

Gargrave Neighbourhood Planning Meeting
Minutes of Meeting held at Gargrave Village Hall
Thursday 4 January 2018 at 7.30pm

Present: Pr Cllrs Peter Ward, Janet Turner, David Syms, Martin Banks, Bryony Lebeter, Alan Robinson, Kath Ashby-Clerk, Rufus and Jane Drake, Ian Maxwell, Chris Lloyd and Mike Palin.

JT chaired the meeting this evening and welcomed everyone. She introduced to the meeting our new Parish Councillor, Mrs Bryony Ledbeter.

JT asked the meeting if we could put Point 7c) the very last question and place it as point 1 on the agenda.

At last month's Parish Council meeting, any proposed changes or updates were discussed and we asked permission to alter the Neighbourhood Plan before we sent this off to CDC. As you know the Neighbourhood Plan is now under the auspice of the Parish Council. It was also agreed to hold this meeting tonight before the document was sent off to CDC, so they have not yet received from us the updated version.

If you recall, David Feeney told us some time ago that he planned to work over the Christmas break on the necessary work needed on the SEA/HRA.

It was agreed that the Clerk would contact David Feeney tomorrow to ask for an update on this work and see if this has now been completed, also ask for some timescales.

The Local Plan is now in public consultation from the 2nd January 2018.

MP pointed out that CDC did promise it would run concurrently. If there were no implications in the SEA/HRA our plan will be ready to proceed.

RD felt that we needed to pin CDC to a timescale.

PW told the meeting that if we can agree the amendments this evening, the updated plan can be with CDC by the end of next week.

2. JT told the meeting that going back to when we were creating our Neighbourhood Plan early days, Louise Kirkup instilled into us that the NP was just not about housing numbers but looking at the whole of the village to see what we want our village to look like and this is the ethos of how we would like it to be.

Over the years we have really looked at housing numbers and plots of land for development or not, on the sites we are looking on to build or put on the back burner and Chris Lloyd very kindly agreed to put something together for us.

CL explained that if we do not this, for example the Cricket Field site is an awful example of what could happen so that is the reason he did this work.

RD had concerns if you are too specific, without an evidence base it will be questioned by a developer. He did not feel we should be setting out a specific design and 3 storey properties is specific.

CL then explained to the meeting the reasons behind his suggested design.

JD felt that you could not compare three storey development along canal side in Skipton with the rural village of Gargrave.

PW said he too was nervous about 3 storey development, and suggested wording indicating not more than 2 ½ storey properties.

JT pointed out that we do have ¾ storey buildings in the village, either built as houses or converted mill buildings.

MP told the meeting that they are old buildings. We are talking about a canal in the countryside here, two entirely different spots.

General agreement some 3 storey new builds have not all been as sympathetic as villagers would have liked.

It was suggested that G8.8 be removed from the NP altogether.

3. CL confirmed that the National Policy is the main evidence base. Density has increased by 80%.

RD felt that we do need to adhere to some National Policy or otherwise someone will pull this policy to bits, therefore an evidence base is needed.

JT pointed out that we still have a consultation process to go through and this is something that can be pointed out at that time.

JD said that this last consultation is a public consultation about checking the technical processes, not about the detail of the plan.

After further discussion CL and MP agreed to put some wording together and send through to the Clerk and certain amendments were also agreed.

Page 41 - take out the first sentence altogether.

Page 42- Map should read A65, not A54

Page 43 and 44 everyone was happy for these to stay the same.

Page 109 - spelling mistake, Church not Chirch.

As there was no further business, the meeting closed at 9pm.