off site. We will need to set this out with allocations, as we did for the local sites document.

Some Members raised concerns about large development whereby infrastructure lags the development, rather than the more appropriate way around and felt that this was positive to avoid this. Member also asked for clarification on whether or not we could incorporate building standard and environmental standards into policies around allocations. Officers confirmed that, yes this could be done, but we would need test the viability.

One member explained that they had been present at the Ganthorpe meeting and had concerns that CHE not able to be legally bound to deliver all the wider benefits they are identifying and will simply sell the site to a major housebuilder.

It was also mentioned that CHE do attract money and tourism into the wider area, and this is about the wider estate.

That we should be open minded when considering these schemes and CHE's intentions.

Sustainable build standards

The chair noted that national policy doesn't contain enough about these matters raised (climate change mitigation, build standards etc.) Therefore all Members can do is get as much in to the Local and hoping that national policy catches up soon. We should be looking at successful plans and seeing how Ryedale can implement their approach. Rachael explained that the legal power is the Local Plan and expressed through the policies. In order to do that we need to evidence those policy choices and provided a viability evidence base to back it up.

One member stated that the viability evidence base is the struggle as this is where developers can then find they are unable to build because of our requirements, and they will build elsewhere.

Rachael explained that this is on the basis that we have viability tested those chosen standards in the Plan before allocations, so that developers can't then come back and say this. This would be based on the level of housing delivery, housing market values that developers have submitted to us, against the build standards and factoring affordable housing policy and CIL. Making sure it can demonstrated that a specific build standard is achievable and therefore they should build to that standard.

One member felt this would then be reflected in the price of those houses when they come to market, they are likely to then be more expensive to equate for the extra build cost, and therefore less affordable.

Slingsby Sports Field and other matters

There was some discussion over Slingsby sports field and potential for it becoming an Asset of Community Value. Rachael explained that the Parish could instigate this, or a neighbourhood group and it is then administered by the district council. A number of members have had conversations and worked with Slingsby sports association, and felt they may be the best group to go for Asset of Community Value.

A member explained that there was a direct question at the Slingsby meeting to see if the Castle Howard Estate would gift the sports field to the community. CHE did not agree to this, but nor did they disagree. Also the provision of a school, they said they might be able to assist with this.

There was a comment about the existing housing stock in the village, and how CHE are selling off some of this existing stock at present. There was concern that this existing housing stock being sold off may be brought and turned into holiday lets/B&B. CHE had apparently suggested that we might impose a principle residency policy. This is not current policy, no decisions have been made to implement such a policy, and would not apply to existing dwellings. Cllr Mason asked if we will be looking at neighbourhood plans and local green space in this review, as he felt this should be considered.

RB explained that we would not be, but neighbourhood plan preparation is something the government is very keen for us to support.

RB In larger unitary areas, such as Cornwall and Northumberland that have been through unitary changes there are more neighbourhood plans present. Going forward with LGR we are likely to see North Yorkshire having many more Neighbourhood plans coming forward as the overall plan will likely be a lot more high level, so more detail could be dealt with in localised Plans.

RB In the development of the local plan sites document we took the view that the subject of green space is best responded to by the local community, so this would best be addressed through the neighbourhood plan process.

RB We will look at green infrastructure in the review in relation to sites but don't have the capacity to identify and designate local green space in the review of this plan.

The Chair asked if the site submissions are already out there in the public domain and had everyone seen the Transport connectivity paper issues in May by CHE. It was confirmed to members that all sites and submitted documentation is now publicly available. Members were concerned that there had been delays in getting the information out.

Minutes from 24 May 2022.

Cllr Goodrick noted an error in the Welburn section on the minutes (paragraph 3 the second sentence) the wording reads 'car' not 'car park' – as it should.

Following these discussions the minutes were moved by Cllr Potter and seconded by Cllr Frank, for approval with this aforementioned amendment.

The minutes were approved with the amendment by Cllr. Goodrick.

48 **Report: Local Plan Review - Scope**

RB gave a brief overview of the report published to members and explained that this was to revisit the timescales and reconfirm the scope of the principles of the Review.

The report notes that we aim to take a key decision paper to members in autumn. Followed by publication and intended submission on 23rd February 2023. This will mean the review has been published and the principle of submission agreed when the new council comes into being.

In terms of the scope, the review needs to concentrate on spatial distribution principles, associated allocations, ensuring policies are in line with any amendments to NPPF and how the council will respond to climate change and build standards.

Things not to be covered in the review: Retail space requirements, CIL, Affordable housing policy, and the existing Ryedale Plan to sit alongside the review rather than a whole new document. It is also not the intention to do a whole scale review of development limits.

RB raised that in light of not reviewing development limits beyond allocations, and the discussions Members have been having on the sites that they may wish to explore a criteria based policy which gave a clear steer on small scale development.

