

Ryedale Plan Review

Key Decisions Consultation Document

November 2022

Contents

Section 1: Introduction	3
Where to provide your comments:	4
Section 2: Strategic Considerations	5
Plan period/life of the Review of the Ryedale Plan	5
The proposed housing requirement	6
The Helmsley Plan.....	7
Broad Distribution Options:.....	8
The current strategy	8
Context informing the Distribution of Development Consultation in 2021	8
Designation of Service Villages	12
Section 3: Specific Policy Considerations.....	15
Occupancy Conditions- the Local Needs Occupancy Condition	15
Occupancy Conditions –Primary Residence Condition	16
Housing Delivery for Specific Tenures and Development Limits	17
Self-Build	17
Development Limits and a proposed criteria based policy for small sites	17
Accessibility standards in new homes	19
Responding to Climate Change- a review of Policy SP18.....	20
Stand-Alone Renewable and Low Carbon Energy generation proposals (Part 1 of Policy SP18) .	21
Sustainable Build Standards (Part 2 of Policy SP18)	22
Section 4: Changes to other Policies in the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy	26
Section 5. Next Steps	30
Appendix 1: The Plan Review Process.....	31
The Review of the Ryedale Plan.....	31
What do we mean by a review?	31
What the review will cover?	32
Appendix 2: What is our evidence for determining what the levels of housing should be to different settlements?	34
How effective has the current approach been?	34

Section 1: Introduction

The Ryedale Plan is our Local Plan, and a local plan is expected to express how the area it covers is to respond to changing circumstances for at least 15 years. This is essentially about the right types of development taking place in the right locations, in the right amounts. It achieves this by looking at settlement-specific response to how growth is delivered, by understanding the capacity of the settlements to adapt/accommodate the amount of development and to understand what new infrastructure may be required to deliver that development. In doing so, it must also take account of historic/cultural and environmental sensitivities that may be present at a place. This then influences choices around how much development should go where: we call this the spatial distribution strategy.

We need to assess whether the current approach to the distribution of development, and whether other policy approaches remains fit for meeting our needs going forward; and that in delivering that chosen spatial strategy we identify areas of land to meet those different needs- known as allocations. We also look at the other policies of the plan- to make sure they are working as they were intended to do. We call this a review, and we have section in Appendix 1 of this document which sets out in general terms how this review of the Ryedale Plan is to be undertaken, should you wish to find out more about the general review process. You can also look at our Local Development Scheme which sets out more information about planning policy in general:

[Local Development Scheme](#)

We consulted at the end of 2021 into 2022 on a consultation called 'Distribution of Development'. This consultation on 'Key Decisions' is the next consultation stage to gain views on the proposed policy approaches we are considering as part of the review of the Ryedale Plan. This consultation document also sets out some of the key messages received as a result of that consultation, and signposts updates to the evidence base we will be using to inform our approach.

The distribution of development is made through informed choices that are underpinned by guiding principles. It results in a list of settlements in a particular order known as a Settlement Hierarchy, and to that hierarchy different levels of a development are attributed- this is translated into sites – known as allocations. There is still further consultations to be undertaken on sites before we can present the review of the Ryedale Plan as single document with policies and sites together. Consultation on the potential allocations will come after the outcomes of this consultation have been considered, this will be early next year.

Section 2 of this consultation document is focused on the Key Decisions, those being the strategic considerations of:

- The proposed plan period/life of the review of the Ryedale Plan
- The proposed housing requirement
- The proposed distribution of development strategy
- The settlement hierarchy and the proposed consideration of Service Villages

Section 3 of this document sets out the main changes we are proposing to specific policy areas of the Ryedale Plan. These are in relation to:

- Consideration of Development Limits- and consideration of a criteria-based policy
- How we consider stand-alone renewable and low carbon energy schemes
- Sustainable building standards
- Accessibility and space standards for new housing

There is a further section which indicates where there are some other areas of the Ryedale Plan that we will look at as part of the review, but they will be in relation to specific changes as a result of national policy, or specific sites work and so will be set out in the Publication of the Plan review- but we identify what general areas the changes will be made.

Where to provide your comments:

We have created an on-line form for you to fill out at: [LINK TO ADD](#)

We would appreciate if you could use this form to provide your comments.

Or you can email your comments to localplan@ryedale.gov.uk

Alternatively, you can also write to:

Planning Policy
Ryedale District Council
Ryedale House
Old Malton road
Malton
North Yorkshire
YO17 7HH

The consultation is to run from:

Tuesday 29 November for 8 weeks, until 5pm Tuesday 24 January.

localplan@ryedale.gov.uk
Ryedale District Council Planning Policy

If you cannot access this consultation document in its current format, please call us on 01653 600666 and we will provide it in a format which best meets your needs.

Section 2: Strategic Considerations

Plan period/life of the Review of the Ryedale Plan

The 2021 consultation we did on the Distribution of Development identified the review of the Ryedale Plan as having a life span of 15 years, from 2023-2038. This is the normal length of a 'plan period' and our previous Local Development Scheme identified that it would be to cover a 15 year period.

The New North Yorkshire Council is required to develop its own Local Plan within 5 years of the vesting date (April 2023) which means it will need to prioritise work on the new local plan, and focus on only selected local plan reviews where the risks of not reviewing (such as not having enough housing land identified) mean it is necessary to continue with the plan review. The Ryedale Plan is one of the selected plans to be reviewed.

But this context is prompting the Council to consider whether it is necessary to have a 15 year plan review period, on the basis that by 2028/29 a new Local Plan will be close to being finalised if not adopted. So the Ryedale Plan's lifespan extended by the review will only be a matter of a handful of years- at the most - before it would be effectively subsumed/superseded by the new North Yorkshire Plan, accepting that its allocations would likely be rolled forward.

There is also a need to ensure that the review does not present areas of incompatibility to the emerging new North Yorkshire Local Plan, such as around the consideration and treatment of growth points and investment in aligned infrastructure to deliver those growth aspirations- particularly in light of the Devolution deal with North Yorkshire and York.

There is going to be additional consultation on both the new Local Plan for North Yorkshire and the review of the Ryedale Plan. The presence of the two plans, and their similar timelines, could cause confusion for local communities.

We think there is no need to plan out a 15 year land supply from 2023/4 from adoption to 2038. Instead the review can provide additional sites to modestly extend the land supply. So we are exploring whether the Ryedale Plan review could be reduced in its timeline of operation, from currently a 15 year plan period from adoption (as set out in the Local Development Scheme), and allowing it to be a limited roll forward in light of this position. We are therefore proposing that, subject to legal advice, we:

Reduce the plan period end date from 2038 to 2032 by only rolling forward the plan period from 2027 to 2032 (5 years). This is to be subject to legal advice but we would welcome your views on this approach.

This is not an established route for a plan review to normally take, although the National Planning Policy Framework does not require full detailed allocations in years 11-15 of a local plan. We think that there are exceptional circumstances with the clear mandate to prepare a new local plan for North Yorkshire, coupled with the strong current land supply of the Ryedale Plan. The evidence base and land supply will be key determinants in the approach ultimately taken. Ryedale's land supply which was ultimately defined in the Local Plan Sites Document with the formal identification of allocations and commitments provided an extremely robust land supply, and this is helpful in relation to the review of the plan, as most of these can be relied upon to come forward.

The additional land supply is very much influenced by the existing land supply, as we need to factor in allocations and commitments. As of March 2022 we have, at 1092 dwellings, over approximately 1/3

of our housing land already ‘accounted for’ on the basis of a 15 year plan period, and can demonstrate a 5 year land supply.

In undertaking a limited roll forward of the plan review period of 2027- 2032, which would mean an additional housing land supply of up to 1000 dwellings to allocate- covering a 5 year-roll on, on the basis we continue to apply our existing plan for figure.

It is important for wider stakeholders to note that if we are able to achieve a roll-forward of 5 years, the site assessment work, site submissions, and evidence base commissioned as part of the review of the plan will be incorporated and subsumed into the plan making work for the new Local Plan for North Yorkshire.

The proposed housing requirement

The Ryedale Plan identifies that we deliver at least 200 homes per year. As part of the review, we have to consider whether the amount of housing to be delivered over the plan period needs to change.

In terms of the overall amount of housing, National Planning Policy (NPPF) requires that we plan for, as a minimum, our objectively assessed need for housing and other uses- and that is our starting point. This is subject to technical evidence, and applying national planning guidance. Government guidance requires that we establish our ‘housing requirement figure’ for our Ryedale Plan area to deliver a level of housing established from a local housing needs assessment. This is established through our Strategic Housing Market Assessment which has been completed.

In the Distribution of Development consultation we asked:

Do you think we should deliver more housing than the Government requires in its ‘Standard Method’ to deliver other aspirations such as more affordable housing (including social rent), infrastructure, and support wider economic development in the district?

