

## **GARGRAVE PARISH COUNCIL**

### **Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Wednesday 23 March 2016 at 7.30 pm Gargrave Village Hall**

**Present:** Chairman Edward Bartle (EB), Chairman of Parish Council, Peter Ward (PW), Cllr Janet Turner (JT), Cllr David Syms (DS), Jane Drake (JD), Rufus Drake (RD), Michael Palin (MP), Ian Maxwell (IM), Chris Lloyd (CL), Louise Kirkup of Kirkwell's Consultants (LK) and Clerk-Kath Ashby

**1. To receive apologies:** None received.

**2. To approve the minutes of the GNPWG held on Wednesday 17 February 2016**  
The meeting agreed to defer until next meeting.

**3. Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting on 17 February 2016**  
The meeting agreed to defer until next meeting.

**4. Current situation with CDC**

a) EB referred the meeting to the response received to the letter sent to David Smurthwaite. Basically to summarise, he is saying they need to assess all sites put forward within the SHLAA. He is talking about the Neighbourhood Plan following the Local Plan.

EB asked LK for her views on this response. LK told the meeting that there is nothing to stop the group moving to submission and taking into consideration the emerging Local Plan. You can certainly move forward to submission and that is probably what you need to do. LK told the meeting that her concerns were the contents of the letter from Natural England, namely the SEA and HRA Screening Report.

b) LK advised the meeting that she is in the process of going through the representations and once done, we can then amend the plan and we should be able to have a submission document fairly soon. There is nothing in the guidelines to say we cannot move forward to Referendum and continue to work with CDC keeping them informed. There is no reason why we cannot carry on but would recommend we try and arrange a meeting with CDC in April.

It would then be worth asking if they have responded to Natural England as it is important that we contact CDC about this matter. We do not know if they are already working to resolve the issues before they publish their Local Plan but we need to find out what is going on.

EB anticipates the Neighbourhood Plan will be done by September at the latest.

RD express his concerns that CDC are putting specific sites forward for assessment which are their own sites and not the sites we are selecting and these will be left out of the assessment process being done by CDC.

PW pointed out that these can only be Knowles House and the Saw Mill sites.

d) JT read out to the meeting the appropriate paragraph from the email received from David Smurthwaite. RD told the meeting that this wording had been picked from technical guidance notes.

LK told the meeting that CDC do have to continue with their process because if they do not progress in the work on Gargrave it would be a complete disaster. There is no reason why they should not look at other sites, as this is their job. If we have followed the proper process, there is no reason why they could not slot our plan into theirs. We should not be duplicating anything. We should move forward to submission at the same time putting comments to the Local Plan through to CDC along with the Neighbourhood Plan.

e) LK stressed to the meeting that she felt that we should move forward with our Neighbourhood Plan as all these discussions are slowing things down.

The matter to be worried about is the letter from Natural England as she felt this was really concerning.

It was agreed that the Parish Council should write to Henry Cumbers and ask what action they are taking to respond to the letter from Natural England and ask if they have commissioned a full Environmental Report.

MP told the meeting that he felt it was very remiss if they have not already done this. LK said she would have thought they would have commissioned a report. There is however funding available for such a report through Locality if this needs to be done.

**To summarise:-**

1. We are not too despondent about CDC's response but it does effect the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan and our intention is to carry on with the NP irrespective of what comments CDC make on March 30th.
2. We need to enquire whether a SEA assessment has actually been done.
3. Arrange a meeting with CDC as soon as possible.
4. Informal Consultation.
5. Submission of the Neighbourhood Plan as this will have a dual purpose and also submit to CDC the Submission Statement which will include the completed Tables and any changes to the Plan, and the Basic Conditions Statement which shows how your Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions.

## 6. Analysis of Representations

LK updated the meeting on the progress of the tables and confirmed she is now in the process of completing the next two columns on each table. Once these are done she can then amend the Neighbourhood Plan.

CDC can however sit on the NP and do nothing with it. Government at the moment are looking into this very issue but there is no timetable set out as yet.

LK recommended the group to talk with local councillors and gain their support to help move the Neighbourhood Plan forward for us.

LK asked the group to help her go through certain points and get a steer on certain issues.

1. G2/3 Knowles House - Objections received as not good access. Do the group wish to retain this site – The group agreed to leave in.
2. Chew Lane, the owners of the land objected to this being designated a local green space. CDC are asking for a lot more reasons. The group agreed to provide suitable written reasons.

The group agreed to keeping all as local green spaces.

EB suggested to the group that workwise it made sense to divide up who is going to do wording for each site. Submit as part of your evidence base.

Peter Ward - Nos 1 & 2

& Kath Ashby

Janet Turner – No 4

Ian Maxwell – Nos 5 & 6

Edward Bartle – No 7

Mike Palin – No 8

The deadline will be 3 weeks' time, 15 April 2016.

LK asked for photos of people using the Village Greens, i.e. walking, picnics etc to include in the Neighbourhood Plan.

G2/6 Saw Mill - Flood reasons given by CDC and the Environment Agency requesting this site to be deleted. A lengthy discussion took place and LK advised the group that if they wished to keep this site in, they needed to provide her with the wording to justify keeping the site in as she did not have that.

CL explained that the Environment Agency look at a very large map and they do not understand that there is an historic building on the site, people already live there.

With the greatest of respect to the Environment Agency, CDC and LK, we as a group know the reality of this site and there is a good solution and we should keep it in.

Edward Bartle and Ian Maxwell were against keeping the site in, the remaining group felt it should be left in and RD will provide the wording to LK within two weeks.

G2/5 Marton Road Site – CL confirmed he had circulated to the group Minutes of the meeting he had attended on Tuesday 22 March 2016 at Area 5 in which NYCC Extra Care Team advised they are looking for a new site for future elderly care in Gargrave. This site, NYCC felt would be a good location for this future facility. A figure of 50-60 units was mentioned. A mixture of building types was envisaged, apartments, houses and possibly bungalows. NYCC to look into this proposal in more detail given the advance progress of the NP. This is very confidential at this stage.

LK to leave the site in but not provide any wording at the moment.  
CL told the meeting that this would certainly strengthen our NP.

G2/2 Neville House Site – The group agreed to keep this site in.

Pasture Land off Skipton Road, Knowles House paddock at the rear of properties on Skipton Road – the group agreed this site should be deleted.

LK told the meeting that within the Police representation, they advise that Gargrave has significant crime figures recorded.

## **7. Timescales**

It is hoped to deal with the representations and submit the Plan for May 2016 providing the SEA is sorted out.

Arrange a meeting at CDC mid-April with H Cumbers, D Smurthwaite and Sian Watson as time is limited. Ian Maxwell suggested that we make ourselves responsible for the minutes at that meeting.

CL and DS to move forward with arranging a meeting with the Heritage Group.

**8. Date of next meeting:** The next meeting was arranged for Wednesday 27 April 2016 at 7.30pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.55pm