

## Note of Meeting

**Local Government North Yorkshire and York  
Spatial Planning and Transport Board  
Thursday 10 September 2015, Craven Room,  
CoYC West Offices, York**

---

**Attendees:** Cllr. Ian Gillies (IG), City of York Council (Incumbent Chair)  
Cllr. Jane Mortimer (JMo), Scarborough Borough Council  
David Hand (DHa), Scarborough Borough Council  
John Craig (JC), East Riding of Yorkshire Council  
Cllr Linda Cowling (LC), Ryedale District Council  
Cllr John Mackman (JMa), Selby District Council  
K Dawson (KD), Selby District Council  
Cllr. Rebecca Burnett (RB), Harrogate Borough Council  
Cllr. Chris Metcalfe (CM) North Yorkshire County Council  
Carl Bunnage (CB), North Yorkshire County Council  
Cllr. D Hugill (DHu), North York Moors National Park Authority  
Caroline Skelly (SK), North York Moors National Park Authority  
Cllr. Carl Lis (CL), Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority  
Mike Slater (MS), City of York Council  
Martin Grainger (MG), City of York Council  
Ian Stokes (IS), City of York Council (Secretariat)

**Apologies:** Cllr. Symon Fraser (SF), East Riding of Yorkshire Council

---

### **1. Introduction and Apologies**

- 1.1. As some authorities had new Members on the Board all present introduced themselves.
- 1.2. The Apologies (see above) were noted.

### **2. Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising**

- 2.1 The Minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.

### **3. Election of new Chair (Agenda Item 6)**

3.1 IG suggested it would be appropriate for this item be moved up the Agenda (from Item 6). IS introduced the item and referred to the Terms of Reference for the Board that state:

*3.1. Each of the core Members and the National Park Authority Members shall be eligible to stand as Chair or Vice Chairs, subject to the following:*

- The Board shall appoint a Chair and two Vice Chairs at its first meeting after 1 May each year.*
- The post of Chair shall rotate annually between a member of North Yorkshire County Council, a member of the District Councils, and a member of the City of York Council ( i.e. Year 1 from either CoYC/NYCC, Year 2 from either a district or NPA and year 3 from NYCC/CoYC as the alternate authority from that in Year 1 etc.)*
- The posts of Vice- Chairs shall also rotate annually, being drawn from the members of the two types of council not represented by the Chair for that year (rotation similar to that of the Chair).*

3.2 IS advised the Board that CYC has chaired the Board since 2012, adding that having the CYC Member as Chair has made it easier for CYC to perform the secretariat function for the Board. The Board was in general agreement with this view and agreed to CYC being the chairing authority for this year. IG agreed to be the Board's chair for this year.

### **4. Harrogate District Local Plan Issues and Options consultation (Agenda Item 3)**

4.1 RB introduced the paper and gave the following brief update:

- There are approximately 5000 individual contributors
- Approximately 4000 comments have been received
- Comments have been received from neighbouring authorities and 'Key consultees'
- House-builder and agent responses have , typically, suggested the Plan has insufficient growth
- Resident responses in the main related to where residents live
- HBC is currently considering the responses
- The next stage of consultation is expected in summer 2016.

4.2 The Board noted the above.

**5. The distribution of the provision of housing in the York housing market area. (Agenda Item 4)**

**Discussion**

- 5.1 MG introduced this item by stating that CYC is seeking to gauge the appetite of the Board and the constituent authorities for a sub-regional approach to delivering housing within the context of the Duty to Cooperate.
- 5.2 IG stated that it the belief of CYC's new administration that not all avenues had been explored under the Duty to Cooperate (DtC) for establishing how York's housing could be delivered. CM agreed that CYC's new administration was correct to 'ask the question' as to whether all avenues had been explored, particularly in view of the prospect of devolution and a potential combined authority for the sub-region.
- 5.3 CM stated that although NYCC sympathises with CYC, it also acknowledges that York has a clear role within the sub-region and expressed concern with CYC's apparent 'shift' in position from one of being able to meet its own (housing) need to one of asking others to take some of its need, without any evidence to support it. CM also acknowledged that Green-Belt is a sensitive issue and York's Green Belt is loosely defined. CM also stated that NYCC is keen to work alongside CYC to ensure York performs (and delivers) in its sub-regional role.
- 5.4 MG stated (with reference to the paper) that CYC is seeking to find out:
- Whether the Board / constituent neighbouring authorities are willing to engage with taking a sub-regional approach to delivering housing
  - What the Board / constituent neighbouring consider to be the extent of evidence required to support this approach
  - What the impacts on the ongoing preparation of constituent neighbouring authorities' local plans are
  - How willing the Board / constituent neighbouring authorities are to contribute to gathering the evidence to support a sub-regional approach to housing delivery
- 5.5 JC stated that although ERC sympathises with CYC he expressed concern about the timing of the sub-regional approach advocated by CYC and the impact it will have on the East Riding Local Plan that is currently at Examination in Public, particularly as a change of CYC strategic policy may adversely affect it.
- 5.6 MG enquired whether a sub-regional approach to housing delivery is something to be considered for a future round of local plans. JMo suggested Board should adopt a 'never say never' stance, and this view was echoed by JC.