The responses we received fell into two broad categories, the development industry supported a higher figure. Whilst communities, represented by Town and Parish Councils and individuals, did not support a higher figure.

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (September 2022) has identified that when setting the housing requirement for the Plan, Ryedale should look to deliver at least the 186 dwellings target of the Standard Method – a calculation which is set by national planning guidance, but that it should not plan to exceed this in setting its housing requirement. This is accepting that in the delivery of any plan there will be some additional ‘windfall’ housing delivered. This is a difference of only 14 dwellings per year between the current to-plan-for figure and the standard method.

We have therefore decided to consult on continuing with the current plan figure of 200 dwellings as this would be delivering modestly in excess of the Government’s housing delivery figure for the District, and support housing delivery, and in particular affordable housing delivery through allocations, and it is not considered necessary to refine down the figure. We consider it is positive response to the partial review of the plan.

Question 1: Do you agree that we should sustain the plan for figure of 200 homes per year?

The Ryedale Plan employed an additional 20% land supply buffer within the housing land supply, and this was delivered through the commitments and allocations. It is not proposed that this 20% land

supply buffer will be continued if the plan review becomes a roll-forward, as we have not under-delivered in our housing delivery. We would need to apply a 10% buffer which is set out in National Planning Guidance.

Because the Ryedale Plan was achieved in stages, the Local Plan Strategy also provided a framework of proportions of development attributed to different settlements. It concentrated the majority of new development at the largest settlements, our Market Towns, with c.90% of the housing requirement. This was further broken down into:

Malton and Norton (50%)

Pickering (25%)

Kirkbymoorside (10%)

Helmsley (5%)

With c.10% of the housing requirement going to a collection of larger villages with a section of key facilities- these were known as 'Service Villages'.

The allocations then followed this approach.

Because the review of the plan is considering the allocations as well as the strategy, we will not set precise proportions or percentages. Instead, we will identify the allocations (sites) needed to deliver the housing requirement and land supply buffer. We will demonstrate the level of housing attributed to different settlements through these allocations, as well as any other land uses for which we seek to provide a specific land supply for. We may also identify a broad location (such as that currently identified for employment land at Malton).

So whilst the Settlement Hierarchy will indicate the general levels of development, the percentages will be removed, and it will be the site allocation process which will determine - for the review of the Ryedale Plan - the extension of the land supply and the best sites to meet a range of social, economic and environmental objectives.

The Helmsley Plan

The Helmsley Plan is a Development Plan Document which focuses on the Town of Helmsley. It has been the subject of a light touch review by Officers of the National Park and Ryedale District Council.

Three quarters of the settlement (and the corresponding land surrounding it) is within the National Park planning area. There are some sites still to be rolled out and beyond these there are known significant constraints which would restrict development (flood risk, heritage designations) on the land which is within the Ryedale District Planning area. It is also not a settlement where any land submissions have been made. So for these reasons the Helmsley Plan is proposed to be continued without amendment.

The National Park Authority have already reviewed the Helmsley Plan, and have agreed to its continued implementation until the remaining sites are built out, or it is superseded either by a review of the recent North York Moors National Park Local Plan and/or the new plan for the new Council for North Yorkshire. Members of the Policy and Resources Committee in November have recommended that Helmsley remains to be considered under its existing Development Plan Document, and it is hoped that this decision will be ratified by Council in early December.

Broad Distribution Options:

Some of you may feel that Ryedale does not need more housing. But this is not an option for any Local Planning Authority to take. We are directed by Central Government to deliver new housing, and we can see that housing is needed in a range of forms across the district and we know this from earlier studies and emerging work on housing need.

If we do not investigate and make informed choices about where new housing is to be delivered; our existing land supply of housing will diminish. Then new housing will be delivered through the making of ad-hoc planning applications across the district, and under those circumstances it will be harder for the Local Planning Authority to resist applications for unplanned development. This will bring uncertainty to our communities in Ryedale; not properly reflect the roles of places within our district; and not allow the consideration of potentially strategic issues about how housing delivery could unlock key infrastructure for a place, or support the retention of a key local facility.

The current strategy

The current distribution strategy of the Ryedale Plan is to **concentrate new housing at the Market Towns, with a focus on Malton and Norton, and ten key ‘Service Villages’(listed below) with meeting local needs elsewhere in the district.**

- Amotherby and Swinton
- Ampleforth
- Beadlam and Nawton
- Hovingham
- Rillington
- Sherburn
- Sheriff Hutton
- Slingsby
- Staxton and Willerby
- Thornton le Dale

Under this strategy, the focus was placed on Malton and Norton, and this was to secure major infrastructural improvements in and at the two towns, and to deliver affordable housing where it was primarily needed. Development was also apportioned to all the northern market towns. The selection of the service villages was based on having three key facilities: grocery shop, a school, and a regular bus service. In these locations, new housing sites together with infill development and the redevelopment of sites and buildings provide new market housing, of which a proportion is sought as affordable housing. In other villages, infill development is restricted with the use of a Local Needs Occupancy Condition and affordable housing exception sites are supported as a means of addressing affordable housing need in the wider rural area.

Context informing the Distribution of Development Consultation in 2021

The current approach of the Ryedale Plan was considered ‘sound’ by the Planning Inspector in 2013 and viewed to be the right strategy for Ryedale to pursue, in terms of building new housing, providing employment land and buildings, the approach to retail development, and reflecting the roles and character of places.

The approach to the distribution of development is based on evidenced choices, and these choices are influenced by drivers that are considered to be important for the district and for particular settlements. Such as: affordable housing delivery, delivery of key infrastructure, supporting economic development of an area. It can also reflect other wider aspirations around access to

services and facilities, or help to support or enable the long term management and protection of heritage assets or land management.

Below are the reasons in summary why the current settlement hierarchy was chosen:

- Promoting sustainable patterns of development close to existing towns and villages
- Protecting the countryside from urban sprawl
- Availability of services and facilities being a driver for locating new development
- Making best use of existing infrastructure; and using development as a tool to deliver key elements of infrastructure at Malton and Norton
- Accessibility to other places

This was alongside:

- Prioritising 'brownfield' sites where practical.

We stated in the 2021 consultation that these all remain relevant considerations.

Alternative broad options for housing distribution were considered during the development of the Ryedale Plan, such as solely focusing on the towns, or having a fully dispersed approach where all settlements get a level of development. However, these were not considered to be appropriate or sound development strategies for Ryedale as they were not sustainable. The option of a new settlement was also discounted in the preparation of the Ryedale Plan. This would be a strategic decision, with wider implications for housing delivery beyond Ryedale's area. It would be more appropriately considered by the new authority as part of its development of the new Local Plan for North Yorkshire.

Taking into account the above factors, in 2021 we consulted on our Distribution of Development Consultation, where we proposed that there are two options to consider regarding the principle of the approach to distributing development in Ryedale:

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 1 would continue the focus the majority of housing delivery at the Principal Town (Malton and Norton) as well as housing to the northern market towns and the identified Service Villages. It is an approach which is focused on delivery of housing where community infrastructure and transport options are most well-established.

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.

Option 2 would see some changes to the approach to the distribution from that within the Ryedale Plan. It would continue to seek to deliver housing at the market towns with less emphasis on sustaining those significant proportions to Malton and Norton, acknowledging the existing allocations and commitments. It would also seek to deliver a greater proportion of housing at the villages.

We viewed this as not an approach which seeks radical change or growth in any one location- it is about consolidating the development already delivered or allocated, establishing the amount of housing attributed to settlements, and exploring the extent to which additional villages may be suitable locations for additional development.

We stated that the 2021 consultation when considering a greater amount of housing going to the villages, we will be taking account of:

- Villages' distance and relationship to neighbouring settlements;
- The site specific constraints around some of our villages such as higher flood risk, designated heritage assets, national biodiversity designations;
- What wider opportunities may be presented by specific development for environmental or historic environment considerations;
- Sustainable building considerations;
- What services and facilities they already have or have access to within a walkable distance.

The outcome of the consultation was that both options have been supported for various reasons and perspectives, with no clear 'winner' in terms of an approach. This is perhaps not surprising: what both options 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. It also reflects that the approach to distribution of development is very much about evidenced choices. It is important for ongoing plan-making work that we define which option choice is to be pursued in the review to better frame site assessment work.

Option 1 has to date resulted in strong housing delivery, with aligned and planned infrastructure. Discussions with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers and our emerging evidence base would indicate that continuing with 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. A study in 2018 (Infrastructure and Connectivity Improvements Study) found that some small-scale improvements could be made with softer interventions and improving connectivity and some works to junctions within the towns, but significant junction improvements to bring access to the A64 would come with significant cost and there is the matter of the rail/river crossing considerations in Malton and Norton. Sustaining Option 1 requires a further degree of infrastructure investment at Malton and Norton which if it was to be effective in its operation, is well beyond the scope of being matched/driven by the currently expected additional housing requirement of even c.2500 dwellings to find in this review- if the plan period extends to 15 years.

