

Roy Banks

From: Ruth Parker
Sent: 17 December 2018 09:29
To: 'Robert Bryan'
Subject: FW: Gargrave GA031

Robert

I forward you an email received by CDC from the MRWG on Fri 14th Dec, which is addressed to you however it does not appear to have been sent to you.

Kind regards
Ruth

From: Marton Road [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 December 2018 13:20
To: Ruth Parker; David Smurthwaite
Cc: Jeff Adams
Subject: Gargrave GA031

Dear Robert

Thank you for your response to our concerns covering the housing proposal (GA031) in the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan.

We apologise for our continual questioning of the neighbourhood plan at this stage of its development, but we are sure you will appreciate that our concerns are not based on some ulterior motive to discredit the plan per se, but for a genuine concern for the people who live on Marton Road and through to the bridge onto the A65.

A continued catalogue of concerns for safety on the road, sewage problems etc by all, but in particular senior citizens and the apparent lack of willingness of the Parish Council to 'sit back' and ask themselves if they have really given enough thought to the housing proposal, coupled with what appears to be a 'mission' to push through their proposal and apparent comments like 'we must be squeaky clean' in the future and 'the Marton Road site is going ahead over my dead body' do not lead us to feel that those responsible really care about Probity.

We recognise that your focus concerns issues of procedure at this stage. We have looked carefully at the information that is available in the public domain and recognise the extent of consultation, especially over the period 2015-2015. It is not this that concerns us, but interpretation, thoroughness, transparency and ultimately probity that is of concern

We spelt out our concerns in the paper dated 4th December. In your email response you say that you will be looking at fairness and transparency as part of your examination and the need to 'comply with the basic conditions as expressed in the Town and Country Planning (General) Regulations 2012. We assume this has been covered in the context of Part 5, 14-16.

We hope you can see 'the trees for the wood' in our paper

But to reiterate those points which we feel are relevant to fairness, transparency, due process, fit for purpose etc we list them below

Formal and Informal Consultations:

The way in which the results of the questionnaires etc have been used, especially when majorities against (67%) are overridden to keep sites in and in other cases the same percentages used to take sites out

The compilation of the tables from the raw data, their emphasis and possible misrepresentation **(the neighbourhood plan uses informal responses to make decisions)**

We have requested site of the raw data to undertake a full audit, but feel it should also be completed as part of the examination process

Highways

In the light of continued concern for safety, inclusivity and sustainability why the Neighbourhood plan didn't investigate the suitability of the road system down to the A65 as part of its process to ensure the final recommendations are fit for purpose

Why the impact on a Grade 11 listed bridge with insufficient footpath for the safety of pedestrians, especially children been collected for bussing to local schools and the disabled was not fully considered

Why one part of the report says a TA would be required and another that it is not

Why the fact that we believe a significant part of the road into the village is in the conservation area, the feasibility of making it fit for purpose was not investigated

Why important information (independent highways report) which was made available to CDC and GPC in December 2015(at the hight of consultations) is not referenced or investigated in depth. Indeed, the chair of the Parish council stated at the last council meeting that it was attached to the proposed site GA025 and the first sight they had of it was when the MRWG or CDC sent it to them recently

Sewage

Again, In the light of continued concern for safety, why the Neighbourhood plan didn't investigate the suitability of the sewage system to ensure the final recommendations are fit for purpose. It should be noted that Gargrave residents' concerns for the sewage system are a major concern raised from the first consultations through to the last

Wild Life

It is known that many protected/endangered species use site (GA031) throughout the year and cannot understand why a detailed biodiversity assessment is not considered part of the concerns for building on a green field site

Equality for all

We can find no consideration of the proposal for Marton Road having taken into account its impact on equality and diversity (which we believe the 2010 Equality Act says it is illegal not to do so)

In addition to the above there are several concerns 'below the waterline' that raise questions of due process, fairness etc

In Particular

1. The use of consultants to argue the Parish Councils case for objecting to an outline planning application for one of the sites in Gargrave which was favoured by many in initial consultations (who paid for this)
2. The admission by the Chair of the council at the last parish council that 'there was a whole raft of information/documentation that had not been looked at'
3. Mentioned earlier, the apparent lack of diligence in giving due regard to the independent highways report

We feel the above are all concerns for Transparency, Fairness, Due Process, Fit for Purpose and Probity and hope that they may come within your terms of reference. If they do not we would be obliged if you could let us know.

You will appreciate that we don't accept the responses within the Neighbourhood Plan to issues of concern by residents concern for the housing proposals.

We do not feel that Government guidance on Neighbourhood planning has been followed with the thoroughness you would expect when 45 houses are being proposed on a green field site on the edge of the village

'A qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or order will contribute to improvements in environment, economic and social conditions or that consideration has been given to how potential adverse effects arising from the proposal may be prevented, reduced or offset'

If any of the above can be clarified with yourself and Ruth over a coffee at your offices, we would be happy to come.

Thank You

MRWG