- 5.7 JMa stated that, at this point in time, pursuing a sub-regional approach to housing delivery is a 'non-starter' for SDC, adding that currently the Local Plans for all other LAs in the sub-region do, or will seek to, meet their own needs. Also the latest SDC Strategic Housing Market Assessment backs-up this position. Furthermore SDC can not demonstrate it has a 5-year housing supply and this has led to planning applications being granted in less than optimum locations. However, notwithstanding this, SDC is willing to look more strategically beyond 2027.
- 5.8 RB stated that HBC is seeking to adhere to its Local Plan preparation timescale. And suggested that the evidence for taking a sub-regional approach to housing delivery needs to be presented before seeking the Board's /constituent local authorities' view on whether to pursue it.
- 5.9 LC stated that she is willing to consider various issues more sub-regionally (i.e. beyond parochial interests), but as RDC has an adopted Core Strategy in place, taking a sub-regional approach to housing delivery is something she (and RDC) would support, but only in the longer-term.
- 5.10 IG proposed that the Board / constituent local authorities consider the current round of local plans as 'Stage 1' and sought the Board's agreement to a potential 'Stage 2' for future plans being more sub-regional in approach. JC agreed in principle, provided it is sufficiently evidenced. JMa advised the Board that local Plans will need to be reviewed at some time in the future. JMa also stated that all authorities had constraints and 'issues' to be considered in preparing Local Plans, and the evidence for taking land out of the Green Belt must show this is a more sustainable approach (than developing in land not within the Green belt).

## **6. Amalgamation of the NY&Y SP&T TOG with the North Yorkshire Development Plans Forum (Agenda Item 5)**

- 6.1 IS introduced that paper which contained a recommendation to the Board to amalgamate the two officer groups.
- 6.2 JMo expressed concern about losing the informality of the NYDPF if it is merged with TOG. DH added that the more informal approach of NYDPF provided a suitable opportunity for less experienced/more junior LA officers to gain experience sub-regional officer discussions and requested the Board the proposal should be referred back to the NYDPF to seek its view on it. The Board Agreed to this.
- 6.3 JMa stated that in his opinion the TOG had not performed adequately, in accordance with its terms of reference, in supporting the Board, adding that the Board had focussed too much on spatial planning rather than transport

(e.g. transport for the north and the northern powerhouse etc.). JMo stated that the Board had considered transport to a significant extent.

- 6.4 MS suggested that there is a need to take stock of all member / officer groups and rationalise them, where possible.
- 6.5 CM suggested there is a need to be more strategic and stated that transport is essential for delivering a spatial plan.
- 6.6 The Board agreed to an offer by CYC (as the secretariat) to prepare for the next TOG / Board a report that addresses some of the concerns expressed above. CB suggested that such a report should look at the functions of other sub-regional groups too.

## **7. Planning Advisory Service Duty to Cooperate Workshop for Members**

- 7.1 IS informed the Board that the previous support package offered by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) and taken-up by the TOG had ceased, but PAS was willing to provide further support under a new package, so the Board's view as to whether to pursue this was being sought.
- 7.2 LC referred to work being undertaken by Government on strengthening DtC, so suggested waiting until this work had been completed before convening a workshop, which RDC, as a LA neighbouring York, is willing to attend.
- 7.3 JMa stated that PAS recently gave a presentation to the Leeds City Region (LCR) Planning Portfolios meeting and suggested something similar for the Board could be done (e.g. a 1 to 1.5 hr presentation + Q&A). MG offered to pursue this with PAS.

## **8. Board and TOG work programme**

- 8.1 JMo suggested that one purpose of the Board is to enable LAs to keep everyone else informed of what they are doing and why they are doing it. CM added that the Board is a key opportunity to present the evidence in support of why certain approaches / actions are being taken.
- 8.2 JMo suggested that the next iteration of the SBC Local Plan should be presented to the next TOG before it is presented to the Board.
- 8.3 JMa stated that the Board had not received TOG minutes.
- 8.4 IG suggested that any work programme should be tailored to the Board's function and for what it has been constituted to achieve. CM suggested the report (see Item 6.6) could inform this.

- 8.5 JMa suggested that LA are required to cooperate, but the authorities in this group do not have a 'statement of cooperation, similar to the LCR's '*Statement of Cooperation for Local Planning*', nor a common methodology for assessing objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) as LCR does. JMA added that having such would strengthen the evidence of the Board's constituent LAs.
- 8.6 IG suggested that for the interim, Board meetings should be held quarterly, with the next meeting to take place in December 2015.

**9. Any other Business**

- 9.1 IG requested Board Members (authorities) inform the secretariat of Items to be placed on future Board meeting agendas and forward papers when necessary.

**Meeting Closed.**