Pursuing Option 1 into the future is a step-change in how the settlements of Malton and Norton could now grow. We think it needs to be considered/explored in the development of the new North Yorkshire Council's spatial plan as part of its Local Plan and requires a significant step up in housing delivery over a full plan period- and perhaps longer- at these settlements. It also needs to consider the emerging Neighbourhood Plan at Malton and Norton. Option 1 is therefore not considered to remain realistic for the pragmatic review of the Ryedale Plan, but that allocations or the review should not undermine such an approach being capable of being considered in the future.

We can see that there is 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.

However, without the aligned investment in infrastructure which demonstrably responds to providing better connectivity and active travel; the distances of additional development to the town centre of Malton, in particular, are increasing and resulting in potentially more vehicular travel which raises

further air quality and traffic flow concerns. There are also implications for expanded housing delivery on the south western of side of Norton, due to the need to access the Welham Road, Church Street County Bridge junction. It has also been identified that Pickering may have traffic flow concerns at Vivis Lane/The Ropery and the A170/A169 junctions.

Option 2 still reflects the Ryedale Plan's overall approach, as the market towns of Malton and Norton would remain a focus for growth, given the current allocations and commitments, but with a change in emphasis by seeking to not replicate the 50% of any further supply, but to allocate additional land to meet the housing requirement also at the other Market Towns and the Service Villages.

Option 2 also gives the flexibility to consider the scope of the Service Villages. The expanding roll out of fibre broadband and many people choosing to remain working from home for part or all of their working week, post the Covid-19 lockdowns, means that commuting patterns and driving to access some services and facilities is reduced, and allows the ability to consider more development in our more rural areas and existing villages. This has the potential to deliver wider benefits in terms of meeting housing needs more locally including affordable and market housing, supporting existing rural-based services and facilities, and could present opportunities to expand the delivery of rural-based services, as part of a wider programme of rural regeneration exploring the ability to enhance connections between villages around shopping/employment/education.

Some of the larger allocations of the current Ryedale Plan are still to roll out and so there will still be new housing delivery at all the Market Towns, and in particular at Malton and Norton with the planning application under consideration for the close to 700 dwellings of the Norton Lodge scheme. Development at Malton and Norton becomes more about consolidation of the existing sites and allocations. But it would not preclude the making of allocations which were considered, as part of the site assessment process, to be capable of being delivered without significant adverse impacts. In this regard, Option 2 would still have measured degree of focus at Malton and Norton. In pursuing Option 2, there is a need to explore what this means in terms of the quantum of development for Kirkbymoorside and Pickering, and what additional capacity if any exists in Malton/Norton. This is to be the subject of additional technical advice.

We think that as an approach to the distribution of development, Option 2 does present the more flexible of the two approaches and would allow development at the Towns to be sustained, but to also explore housing delivery at the Service Villages, and explore the inclusion of additional Service Villages. This is subject to consideration in the next section of the report.

There is still significant work to undertake before we can make allocations. We need to investigate what the capacity of each of the settlements is. This is both in relation to any constraints which might be present, and any opportunities which new development could bring to the wider area. This will be a key component of the review of the plan, and will be informed by the site assessment work which is on-going. We asked a series of questions about capacity and opportunity at the Market Towns in the 2021 consultation, and we will explore this part of the consultation in the consideration of site choices. As part of this work, we will look at the environmental capacity and constraints of places- principally around the areas of air quality, biodiversity and flood risk, landscape setting, and responding to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

We stated in our 2021 consultation that the chosen approach to the distribution of development could also support facilities and services that are already in operation in the District. We have now mapped various services and facilities to see how provision varies across the district. We can see where facilities and services are concentrated- and this means greater access can be achieved. We can also identify villages where there are considered to be key services, which need to be supported

and where such a service(s) could be shared amongst villages. We have been undertaking specific consultation with those companies and organisations which have a responsibility concerning the provision of utility services, including broadband, highways, education, social care and health services to understand what this infrastructural capacity is, and how it might be expanded in the future.

We are aware that the communities of our towns of Malton and Norton, Pickering and Kirkbymoorside are concerned about the levels of growth they have recently experienced, and this has been raised in the responses to the 2021 consultation. We are also aware that some villages would support some small scale housing, and others have had sizable recent permissions/allocations and are concerned about further allocations, and we will be taking this in account.

Development can also enable wider enabling benefits- these could concern heritage, biodiversity and land management improvements. This is likely to involve a greater role of Green/Blue Infrastructure and specific measures regarding how new development responds to Climate Change. It is very important indeed that new development is more resilient to the impacts of climate change, and increases its inherent building sustainability.

Affordable housing will be expected to be delivered as part of our allocations, and these will still be part of the land supply for new housing. They may also come forward in addition to the Plan's housing requirement as Exception Sites. We will also need to identify sites for self-build schemes.

Since the adoption of the Ryedale Plan, the National Planning policy Framework also now requires Local Planning Authorities to ensure that at least 10% of their housing allocation are on sites which are less than 1ha in size. So this is also something that we will need to factor in at the site assessment stage.

**The proposed approach is to apply the application of Option 2 as a principle:
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.**

Question 2: Do you agree with this as a principle?

Designation of Service Villages

The Service Villages are Local Service Centres- and identified as a tertiary focus for growth, for smaller scale housing sites. They were either as stand-alone settlements or as paired villages, they had the following key facilities:

- a) Regular bus service to higher order settlements to permit commuting; and
- b) Grocery shop with the means to make a meal; and
- c) School (primary and/or secondary)

This resulted in ten Service Villages (some of which were paired settlements).

Ampleforth
Amotherby/Swinton
Nawton/Beadlam
Hovingham
Rillington
Slingsby
Sherburn

Sheriff Hutton
Staxton/Willerby
Thornton le Dale

Option 2 gives the opportunity to explore additional villages. In the 2021 consultation we explored the criteria around how these are chosen in and in doing so what are the key factors which are justifying their inclusion as settlements which merit formal allocation of housing land in principle.

It is important to stress that the designation criteria as Service Village provides the principle of identifying settlements which could be subject to housing allocation(s). But does not mean in absolute terms they *would* be subject to an allocation. There could be site-specific constraints which rule-out some or all of the sites submitted to the Council in specific settlements. Also, as part of this review, the Council will also take into account the scale of previous allocations at the villages, and any approved planning applications, as commitments.

In the consultation in 2021 we asked:

If you live in a village, what would you say are the most important local village services/facilities to your community?

What services and facilities do you consider to be essential/need sustaining, please explain your answer?

Are there specific facilities/ services that a village should have before we consider allocating land for housing at the village?

In a rural district with close to 100 settlements, it is important that a group of criteria is established to select those settlements which it is considered in principle could have a housing allocation attributed to them. When we previously paired villages together they had to have a very close connection.

The threshold cannot be set so low as to group too many settlements together or to use a criteria which is so broad, such as the presence of a school bus service or the ability to cycle between villages. We think to do this would have the following knock-on consequences:

- It would result in a dispersed pattern of development which would be at odds with the spatial approach of the current Ryedale Plan and the approaches we have previously consulted upon.
- If multiple villages are grouped together, the designation criteria would effectively cease to provide a hierarchical framework to which allocations could, in principle, be made.
- It would delay the review of the plan because of the increased volume of site assessment work for the over 300 site submissions.
- It would effectively supersede the criteria-based policy for considering small-scale windfall applications at the villages, which is considered later in this consultation document.

A number of the consultation responses stressed that in order for villages to be identified as settlements identified in principle for allocation, they would need to have key facilities, and that villages without commensurate facilities should not be considered suitable for allocation, as to do so would promote greater vehicular travel to settlements with key facilities. Other community facilities which promote congregation and community cohesion are certainly not unimportant for the vibrancy of rural communities, as recognised by national planning policy, and our own local plan, but they are not considered to be a basis on which to build a framework for delivery of new housing in rural areas.

Some of the existing Service Villages, such as Slingsby, have lost their shop, although no schools or bus services have been lost. Whilst allocations are retained, keeping the existing Service Village Designation as it is currently prescribed would result in a reduced number of villages eligible for allocations in principle.

In discussions with Members over the spring and summer, and the outcomes of the public consultation, we think that the most important facility is access to a daily bus service. It may not be a service with multiple daily stops, but nevertheless allow daily access to our market towns. This would mean that the bus activity may not permit commuting, but it permits access to services and facilities without the need for a private car. Whilst commuting will still occur, there has been a sustained continuation of many people working from home for at least part of their working week. With online shopping the presence of a shop is welcome and its presence should be supported, but it is not necessarily a key feature. Schools are not necessarily required for each household, but remain a key facility for the community as a whole. Presence of a school provides the opportunity for families in the village to have the opportunity to access those key facilities as needed through active travel, as well as being accessed by a range of school bus services.

