

Gargrave Neighbourhood Planning Group
Minutes of Meeting held at Kirk Syke
Wednesday 10 May 2017 @ 7.30pm

Present: Parish Cllrs Peter Ward, Janet Turner (Chair), David Syms, District Cllr Alan Sutcliffe Jane & Rufus Drake, Chris Lloyd, Mike Palin, Ian Maxwell and Clerk – Kath Ashby.

1. To receive apologies for absence: District Cllr Myers.

2. To acknowledge those present.

3. Update from Consultant and latest from Ruth Parker and David Feeney:

JT asked the meeting if they had all read the latest response from Ruth Parker and David Feeney received on 12 April with several pages of comments and suggested amendments.

AS told the meeting that he was furious about the response the Parish Council had received and noted that our Consultant has done a suggested response which will be sent next week. At this present moment in time the Local Plan is going nowhere. CDC no longer has a low cost housing policy, it is illegal and until such time as a new policy is agreed, the Local Plan cannot progress and go forward. CDC are faced with a situation where their Local Plan has again been put back another eight weeks. He recommended we take our Consultants advice and use her draft response back to CDC.

PW advised the meeting that we will use our Consultant's response and intend to definitely remove the final paragraph of the draft but we may well add a further paragraph.

RD suggested that we do not include housing figures but go with the point Louise Kirkup has made whereby she proposes that rather than amending the plan now and possibly again in the summer following completion of the AA work, it would be more proactive for CDC to provide written detailed comments reflecting the most up to date position once the Plan is published for Regulation 16 consultation. The Examiner would then be able to consider such comments as part of his or her report and make any recommendations for changes as required.

JT told the meeting that LK told us that we could apply ourselves for inspection as she mentioned in the January meeting. She advised RP and DF information at that meeting that they should have already known.

After further discussion it was suggested that it might make sense to put our name forward and in the interim CDC might come up with the other information needed for us.

This would mean two possible parallel routes:

1. Inspector
2. Louise's response and amendments.

AS advised the meeting to do it independently, consultation, inspection and through to Referendum. Also to bear in mind that the Local Plan is going nowhere at the present time. It is costing CDC £160,000 per month in costs up to now.

PW confirmed that he will speak with our Consultant as soon as possible and that we do not intend to change our NP, we will amend when it has been to Inspection.

We have already amended our NP three times, resulting in two consultations and now CDC are coming along with more amendments. MP to draft some comments.

4. Saw Mill Site update and EA information:

JT told the meeting that we have had various conversations with the owner of this site and received correspondence this week and at our recent Parish Council meeting this week, some of the Cllrs were quite concerned that perhaps we had allowed ourselves open for something legal to be through back at us.

CL felt strongly that we should keep this site in the NP. It would benefit the village, and develop an old building, it is brown field site and there are lots of reasons why it should be developed.

CL confirmed that he had a long conversation back in March with Neville Watson, who initially supported this site and he suggested another conversation with Neville Watson should take place. PW agreed to advise the Architect accordingly.

After discussion PW agreed to also advise the Architect dealing with the matter on behalf of his client, to contact David Smurthwaite who is the Planning and Re-generation Manager. JD advised the meeting that she felt by putting this site back in it would look confrontational with CDC.

CL pointed out that what matters is the end result on that site.

5. Planning Application adjacent to Cricket Field, latest from Mr Morton:

JT highlighted 4.3.2 within Ruth Parker's comments which she feels is definitely referring to the Skipton Road site.

Originally this was a mixed site.

RD told the meeting that by approving this site, it would erode everything we have worked for.

AS asked the meeting, "do we want it refused"? Yes.

He has already spoken with Neville Watson, CDC regarding this application. Two thirds of this site is in the flood zone. The Environment Agency has not changed its mind, therefore he will automatically recommend refusal.

AS advised the Parish Council to write to Mr Morton same as to CDC.

AS told the meeting that the application will still come to a planning meeting and it is important to have Cllr Simon Myers to speak at that meeting. He will be allowed to speak for as long as he wants. AS explained to the meeting the planning procedure and the sequence of events at the planning meetings.

It was agreed that Claire, one of our consultants will also speak on behalf of the Parish Council but will only be allowed to speak for five minutes.

AS also suggested a meeting the week before the application comes to the planning meeting, so that the Parish Council can submit any late information.

For example: Flood Zone, the implications on the Neighbourhood Plan.

AS advised the Parish Council to write to Mr Morton on the lines of the information contained in his latest update and the attachments in his submission made by Johnson Mowat are factually incorrect. Therefore utterly refute all contents made in his response and the attached documents.

Stating that the Parish Council not willing to maintain any further dialogue in the future in any form.

6. Actions going forward for Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan:

JT told the meeting that she wondered if we should prepare a short summary of where we are at with the Neighbourhood Plan so that people are kept in the picture just to let them know an update. JT to prepare some appropriate wording along with the Clerk so that this can be placed in the Parish Magazine along with the new website information.

7. AOB:

CL asked if there was any further news regarding the proposed Extra Care facility planning for the village. JT confirmed that nothing further had been received.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.15pm.