

Public Document Pack

Local Plan Working Party

Held at Virtual Meeting
on Thursday 13 October 2022

Present

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

In Attendance

Rachael Balmer, Matthew Lishman, Lizzie Phippard and Jill Thompson

Minutes

58 **Apologies**

No apologies were received.

59 **Minutes of the meeting held 4th August 2022**

The minutes were approved, however Cllr Andrews voted against their approval and Cllr Thackray abstained.

Cllr Goodrick stated that they were a reflection of what was discussed; Cllr Cleary agreed.

60 **Report**

Rachael Balmer introduced the report by explaining that Officers were seeking a steer from Members regarding the following policy approaches:

Criteria based policy for small-scale windfall sites

Members broadly agreed with the recommendations as presented in the report, in relation to the use of criteria for small sites across the Ryedale Plan area for up to 5 dwellings.

Treatment of occupancy conditions

Members broadly agreed with the recommendations as presented in the report, and the decision to remove the Local Occupancy Condition as part of the review of the plan was unanimous. However Cllr Andrews did not agree with the non-application of a Primary Residence Condition, stating that to continue without restriction would result in houses being sold to the highest bidder, to the detriment of local people.

Embedding climate change mitigation and adaptation

a) Consideration of stand-alone renewable and low carbon energy technologies (part 1 of Policy SP18)

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation as presented in the report, which was to continue with the criteria-based approach presented in SP18 currently, and that the Council is unable to identify specific areas for on-shore wind technologies.

b) Sustainable build standards (part 2 of Policy SP18)

Regarding the recommendation for not setting specific targets for compliance relating to renewable energy usage, Members felt that it could be more strongly worded.

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation regarding water usage.

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation regarding BREEAM standards.

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation regarding the energy hierarchy; however, Cllr Mason pointed out that it should be enforceable, whilst Cllr Thackray suggested that viability statements should be submitted with planning applications, as opposed to 'sustainability statements,' as suggested in the recommendation.

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation regarding decentralised renewable/low-carbon energy schemes to feature in allocations.

Members were keen to ensure that Green Infrastructure/SuD's and Biodiversity Net Gain were also considered. Officers advised that they are already within the plan.

Accessibility and space standards

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation as presented in the report, to explore requiring that the current 5% requirement for bungalows on sites of 50 units and over (Policy SP4) be delivered to wheelchair user standard M4(3) which is set out in Building Regulations and an optional technical standard for Local Planning Authorities to apply.

The to-plan-for figure

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation as presented in the report, however Cllr Andrews did not agree, suggesting that the 200 figure should factor in a windfall allowance of 25%, meaning 50 dwellings would be considered as windfall. Officers explained the reasons why, although such an allowance can be made, it gives the plan resilience and helps at Examination if the full plan requirement is delivered through allocations.

The Plan-period – regarding local government reform and the scope of the review

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation as presented in the report which is to explore rolling-on the plan period from 2027 to 2032, to deliver an

additional 5 years of land supply. This would be different to the previously approved approach of looking for a land supply of 15 years from 2023-2038. Officers have suggested this in light of recent advice in relation to the legal obligations placed on the new council of North Yorkshire to prepare a new Local Plan within 5 years of vesting date and in that position, the new Local Plan will supersede the Ryedale Plan by 2028/29.

Spatial principles around the distribution of development and the settlement hierarchy

Members broadly agreed with the recommendation regarding no specific proportions attributed to settlements.

Members were not in full agreement with the recommendation regarding options for spatial distribution. Both Cllrs Andrews and Thackray did not agree with the recommendation, whilst Cllr Mason agreed, only pending further details. Cllr Potter and Cllr Cleary agreed that, of the two options presented, Option 2 would be preferred.

Members accepted the recommendation regarding the Helmsley Plan light-touch review which is to allow the plan to continue to operate without modification – a decision which aligns with the National Park. However, Members are expecting that Helmsley would not be considered in isolation into the future, and planning matters at Helmsley would be subsumed into the new Local Plan for North Yorkshire with joint working with the National Park. Cllr Andrews abstained from making a recommendation.

Defining the Service Villages

Members generally acknowledged that the Market Towns would be as they are currently identified in the uppermost tiers of the hierarchy.

There was some disagreement voiced with the principle of a settlement hierarchy. There was some discussion that clusters of villages which share services should be considered, whilst the hierarchy system should be discontinued as villages are interdependent on one another. Schools' vulnerability to closure was also pointed out. Cllr Thackray also stated that it was disappointing that the consideration of a new settlement had been dismissed.

It was suggested that the criteria should be widened, including the suggestion that 'access to a school bus' would be a more worthwhile inclusion in the definition of service villages than the existence of a school, to spread the load of development.

Cllr Potter highlighted the need for active travel routes.

Of the two options presented to Members regarding the adjusting of the criteria for Service Villages, Option 2 was viewed more favourably because it gave the need for a daily bus service (not commuting or school) and either a

school or a shop. This resulted in the retention of existing service villages and additional Service Villages (Welburn, West Heslerton, Sand Hutton and Settrington), whilst there was no objections raised to the inclusion of Terrington as a Service Village because of the level of facilities at the village, which includes a doctor's surgery.

Officers have reflected this discussion in the forthcoming report to Policy and Resources in terms of what was discussed, and have set out the implications of taking such an approach in relation the nature of the partial and pragmatic review of Ryedale Plan and other consequential impacts.

61 **Any other business**

There was no other business.

Meeting closed 21:16