What did take place in the Ryedale Plan is the pairing/grouping of some settlements where their facilities and services could be shared, this resulted in, for example, Amotherby and Swinton being defined as a 'Service Village' although only one settlement (Amotherby) saw an allocation. This approach in principle can be replicated again, if necessary, to capitalise on the close connections some settlements have. It is considered that access on foot/wheelchair/ with a pushchair should be achievable, as this would inherently allow an individual to cycle to such facilities.

There is therefore a recognition that in order to consider a larger spectrum of villages, or even to retain the existing service villages, that the current, precise definition of Service Villages may not be as relevant. We need a clear framework for identifying settlements capable of being considered for allocations in principle, and we think the proposed approach below for defining Service Villages provides the right balance of ensuring only villages with a strong level of service provision are identified. We also think that despite not having a daily bus service Terrington has a particularly good range of facilities, including a shop, a school including nursery, a Doctor's surgery, with a school bus service and community transport. It is considered that it has a very good range of facilities which would permit access through active travel and, despite the lack of a daily bus service, no other villages have this level of facilities which are not already a service village. When we prepared the Ryedale Plan we included Nawton and Beadlam as a Service Village because they had a secondary school. So we propose:

The following facilities must be present in the village or must be within an accessible distance via walking/wheelchair to these facilities:

- **A daily bus service; and**
- **Either a primary/secondary school and/or a grocery shop**

On this basis, the existing service villages would be retained and the following villages would have two of the three facilities, including the daily bus:

Welburn

West Heslerton

Sand Hutton

Settrington

With the addition of Terrington

This provides an additional 5 Service Villages to the existing 10 designated Service Villages, and retains those existing villages.

Question 3: Do you agree with our chosen approach and if not why?

Section 3: Specific Policy Considerations

The Ryedale Plan has some specific policy choices which we are exploring now as part of the Key Decisions Consultation. These are:

- Occupancy conditions: Local Needs Occupancy Policies SP1, SP2 and SP21 and primary residence condition;
- Development Limits and a criteria based policy for small scale housing sites (Policies SP1 and SP2);
- Space Standards and Accessible space standards (Policy SP4);
- Responding to Climate Change in Policy SP18;

Occupancy Conditions- the Local Needs Occupancy Condition

In the 2021 Distribution of Development Consultation we sought views on whether the Local Needs Occupancy Condition (LNOC) should remain in operation, or whether it is changed, or ceases to operate.

The Local Needs Occupancy Condition (LNOC) is applied to new build housing only within the 'Other Villages' within their Development Limits, or in specific conversion schemes in the Other Villages or Open Countryside (and not at our Market Towns and Service Villages).

New build dwellings in an Open Countryside location are only supported in principle under very specific circumstances, and one of those is when an essential functional need is identified for the dwelling. This essential need test is a long-standing element of national policy, and is expressed in Policy SP2 concerning new dwellings to support the land-based economy where an essential need can be evidenced. Such properties are then subject to an 'agricultural occupancy condition'.

The objective of the LNOC was to ensure that incremental development of smaller settlements was carefully controlled, and on the basis of meeting a local need. It was also a means to focus development at the Market Towns and Service villages, and acted as form of housing restraint. It was effective: with only just over 11% of housing completions between 2012 and 2022 being outside of the Service Villages and Market Towns, (see Appendix 2).

However, the application of a local needs occupancy condition is not explicitly identified in national planning policy. It is an approach that is very commonly used within the National Parks, where housing delivery is strictly controlled. Its restrictive tests would also not necessarily be in alignment with an approach which seeks to deliver more housing to a greater range of villages, to support village-based services and facilities.

The Local Needs Occupancy Condition is also not concerned with the delivery of affordable housing, and so has not helped to deliver more affordable homes in the villages. The experience of implementing the condition has raised costs and complexities for the Council when the properties are built or are re-sold- these have been in relation to the valuation of the property, re-sale delays and difficulties in obtaining mortgages.

The removal of the Local Needs Occupancy Condition from the Ryedale Plan would bring about a number of properties as 'windfall applications'. These are houses which we have not been able to

plan for, so we would not be able to add/factor them into the supply of allocations. This is because we would not know where and how many applications would come forward, so they would be an unreliable source of housing land supply. They would instead be accounted for in the number of completions when they are built out, so we would be able to add them into our housing delivery test performance (% of housing completed against the plan requirement) and would be part of our five-year land supply position.

In terms of feedback on the consultation, the Local Needs Occupancy Condition was supported by those who wanted to see a greater degree of restraint or control in relation to housing delivery in Ryedale's Other villages, but the condition was not supported by those delivering housing, and particularly smaller-scale local builders.

We propose to not continue with the Local Needs Occupancy Condition as part of the review of the Ryedale Plan. The key reasons for this are:

- The condition cannot be modified whereby it can be considered to meet a local need if it is expanded to the Ryedale area;
- It is not in the spirit of national policy;
- There are implications for its sustained implementation to the existing and future Councils around assessing eligibility, issues with mortgage applications and inheritance complications;
- It does not deliver affordable housing;
- It stymies the ability of small-scale builders to build smaller housing schemes.

Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed approach of as part of the review of the Ryedale Plan to cease the Local Needs Occupancy Condition?

Occupancy Conditions –Primary Residence Condition

We also considered in the preparation of the Distribution of Development consultation document whether we explore views on a 'primary residence' condition (PRC) like that used in Northumberland and Cornwall. This would mean if you occupied the property it would have to be your home, where you live the majority of the time, and this is a policy which would remain in perpetuity.

Second homes are where the property is vacant for extended periods of time. Second homes are an issue in some parts of Ryedale, and they are in many rural areas. We have nearly 800 second homes on our council tax records- that is the equivalent of four years' worth of our housing land supply. It is also often the smaller, more affordable properties which are being used like this, taking them out of the housing market for would-be buyers. However, when the location of these is broken down, the Ryedale Plan area has a lower incidence of second home ownership than the settlements in Ryedale which form part of the National Park and also AONB- reflecting the desirability of such places in which to visit or to eventually retire to. We feel there is insufficient evidence to justify the application of a PRC across the District.

With the need to look at policy-making across a much wider geography as part of the new Local Plan for North Yorkshire, it is considered this will be the most appropriate place to consider this as a policy approach if it is to be applied across a broader area in principle. The policies developed elsewhere in the country are still relatively young, and it remains to be seen how they affect housing delivery in the longer term. There is a risk that if the condition is imposed across the district it would harm our wider housing delivery in relation to the proposed allocations. Also, a PRC will not deliver affordable housing (as per the planning definition of affordable housing) nor housing which meets a specific locally derived need, nor will it make properties affordable in a broader sense, depreciating values by about 5%.

Nevertheless, it a matter of concern for Members, and we think it is a settlement-specific sustainability issue. So we feel that this is an area which could be explored and implemented through the Neighbourhood Plan process by any settlement in any part of the Ryedale district including the National Park, should they wish to do that.

It is therefore proposed that a primary residence condition (PRC) is not imposed in the review of the Ryedale Plan.

Question 5: Do you agree with the approach to not propose the application of a Primary Residence Condition?

Housing Delivery for Specific Tenures and Development Limits

Self-Build

Tenure is a reflection of how a property is owned. We have established affordable housing policies and these will reflect a range of different tenure types including affordable housing (affordable rent, social rent, discount for sale, and First Homes) and those sold on the open market as market housing and Self-Build, which is where a property is built for a specific occupant, and they occupy that property for a specified period of time.

We can identify self-build properties because it was a question we asked in our call for sites, and by identifying areas for self-build, we can factor them into the housing land supply. If we use only a criteria based policy we will be unable to demonstrate how these self-build properties could come forward- but we could employ both approaches to provide flexibility. When we refer to a criteria-based policy it would be a set of tests that a site would need to meet- such as, for example, being in or adjoining development limits; maximising energy efficiency and sustainable building approaches, and general wider plan compliance regarding design, siting, amenity and access. In the Distribution of development consultation we asked:

Question 16a: Do we make specific allocations which will be only for Self-Build properties?

Question 16b: Do we employ a set of criteria to assess Self-Build homes by- what should those criteria be- what is most important?

There was generally support for the identification of sites for self-build properties. This will be primarily determined by the site submitter's interest in having self-build plots on their sites. We will not seek to have larger sites deliver a proportion of self-build properties. They will be through a mixture of specific allocations and a criteria-based policy to deal with windfall applications. Such proposals would still need to be compliant with wider plan policies. Planning authorities already have to demonstrate we are meeting self-build demand in the Ryedale area. Our recently completed Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies that we need to allocate sites to meet 28 self-build dwellings a year. This will be explored in more detail through the site assessment work.

