

Gargrave Neighbourhood Planning Group
Minutes of Meeting held at Gargrave Village Hall
Tuesday 29 June 2017 @ 7.30pm

Present: Parish Cllrs P Ward, D Syms, J Turner (acting Clerk) District Cllr A Sutcliffe, Jane & Rufus Drake, Mike Palin.

1. Apologies received District Cllr Simon Myers, Chis Lloyd and Ian Maxwell.
2. The Minutes of 10 May 2017, all accepted as a true record.
3. Matters Arising from Minutes of 10 May 2017: Item 7 Proposed Extra Care facilities.
JT told the meeting that as Item 7 referred to Extra Care Facilities and it is in the most recent CDC Local Plan document for consultation, she reported that the Parish Council has had no recent direct contact with NYCC about this development.

It was agreed to contact NYCC directly and ask for an update of their timescale and plans and the planning category.

MP told the meeting that CDC continue to ignore our Neighbourhood Plan and only drip feed information to hold us up.

RD said that the Local Plan will come before our Neighbourhood Plan showing non co-operation to us.

JT referred the meeting and read out an email dated 16.6.17 from John Wilkinson re AECOM a possible funding source.

PW confirmed that funding was not for adversarial work. In the new Local Plan document, CDC stated that Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared. PW stated that "it has been submitted" therefore that is incorrect. He also added that he thought English Nature will do Craven as a whole and not just us.

RD was concerned that this would result in CDC only having reports done on their Gargrave sites within their Local Plan and not our Neighbourhood Plan sites.

JT remembered and RD and JD recalled our consultant saying we could have sites looked at ourselves.

It was agreed to confirm this with Louise and contact AECOM for funding if our Neighbourhood Plan sites not included in the Local Plan.

PW told the meeting of the Spatial Planning Meeting he had attending and AS had chaired two weeks previously. In his given time slot to speak PW had covered

1. The 1-5 year timing in the Local Plan for all proposed developments to be completed. This front loading left Gargrave open to large development over the rest of the planning period. Mr Smurthwaite said he would look into it. The Local Plan came out a couple of days later.
2. Gargrave might have to mount a legal challenge.

RD suggested that the Parish Council should ask the Minister directly as there is obviously no co-operation. However he feels for the Parish Council "taking on" CDC, who have no respect for us.

MP told the meeting that having looked at the document on his iPad, it stated the HRA has been done for the Local Plan.

JT said that whilst writing these minutes we need to look and see if it covers all our sites and ask Louise if she has had heard from Feeney and Parker.

RD asked PW about the rest of the Spatial Planning meeting and PW talked a little about Giggleswick and attendants.

AS recommended we approach Cllr Simon Myers for a possible local Barrister to meet in Chambers to advise the Parish Council of a way forward.

It was agreed to contact Cllr Myers for a contact to discuss our legal options.

JT (Wed morning phone call from AS will help with contact of Barrister and check if any names given have done CDC works. Annette Moppet is CDC Legal Person and would probably get involved if we go down the legal route)

JD told the meeting that the NYCC site might end up as housing alone and not a care facility if NYCC fail to get the development they want. AS & PW agreed.

General discussion took place regarding the Eshton Road site in the Local Plan which is C3 and should be a different category to normal housing.

It was agreed to ask what the special planning category for care hub to both NYCC and CDC. AS spoke about Affordable Housing and CDC's problems with developers and their push to lower 40% to 20% housing on new sites.

The discussion then moved to the A65 site adjacent to the Cricket Field.

AS Spoke about developer being 'tied down' and them pushing the Environment Agency to change flooding levels.

PW said he was worried about the whole aspect of this development i.e. Its length of time, its actual house plans whether they are built high enough to cope with a flood and the water's route from Eshton Beck onwards towards the river. The flood zone 3 did not include water from other sources. He suggested giving the developer 1 month and then CDC make a final decision.

AS agreed to ask Neville Watson on his return from holiday, as to where we are with this site (back 11 July)

General discussion then took place relating to Hellifield sites, led onto Green Spaces and Local Green Spaces. Gargrave's not specified in Local Plan.

General agreement to send a letter to CDC that 'Before our response to the six week consultation process, we require ASAP confirmation of various pieces of information. This will help us formulate a response within the prescribed time.

1. The Eshton Road site for NYCC GA009 What is the correct planning category please?
2. The three sites within Gargrave you have put forward for completion are all within the first 1-5 years of the plan. Mr Smurthwaite agreed to look at this front loaded timescale.
3. We have no record in recent Spatial Planning meetings of tier 3 villages, Gargrave being one, where housing levels were agreed to be raised by 3.5%.

4. Your recent Local Plan document has no reference to all of Gargrave's Local Green Spaces despite assurances from your department they would be included.
5. Why have you referred in your opening paragraph to Gargrave as a village Neighbourhood Plan in preparation when the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted?

As there was no further business the meeting closed at 9.30pm.