Member's Questions and Discussion

There was discussion surrounding criteria based policy and looking at smaller sites coming forward outside of development limits. There was discussion over % increase per smaller settlement. Members explored within 5% to 10% of settlement size, as a more favourable figure. This would mean small scale development outside Development Limits could be considered but that those sites don't need to be formally allocated. Some Members felt this should include brownfield sites but noted that developers are often less likely as they are more expensive to develop. Most members echoed that this would be a good idea to encourage smaller development.

RB explained that Members would need look at the criteria which they had been exploring when they looked at all the site submissions- to think about the factors which would important to consider such as access, amenity, flood risk.

RB advised that the review of the plan needs to ensure we have identified sufficient allocations to meet the land supply. We can't rely on the additional housing from a criteria based policy, as this wouldn't evidence delivery. It would just allow organic schemes to come forward in conjunction with the allocations under very specific circumstances.

Members discussed the scope of the review. RB explained that we have to evidence the policy changes we are making, but also the elements we don't change need to also be proportionately evidenced and justified. The evidence base has to be comprehensive because of this. Members asked if there are plans for major shifts in government policy. Rachael explained that it has been noted that the NPPF will be updated in July, and this may affect how we respond to the Plan Review, subject to any transitional arrangements.

The topic of building standards was also covered. It was noted by one member that the government had formally responded last year in reconfirming that Local Plans can set standards for new homes that go beyond building regulations specification. Members expressed support for looking to employ sustainable building standards, and that we would need to be sure that the developers could deliver those standards, looking at viability.

Members discussed Policy SP8 and raised concerns around holiday cottages not paying an appropriate amount of council tax or business rates. RB explained that we have an established approach in terms of tourist accommodation. It was confirmed that our approach to tourist accommodation is not something we expect to be reviewing. But we will be looking at occupancy conditions and the review of the plan- specifically the Ryedale Plan Local Needs Occupancy Condition (LNOC) condition and the use of a primary residency condition.

One member was pleased to see that LNOC and primary residency would be coming forward in the Review, but did say that in relation to development limits, they felt it was wrong to restrict to the size of development, instead they felt the restriction should be development that will not be in line with the character or location of settlement. This has the potential to allow more development.

Reference was made to the site selection criteria and that not changes had been made to the assessment from last time. They felt that the selection methodology was restrictive and we only allowed for allocation of sites if they were in the locality of a pub, a school and a bus stop, restricting development to about 10 or 12 villages.

RB confirmed the site section methodology (SSM) has been reviewed and updated in relation to the sustainability appraisal objectives and updates in specific areas. But the SSM only employs the settlement hierarchy as it is ultimately identified. So as the criteria for service villages is being reviewed, and so it is for member to decide the settlement hierarchy, and to establish if it will remain the same or be amended and if so how it is amended.

Members discussed subsection 6.13 of the report which looks at the aspects of the Plan which are proposed not to be under view. This included the affordable policy. Members raised concerns around the current situation in the district with affordable housing, and affordable not being affordable. It was considered that local affordable housing and social housing are different things. Concerns for families wanting to stay in a local area and not being able to buy there.

There was discussion around Malton and Norton, particularly in relation to the existing allocation for 700 houses at Norton and limited infrastructure in the principle towns.

There was also conversations about Malton and Norton air quality management areas and need for improvements there.

A number of members agreed that we need to be more agile and concise about the scope of the review given the limited time scales, with the timeframe being a concern. RB advised that Officers would keep Members up to date with work and any delays. Members appreciated that it is a case of being effective within in a short period of time for the communities in Ryedale.

It was also noted that we need to take note of other authorities Local Plans who will be joining the new north Yorkshire council. RB confirmed that as of yet no decisions have been made in terms of what the format of the Local Plan will look like in the new council or indeed the principle of the Shadow Authority's approach to plan reviews. A number of members agreed that given the substantial change upon the authority, they would like to get as far through the current review as possible.

Conclusion

The Chair moved the recommendation with amendment of subsection underlined below

2.0 RECOMMENDATION in part (ii) to change the wording to 'Agree the scope in principle of the review of the Ryedale Plan to the elements identified in paragraph 6.11 and 6.15;

(Parts (i) and (iii) to remain the same).

This is in relation to ensuring criteria based policy is included, as part (i) specifically mentioned that we will not be doing a full scale review of development limits.

This was seconded by Cllr Mason, who was advised of the change in the meeting due to him leaving earlier.

Members voted to approve recommendation within the report with the amendment as above.

5 for, 2 abstentions – recommendation approved with amendment.

49 **Any Other Business**

Dates of the next meeting is 7th July to explore occupancy conditions then there will be a recess in meetings until September.

Meeting closed 19:45

This page is intentionally left blank