Development Limits and a proposed criteria based policy for small sites

Development Limits are drawn around most of Ryedale's settlements to identify a general area of support for certain types of development, particularly housing, and outside the Development Limits being subject to greater restraint. They are a policy tool used to steer where development could happen, and so do not necessarily reflect the built extent of a settlement.

When land is identified or 'allocated' to meet future development needs, the Development Limits are reconsidered as part of this process and expanded to accommodate the site/allocation.

We asked in the 2021 consultation whether this approach was agreed with. Also we asked: *Do we make small scale adjustments to take account of appropriate Self-Build proposals that have been submitted through the 'call for sites' event?*

There was general agreement that Development Limits are retained, but that they are reviewed as part of allocations being made. These allocations would include some small-scale self-build schemes, and larger allocations covering market and affordable housing delivery. But there was some concerns raised that the Development Limits are very restrictive, and have been in place since 2002, and that some local plans do not use Development Limits.

We asked in the 2021 consultation: *If you live in a village, would you like to see more housing development if it brought wider improvements such as public open space, biodiversity enhancements as well as address as a minimum any infrastructure requirements of the development? and Would you like to see development in the smaller villages? If so, what would be your reasons for this?*

The majority of respondents were not supportive, though there was some support specifically for schemes involving the conversion of buildings in order to meet local housing needs. Some respondents qualified their support by referencing the need for investment in infrastructure and services in order to accommodate any development. Many of respondents who were supportive of development spoke on behalf of site submitters.

For those who did not want to see further development, the villages of Wintringham, Terrington and Leavening were referred to specifically. One respondent outlined that they did not want to see further development in any village. We also asked: *Land allocations at the villages have been made to help provide affordable housing in the rural area and to help sustain local services. They could also be used to help support our local landed estates in conserving important heritage assets and landscapes. Do you think that this is something we should be looking to directly support in Ryedale, through the review of the Plan?*

There was support for such an approach from the landed estates, and some support from other stakeholders, but there was also concerns raised that by supporting such development it could undermine landscape and heritage considerations.

Rather than review the Development Limits as an exercise in itself, we have decided to consult on the development of a criteria-based policy which could be applied to small scale housing developments outside of Development Limits. This policy would become part of the reviewed Policy SP2. By referring to development outside of the Development Limits, there is also then an ability to continue to apply the existing wording of SP2 in relation to the treatment of infill development, and development within development limits (subject to any changes regarding occupancy conditions). A draft policy is proposed below:

Small-scale windfall housing schemes

- *The policy applies to sites adjacent to Development Limits at all settlements. Proposals will not be supported if they are not contiguous with part of the existing Development Limits of a settlement or are attached to an earlier scheme previously considered under this policy.*
- *This policy applies to housing proposals of 5 dwellings or less.*
- *Sites which form part of a larger, identified allocation will only be supported if they do not prejudice the development of the wider site, i.e. they do not stymie the wider site from being built out.*

- *Schemes will have demonstrated a sequential approach to their development by development of any deliverable and developable Brownfield sites at the settlement first.*
- *Schemes will be expected to maximise the use of land and provide efficient use of the site by a density of development which also reflects the general density of development within the settlement.*
- *The scheme will be expected to contribute to the delivery of a range of housing types, including self-build, and proposals which support accessible/adaptable homes and propose the application of renewable/low carbon technologies within the development will be supported in principle.*
- *Individually, or cumulatively, proposals will be supported where they deliver incremental growth, which responds to and reflects the form and character of the existing settlement.*
- *Proposals will be supported in principle where they do not result in the loss of spaces of acknowledged value, such as Visually Important Undeveloped Areas, or result in harm to other policy designations such as Conservation Areas and other designated heritage assets Listed Buildings and will be considered in accordance with Policy SP12.*
- *Schemes will be expected to comply with wider plan policies: Policy SP16 (Design) Policy SP17 (Flood Risk) and Policy SP18 (Climate Change – currently Renewable and Low Carbon Energy) and concerning the General Development Management Issues- such as amenity and access (Policy SP20)*

Question 6: Do you agree with the principle of the policy?

Question 7: Is there additional criteria that should be considered?

Accessibility standards in new homes

We identified in the 2021 consultation that we would explore build standards in relation to accessibility. Recent assessment of housing needs, in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, identifies that if current rates of provision were to continue, a further 425 specialist older person dwellings would be required over the 15 year plan period. It is considered that given the evidence base of the SHMA and its findings, there is a need to provide a greater range of accommodation types for an ageing population, to reflect that buildings will be adaptable and capable of allowing people to live for longer in their own home.

There is also the provision of extra care facilities which is delivered through private development and public investment and through the County Council in their capacity as providing adult social care. This is a specific type of housing which is actively managed.

The plan review is mindful of the changes being proposed in relation to building regulations. Planning Policy should not seek to replicate building regulations, nor advance them without evidence to justify that it will not harm the delivery of the housing requirement in the plan.

The Government intends to mandatorily raise accessibility standards by making M4(2) ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’ mandatory through Building Regulations. We are not sure when this standard will be implemented, but for life-span of the plan it is considered that we should allow building regulations to respond to this as a nationally-applied approach. We need to explore whether there is a specific, local response we can make.

The Ryedale Plan is already supportive of the principle of housing meeting a wide range of different

needs. Policy SP4 is already supportive of the delivery of Lifetime Homes, but it is not a mandatory requirement to apply the standards. Lifetime Homes is a long-standing standard which incorporates 16 design criteria to ensure that properties can be adapted to the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of their lives. Although it has been primarily applied in affordable housing schemes, the Council did not apply this as a policy indicator and so it has not been monitored. Specifically, Policy SP4 of the Ryedale Plan also requires that: *At least 5% of all new homes built on schemes of 50 dwellings or more shall be built as bungalows providing this is viable in conjunction with other requirements or where there are overriding reasons why this cannot be achieved in terms of urban design.*

It is considered that this policy has been reasonably well-received by developers, but it is now considered whether or not these properties should now be designed to be wheelchair-user accessible M4(3) standard. Bungalows are a form of building which is conducive to being able to take into account the additional features of a fully wheelchair accessible dwelling. The main reason for revisiting this 5% bungalow requirement is that the seeking of a proportion of bungalows alone does not address the crucial aspects of needing accommodation which is wheelchair accessible, for example, a two storey dwelling with lift but wider doors and circulation space could be much more accessible than a bungalow with standard doors and limited circulation spaces. We feel that if the council is to continue to implement its 5% bungalows requirement, those dwellings need to 'work harder' but without fundamentally affecting the viability. The Key Decisions Consultation therefore seeks views on this whether this is a viable approach in principle, and if not- why, given that it is only 5% of the build- and the provision of bungalows in the first place is the biggest viability consideration and has been an established policy in Ryedale for close to 10 years.

Question 8: Do you agree to requiring the 5% of bungalows specified in Policy SP4 to be built to M4 (3) wheelchair-user accessible standard?

If not, please explain why.

Responding to Climate Change- a review of Policy SP18

We are reviewing the policy on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (SP18) to make it more relevant and active in what it is seeking to achieve: to help deliver our aspirations to significantly reduce carbon emissions in this plan period, and make developments more resilient to the impacts of climate change. This is around working towards net zero carbon in our new development, embedding now adaptation to the impacts of climate change we are going to experience in the future. It is also to support the related agendas of reducing congestion, improving air quality, reducing fuel poverty and increasing energy security and stability. So the whole of the Ryedale Plan plays a role in responding to Climate Change.

Policy SP18 is currently split into two parts, and so we have reviewed in this way. The first looks at stand-alone renewable energy schemes and the assessment criteria we will use to assess them. The second part is concerned with building sustainability, including energy efficiency, and responding to climate change adaptation and mitigation.

In the 2021 consultation we were keen to gauge the depth of concern and feeling regarding how the Local Plan responds to climate change, and in terms of how we approach this, and what should be our priority. We asked people to rank from 1-5: How important do you think it is to maximise the following aspects of new development?

(1 being very important- 2 being Important 3 being somewhat important 4 being less important 5 being least important) for the following:

- Energy efficiency
- Carbon neutrality
- Water conservation
- Active travel (walking and cycling)
- Green and blue infrastructure (spaces for habitat creation/recreation/sustainable water management)
- Biodiversity protection/enhancement/resilience

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 addressed 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.

Responding to climate change is already embedded in the Ryedale Plan, across a suite of policies which have the potential to a) reduce the impacts of new development on Ryedale's natural environment, and b) also to promote the use of sustainable technologies and c) support delivery of schemes which will help Ryedale adapt to the challenges of climate change. Nevertheless, it is considered that the policy on renewable and low carbon technologies (SP18) needs to be updated and expanded to provide:

- a) an updated framework for the consideration of renewable/low carbon energy schemes which better reflects national planning policy;
- b) overtly seeks to ensure new development is reducing its energy (by explicit application of the Energy Hierarchy) and water usage;
- c) promote the use of complementary micro generation on new developments, but to not set specific standards.

Stand-Alone Renewable and Low Carbon Energy generation proposals (Part 1 of Policy SP18)

Looking at the current wording of Policy SP18:

SP18 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments that generate renewable and/or low carbon sources of energy will be supported providing that individually and cumulatively proposals:

- *Can be satisfactorily assimilated into the landscape or built environment, especially in respect of the setting of the North York Moors National Park, the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (and its setting), the Wolds and the Vale of Pickering;*
- *Would not impact adversely on the local community, economy, or historical interests, unless their impact can be acceptably mitigated;*
- *Would not have an adverse impact on nature conservation, in particular in relation to any sites of international biodiversity importance, unless their impact can be acceptably mitigated;*
- *Would not have an adverse impact on air quality, soil and water resources in Policy SP17, unless their*

impact can be acceptably mitigated.

National planning policy and guidance which post-dates the Ryedale Plan outlines that Local Planning Authorities should identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon technology, and specifically so in relation to on-shore wind turbines. Policy SP18 does not provide any 'suitable areas'. These need to be defined in relation to wind technologies, and allocated in a Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan in order for them to be supported as a principle.

The purpose of reviewing Policy SP18 was to assess the Ryedale District in relation to its capacity for renewable energy generation and to identify sites of opportunity and areas of restraint; however, this has not been achieved. When we did the call for sites we did not specify the use of the land, and we did receive some proposals which would involve renewable technologies, but we received none for wind turbines. This means it is difficult for the Local Planning Authority in a pragmatic review to identify suitable areas, as the industry has not provided any areas to consider.

We know that there is a study covering North Yorkshire going to be published potentially before the end of the year. It is proposed to give more specific information about where renewable energy generation could be possible. We think this may be too late to add its findings in the Review of the Ryedale Plan, but will be important as a cross-cutting theme which will be explored as part of the work on the new Local Plan for North Yorkshire, to identify areas of opportunity in relation to renewable energy- particularly in relation to on-shore wind, and ultimately for the planning application process to assess the merits of proposals.

The industry is in rapid advancement and will also need to identify areas of opportunity. Meanwhile, the plan-making process will identify areas of constraint and sensitivities, and the proposals will be subject to extensive consultation undertaken at the plan-making stage, at pre-application stage by the applicant and during the consideration of the application by the local planning authority.

It does mean that there is currently significant policy limitation on the ability to consider particular types of renewable energy technologies (such as new wind turbines), until such areas are identified in the new North Yorkshire Local Plan.

But it is not considered to be detrimental, as significant off-shore schemes are capable of delivering greater contributions, and we think the role of the Ryedale Plan review can be to support decentralised (localised) energy supply and storage infrastructure though site allocations for housing, and development in general.

Question 9: We think the current criteria set out in the first part of SP18 remains broadly relevant and appropriate for majority of renewable and low carbon technologies, and so no changes are proposed to this part of SP18. It is not possible to identify suitable areas within this review of the plan. This part of the policy is therefore proposed to remain unchanged.

Do you agree with this approach and if not why?

Sustainable Build Standards (Part 2 of Policy SP18)

Setting planning policy at this time in relation to sustainable build standards needs to take into account the recent and proposed changes to building regulations. Planning Policy should not replicate building regulations, nor advance them without evidence to justify such an approach.

Building Regulations Part L 'conservation of fuel and power' standards were raised in June 2022 as a stepping stone to the Government's Future Homes Standard which is to be brought into operation in 2025. The Future Homes Standard will require CO2 emissions produced by new homes to be 75-80% lower than those built to current standards. Homes will also need to be 'zero carbon ready', with no retrofit work required to benefit from the decarbonisation of the electricity grid and the electrification of heating. There is also new regulations in place concerning limiting excess solar gain- in both new and existing homes (Part O), and provision of future proofing for EV charging (Part S).

In terms of proposed changes to Policy SP18, the current wording of the policy (which is set out below in italics) will need to be updated to reflect the factual updates regarding references to the former Code for Sustainable Homes (which is no longer referred to national policy) and references to the Local Plan Sites Document:

- All new development will demonstrate that all levels of the Energy Hierarchy have been considered, taking into account the nature, scale and location of the development. The Local Planning Authority will take into account the feasibility and viability issues associated with the delivery of decentralised renewable and low carbon energy. Where it is not feasible or viable to provide on-site renewable/low carbon energy, or within the locality, consideration will be given to Allowable Solutions in line with agreed national definitions.*
- For all new build residential development, the proposal demonstrates that it meets the highest 'Code for Sustainable Homes' standard (or its successor) that is feasible and viable on the site.*
- For major (1000 sq metres or more of floor space) non-residential development, the proposal demonstrates that it meets the highest BREEAM standard (or its successor) that is feasible and viable for that type of development on the site proposed.*
- The Local Plan Sites Document will seek to establish site-specific targets using sustainable building standards and identify opportunities for the use of particular technologies (such as combined heat and power (CHP) and district heating schemes) for sites allocated, subject to feasibility and viability.*

We remain unable to set specific sustainable build standards within this review of the Ryedale Plan which reference specific carbon emission reduction targets. Setting specific proportions of renewable energy use also requires viability testing and an evidence base to demonstrate that it is a standard which will not undermine the financial viability of sites, and ultimately planned growth.

We think that greater emphasis needs to be made on application of the energy hierarchy to reduce energy usage, and to employ a fabric-first approach- aligned with Building Regulations, this is alongside matters around properties' orientation and siting and the use of trees and water (in the form of sustainable drainage systems) to provide shading and cooling. To ensure developments are better able to cope with our more intense weather and more affordable to run. This was the most popular element of looking at building sustainably in the consultation we undertook in 2021.

We have proposed that in relation to non-residential development BREEAM standards continue to be recognised.

We will continue to support decentralised energy generation schemes, and by this we mean smaller scale projects that serve specific areas. We also think implementation of sustainable energy generation should be driven at the site specific level- this will be explored in the site assessment work

and implemented through the chosen new allocations. It is important to note that such an approach will not be possible to apply to existing allocations. Any standards we impose will need to be enforceable, and any site-specific standards could be applied as a 'development principle' where it is precisely defined in the allocation of a site. Officers will explore this with site submitters, and it will be subject of further consultation on sites.

We have decided to explore setting a more stringent standard in relation to water efficiency. Water as a resource is essential for life, but it is ultimately finite and vulnerable to pollution. Current building regulations already require a water efficiency standard of 125 litres of water per person per day, so there is no need to replicate established building regulations in the plan review. However, building regulations have also required an optional requirement of 110 Litres of water per person per day which is already implemented in 'water stressed areas'. However, in a recent letter from DEFRA (1 September 2022), it seeks to:

"...encourage Local Authorities to apply the tighter standard of 110 litres per person per day (l/p/d) set out in the 'Housing: optional technical standards' guidance and prescribed by regulation 36(2)(b) of the Building Regulations 2010".

It goes on to state that in areas of 'serious water stress' (as defined by the Environment Agency) is sufficient justification for the application of the higher technical standard. The north of England is described in the 2021 final classification of water stressed areas as being "not seriously water stressed".

However, in the summer of 2022 Yorkshire Water were very concerned about water levels and implemented a hosepipe ban in the late summer, which was still in place in early October, with reservoir levels at about one third full. Water is being moved round the region, and Drought Permits and Drought Orders are being submitted, and it is anticipated that this will include the River Derwent. Yorkshire Water is supportive of applying a lower threshold of water usage, but also looking at measures on the ground in terms of water appliances and utilities, smart metering and behavioural change.

Water stress may not be as acute in northern England but we think that we need to plan for it becoming much more acute: As pressure increases on resources to support water stressed areas which cover most of the rest of southern England, combined with the ability to cope with the increased prevalence of heatwaves (which also increase water usage). Factoring in too the increased numbers of households, our ageing population, and general population increase will all place further demands on water usage.

This means that there is a greater need now to ensure that developments coming on line in the coming years and into the next decade and beyond employ the 110 Litres of water as standard to ensure that resources can be used in a more sustainable way into the future.

This water efficiency standard has not been tested within a Ryedale context for the viability implications at this stage, this is because:

- a) Ryedale is not an area of low housing demand and low house prices
- b) The 110Lt standard is employed across much of England already and so for economies of scale and efficiency it would not be detrimental to require this higher standard.
- c) This would only relate to new dwellings, and not to existing dwellings or extended dwellings.

The key decisions consultation will provide an opportunity to gain views and feedback on the implementation of this as a policy approach, and part of Ryedale's response to the climate emergency.

Question 10: In summary, we proposed to revise part 2 of Policy SP18 in the following ways:

- **Do not set specific targets for compliance regarding a proportion of renewable energy usage in relation to CO₂ emissions of the type of technology but:**
 - **Propose that new allocations made as part of the review will be expected to have some form of decentralised renewable/low carbon energy generation employed on their schemes**
 - **Explore whether this could be extended to small windfall sites through the criteria based policy**
 - **Propose a standard of 110 lt/p/day for water use in new housing in Policy SP18**
 - **Retain the BREEAM Standards for commercial development**
 - **Require the implementation of the energy hierarchy across all development sites and the submission of a sustainability statement to demonstrate reduced energy needs on sites**

Do you agree with the above changes to Policy SP18?

Section 4: Changes to other Policies in the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy

In this section we briefly mention other specific policy considerations in response to factual changes to National Planning Policy, Practice Guidance and Legislation. There are also some additional policies which we will be considering, but the precise wording on these will be subject to consultation in due course.

We asked in our 2021 consultation are there any other areas of the Ryedale Plan we should be looking to review at this time, and why?

In bold next to the comments we have set out what the review of the Ryedale Plan can do in relation to these aspects.

- Landscape considerations- AONB and candidate AONB with the Wolds – **We are not proposing to review our existing policy on landscapes, except that we will make reference to the candidate AONB of the Wolds**
- Long-term implications of covid on the commuting patterns and ability to live more Rurally – **This is being considered through the approach to the distribution of development.**
- Removing traffic from the centre of Malton and Norton – **this is a very specific aim, and not deliverable through a local plan, as it requires specific highways legislation**
- Improve rural network (broadband) connectivity – **we have been discussing infrastructure capacity with a range of providers, including broadband**
- Responding consciously to flood risk and the impacts of climate change- **we are reviewing SP17 and looking at the sequential test**
- 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 – **we have proposed a small sites windfall criteria based policy**
- Make meaningful progress and publicise the timescales of the local plan – **we have been updating the website with information on our progress.**

We have been applying the policies of the Ryedale Plan over the last ten years, and there are some areas which we are going to review in response to factual changes around the NPPF and the policy's general operation. We have used our Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Document to assess the relative sustainability of our existing and any emerging policies against, and will continue to apply in relation to further policy wording changes. There are other policies in the plan which require more factual changes in light of updated national planning policy.

Policy SP4 (Type and Mix of New Housing)

We were asked to look at Space standards in properties- including those around accessible and adaptable dwellings. This consultation is exploring accessibility standards.

We will be exploring the application of minimum space standards, through **Policy SP4 (Type and Mix of New Housing)**. This is in relation to ensuring that any affordable housing provided meets the right transfer values concerning the room sizes and intended occupancy. It is to ensure that all new homes can achieve these space standards. The Council has also experienced issues with the delivery of homes which cannot be taken on by Registered Providers at the anticipated occupancy level due to bedrooms being unable to have double occupancy and living spaces in three storey accommodation not being large enough to take the expected bedroom occupancy. In dealing with planning applications, we have been able to redress this in relation to affordable housing and ensure that living spaces are commensurate with bedrooms. But this is less possible in market housing. We will be commissioning some viability work to look at this in greater detail.

SP5 (Gypsy and Travellers)

Our new Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment is close to being finalised and it indicates that we need to look for additional pitches. We have a policy in place in the Ryedale Plan which provides an assessment criteria by which to consider new sites. We will be consulting on our approach to additional pitches and sites as part of the sites consultation we will be doing early next year.

SP6 (Delivery and Distribution of Employment/Industrial Land and Premises)

We currently have outstanding allocations and a broad location identified in the Ryedale Plan- and we feel these need to be built out before we look to allocate further employment land. If small-scale expansion schemes come forward we can consider these through our existing policy in the Ryedale Plan.

SP17 (Natural Resources)

We have updated our Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and this will be important for any updates to Policy. This is around setting out the details of the Sequential Test. This is set out in national planning guidance and is how we seek to locate new development in areas of lowest flood risk (Flood Zone 1) but also considering all sources of flood risk.

<https://www.ryedale.gov.uk/resources/strategic-flood-risk-assessment-2021-final-report/>

<https://www.ryedale.gov.uk/resources/strategic-flood-risk-assessment-2021-appendices/>

We will also look at the current policy concerning air quality and see if this needs to be updated.

We received comments in the consultation in 2021 around the following:

- Policy SP17 could be strengthened, taking account of all sources of flood risk and the emerging information from SFRA's – **This will be undertaken as part of the site assessment work**
- 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 **we will incorporate this into Policy SP17**
- 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 - **we will incorporate this into Policy SP17**
- Identify functional flood plain – **this has not been possible as part of the review**

- Specific adjustments concerning protection of Groundwater (potable water supply) protection zones **This is already identified in SP17, but we would be happy to consider any additional wording**
- Additional considerations of water quality and water resources management- **this is to be explored through the site assessment work and changes to SP18.**
- including surface water disposal management which could look at additional policies in these areas **This is already identified in SP17, but we would be happy to consider any additional wording**

Policy SP14 (Biodiversity)

We will be updating this in relation to requiring Biodiversity Net Gain, as part of the Environment Act.

- support the update of SP14 (Biodiversity) to include new information and requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain-
- 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

We are looking at the matter of BNG in conjunction with other authorities and the County Council as part of our approach to considering this across the new North Yorkshire Geography. BNG is to be mandatory through primary legislation, which as material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications would have significant weight. The District Council is mindful that it does not want to press ahead with making specific requirements in this partial review.

We received the following advice from Natural England:

- 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

These are all facets of our existing Ryedale Plan, the review will be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment and detailed site assessment work which will explore these aspects in more detail.

SP16 (Design)

We mentioned in the previous consultation that we may look to update Policy SP16 in relation to design codes, and the delivery of Green/Blue Infrastructure. We feel that this is now better addressed through the site allocations and setting out 'development principles' which could identify design codes and specific blue and green infrastructure schemes on the sites. We will consider in this partial review of the plan the landscape and settlement setting considerations of sites through our site assessment process which identifies key themes to explore around the impacts of developments on the landscape. We have an existing policy on Green Infrastructure (Policy SP15).

Policy SP11 (Community Services and Facilities)

An appeal decision in 2020 resulted in the loss of a rural village pub in Ryedale. Despite Policy SP11 seeking to guard against the loss of community facilities, the Inspector in that case took the view that public houses in the wider surrounding rural area were suitable and accessible alternatives for the local community because they could be accessed by car. This interpretation of the policy is a concern to the Council and is not an interpretation which it considers to support the well-being of Ryedale's communities – particularly those rural, village communities. It is considered that to strengthen and provide additional explanation, it is considered that the reasoned justification (text which is not part of the policy but explains its intended purpose) is amended to make reference for the need to be an accessible alternative being available at the settlement or within walking distance of the settlement, to avoid any doubt that the purpose of the policy is to protect local facilities that serve the local community.

Section 5. Next Steps

Thank you for reading this document, and we hope that you can respond and give us your views on the direction of the review through the questions we have asked. It is very helpful to us if you can complete the online form, but we will accept paper letters. If you want to be notified of further consultations, please let us know so we can add you to our consultee list.

We have further work to do before we can formally publish the review of the plan- a formal stage of consultation known as Publication, which is where we consult on the plan we intend to submit for Examination.

The considerations of the plan period are subject to legal advice, and we will need to give careful regard to any advice we receive.

Whilst this consultation is taking place we will be undertaking specific consultation with statutory consultees and working on and commissioning more technical evidence/appraisal work. Our assessment of sites will be on-going.

Once the consultation is finished we will be collating together the findings from it, with technical appraisal work that will be going on and specific consultation work.

We will then consult on the outcomes and a selection of sites that we think would be suitable, potential sites to be allocated for housing. This will take place early next year.

We are working to a timeframe where Ryedale District Council does agree the Publication of the review of the Ryedale Plan, and this would be in late March 2023.

Appendix 1: The Plan Review Process

The Review of the Ryedale Plan

The Ryedale Plan is Ryedale's Local Plan. It gives direction to how development should happen in Ryedale, and covers the area outside of the North York Moors National Park. It is also known as 'the Development Plan' and is used to provide policies by which to judge planning applications and identify sites for delivering planned growth needs.

The Ryedale Plan was developed in essentially two key stages, with a gap between, where first the general strategic approaches were developed, with amounts of development to different places established. Then in subsequent documents the site allocations were made in accordance with these principles. Before these documents were adopted, sites then came forward as planning applications.

The Ryedale Plan is made up of a series of documents:

Local Plan Strategy- It was adopted by the Council in 2013, after being subject of an independent examination. An overarching, strategic policy document- it sets out in general terms where development is acceptable, and how much development would be delivered in the District over fifteen years- 2012-2027.

Local Plan Sites Document - adopted in 2019- gives site specific policies and the areas of land identified for development known as 'site allocations'.

Policies Map—this shows on a map how the different policy designations operate and was updated to coincide with the Local Plan Sites Document.

Helmsley Plan – Adopted in 2015- this document was prepared jointly with the National Park to look holistically at the settlement of Helmsley and set out approaches to housing delivery and employment land, and to look at any other settlement-specific response needed for Helmsley.

All these documents are subject of the review, although by how much will vary.

What do we mean by a review?

All Local Plans are expected to be reviewed at least every five years, and sooner if there are pressing circumstances which mean a review is needed earlier. Sometimes it is necessary to create a new plan. But the Government does not expect that when plans are reviewed, they are changed completely. Plans are expected to evolve over time and change to meet emerging needs and respond to pressing issues. The extent of a review is subject to a wide range of factors- which can be circumstantial including changes to national planning policy, or a need to respond to a pressing issue, such as climate change. Indeed, the Ryedale Plan was reviewed in 2016. We did this by looking at the evidence around what was our housing need, and how the plan was meeting that need. No changes to any policies were necessary at that time.

When we formally started the review in 2021, the Ryedale Plan is in its later stage. There is a need to ensure that the Plan remains relevant and up to date, with a sustained land supply of allocations, so it can continue to have full weight in considering planning applications. We originally proposed the plan review would provide a plan-period/-life of 15 years between 2023 and 2038. As part of this consultation you will see that we are considering instead ensuring a land supply up to 2032, essentially rolling on the land supply by 5 years.

There are also some wider circumstances which are influencing this review, and this is one of the key reasons why we are looking at a shorter plan period:

In spring 2023 a new Combined Authority will be formed within the established North Yorkshire County Council boundary. Therefore, in terms of the extent of changes to the plan- it is considered that any changes need to be both mindful of the timeframes of the Local Government Reform, and to not prejudice the strategic decision making capability of the newly formed authority who will be tasked with making their own local plan within 5 years.

Our background work on the plan review to date has shown that many social, economic and environment trends remain the same as when the Ryedale Plan was being developed. But responding to Climate Change is much more pressing. The District Council has signed the declaration that there is a Climate Emergency. There is a real need to respond to mitigating climate change by reducing emissions of greenhouse gasses, but also how respond to the impacts of climate change that we are experiencing now and deliver actions on the ground. So the plan review is exploring how we can better embed a response to climate change, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the planning system.

We wrote in 2021 that we are still living with uncertainties around the Covid pandemic and the changes that it has brought to our way of life- particularly in relation to people's working patterns. For many people, the internet has become crucial for working, accessing services and entertainment, and shopping as well as simply communicating with family and friends during the pandemic. It is not expected that this reliance will diminish back to pre-Covid levels. But broadband services are variable across Ryedale. So whilst commuting may be reduced, access to services remains a priority. Since 2022 we have seen spiralling fuel costs, and the war in Ukraine and tensions with Russia are effecting supply chains. In recent weeks we have seen a period of significant instability in the markets and this has affected housing sales, and the ability to obtain a mortgage.

What the review will cover?

The review is therefore, by circumstance, to be targeted and focused on what are considered to be key matters for the review:

- Updating the housing requirement figure (the amount of housing to plan for) based on updated evidence
- The strategic distribution strategy, and within that focusing on the approach to distributing new housing;
- Specific policy matters- around principally, the Plan's response to Climate Change and sustainable building standards and the operation of the Local Needs Occupancy Condition.
- We will also look to update the Plan in light of factual changes around national planning policy and legislation. We will consult on this work at a later date.

Our timetable for the review of the Plan is set out in the Local Development Scheme, which is to be updated in November 2022. We were originally looking to publish (Publication) the plan review in September 2022 with a view to submitting the plan review for Examination in December 2022. There has been some slippage in the timescales, and we now propose to reach Publication by March 2022. This will mean that the new Council for North Yorkshire will need to agree Publication of the plan review, its submission to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination.

Given the timescales we are working to, we are treating this review as essentially an update/roll forward. We are not expecting to be reviewing key policy targets such as the overall amount of affordable housing. We are also not updating our Community Infrastructure Levy Charge which was adopted in 2016.

If policies undergo change- then this will be subject to consultation. If they do not undergo any changes- they will be subject to justification by the Council that the policy remains fit for purpose and this too will be subject to consultation.

We will also not be discarding the existing sites allocated in the Ryedale Plan, since they were only adopted in 2019, but they will be subject to checking when they are likely to be developed and that they remain appropriate. This means these 'saved' sites will be part of the land supply, as well as sites which have planning permission. We will also include any large sites that are currently being built out.

We have undertaken a 'call for sites' in the summer of 2021 and those site submissions have been under on-going consultation. Those site submissions can be viewed at [on-going sites consultation](#). They are under what we have termed a 'general consultation' at this time. We will use the findings of this consultation and that sites consultation, alongside technical information to assess the sites, so we can make decisions on which sites should be allocated in the review.

This means that at the end of the review we would have some policies saved in the existing Ryedale Plan, and new set of policies in the Ryedale Plan Review, and a list of superseded policies. We will also have existing allocations designated as part of the Ryedale Plan and new allocations designated in the Ryedale Plan Review. These will be all displayed in the updated Policies Maps.

Appendix 2: What is our evidence for determining what the levels of housing should be to different settlements?

How effective has the current approach been?

For the life of the plan to date, the approach has been successful. Since the Plan's adoption only two years have seen delivery drop by a small amount less than the plan requirement- of 200 homes a year and in other years, delivery has exceeded it resulting in a mean average of 257 dwellings a year:

Settlement	Completions (net) 2012-2022	% of all completions
Malton & Norton	1226	45.09%
Pickering	611	22.4%
Kirkbymoorside	184	6.76%
Helmsley	53*	<1%
Service Villages	362	13.3%
Other Villages and Wider Open Countryside	323	11.8%
Total	2719	100%

We report on how the plan is working in our Authority Monitoring Reports and these can be viewed at [Authority Monitoring Reports](#).

Housing delivery has been focused on the towns, and these make up the majority of completions with larger sites being built out or under construction at all Ryedale's towns – including Helmsley. A range of sites are either developed, underway or subject of a planning permission in the Service Villages. We only made two housing allocations in the Local Plan Sites Document at the Service Villages, this was to take into account sites which received planning permission from 2012 onwards. One of these allocations now has permission.

The majority of housing delivery was either identified through allocations or was approved by the District Council, and not through planning appeals. We have to date delivered key infrastructure, such as Brambling Fields junction, and the pasture lane junction.

Some of the allocations are larger than others, and so some have taken more time to come forward. A Planning application is now submitted for the large allocation at Norton, known as the Norton Lodge site, which also involves a link road to connect Beverley Road to Scarborough Road and land for a new primary school.

We bring together a range of technical documents, which look at specific issues. We compile studies around the nature and character of places including any site specific constraints, and collate information about services and facilities. We meet with infrastructure providers to discuss what capacity is available for new housing, or what can be undertaken to achieve more capacity. These are considered alongside the responses we gain from communities, including town and parish councils, and statutory consultees who provide specific responses to their areas of responsibility.

Specific areas are:

- Sustainability appraisal scoping report and framework- to technically assess the 'sustainability credentials' of emerging policies and sites- this will then be used to assess the different options and the potential sites through the Site Selection Methodology. More information in this important area of work can be found on our website.

<https://www.ryedale.gov.uk/resources/sustainability-appraisal-scoping-report-and-framework-april-2022/>

- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and this will essentially provide us with our Objectively Assessed Housing Need. This document is now published and can be viewed at <https://www.ryedale.gov.uk/resources/strategic-housing-market-assessment-2022/>
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which we are working on in light of the outcome of the call for sites- which identifies the availability of sites from which to deliver housing requirements. This is being updated in light of the 300+ site submissions we have received

Information on housing delivery and land supply can be found at:

<https://www.ryedale.gov.uk/information/planning/planning-policy/sub-regional-evidence-for-the-ryedale-plan/housing-supply-and-delivery-evidence-for-the-ryedale-plan/>

Please note that we will publish the 2021-22 housing delivery and land supply statement imminently.

- Villages Service Audit – which looks at the distribution of services and facilities across the district We will collate all this information together with the findings of this consultation to develop a picture of where housing delivery is best achieved, and we will prepare background papers for each settlement subject of allocations- and a paper of the settlements/sites where we have chosen not to allocate sites.

<https://www.ryedale.gov.uk/resources/village-services-audit-2021/>

Consultation is on-going in regards to:

- In each of those scenarios it will be the sites that inform the capacity of settlements. Also, communities may wish to express a desire for specific types of housing delivery at their settlements.

- Views from local communities in terms of concerns raised by sites, but also whether communities would like to see specific types of housing to meet different needs
- Views and commentary from statutory consultees
- Site specific constraints – established through looking at sites individually to identify any barriers to their development in accordance with national policy (such as flood risk).
- Infrastructure capacity- established in connection with service providers.
- Landscape setting and impacts on the form and character of the settlement, this will consider heritage and archaeology too.