



Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting #7

6th February 2017, Chapel Schoolroom, Hutton Rudby

1. Attendance & Apologies

Attending: Allan Mortimer (Chair), Jonathan Cooper, Rosie Danjoux, Bridget Fortune, Liam Percy, Karen Picking, Richard Readman

14 members of the public

Apologies: None – all steering group members in attendance.

2. Procedural Issues

a) Minutes Of 5th December 2016 Meeting

Accepted.

b) Actions From 5th December 2016

Item 4): Deliver completed paper questionnaires to HDC.

Action: Allan Mortimer: **Complete**

Item 5): Arrange new interview date with KVA Planning:

Action: Allan Mortimer: **Complete**

Interview took place on 5th Jan, and recommendation of interview panel to appoint KVA was approved by RPC at their 9th January meeting. Letter of appointment signed 25th January 2017.

c) Contacts From Developers / Agents

None since last meeting.

d) Re-scheduling of May Steering Group Meeting.

Steering Group meetings are normally held on the first Monday of each month. In May this falls on the bank holiday so to avoid holding the meeting on a bank holiday, it was agreed to move the meeting to Tuesday 2nd May at 7pm.

e) Call for additional steering group members.

With 7 steering group members, we are slightly below the 8 to 10 members originally targeted. If we could add a member from the Levensdale area, and someone under 40 then there would be a better geographic, and age balance within the Steering Group.

A Levensdale resident (Adrian Davey) indicated an interest in joining the Steering Group but said he wanted to have a discussion after the meeting about what is involved before committing.

3. Costs / Budget

Costs incurred to date are listed below:

2 nd June	£16.00	Room Hire (1 hour)	Village Hall Main Room (Team Meeting)
9 th June	£26.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Village Hall Johnson Room (Team Meeting)
22 nd June	£32.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Village Hall Main Room (Team Meeting)
4 th July	£14.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Chapel Schoolroom (Steering Group)
21 st July	£0.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Village Hall Main Room (Team Meeting)
1 st August	£14.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Chapel Schoolroom (Steering Group)
5 th September	£14.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Chapel Schoolroom (Steering Group)
3 rd October	£14.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Chapel Schoolroom (Steering Group)
7 th November	£14.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Chapel Schoolroom (Steering Group)
15 th November	£506.00	Questionnaire printing	
5 th December	£14.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Chapel Schoolroom (Steering Group)
6 th February	<u>£14.00</u>	Room Hire (2 hour)	Chapel Schoolroom (Steering Group)
Total	<u>£676.00</u>		

Estimated costs to end March 2017

6 th March	£14.00	Room Hire (2 hour)	Chapel Schoolroom (Steering Group)
	<u>£1,050.00</u>	Planning Consultant	(assumes 3 days @ £350/day).
Total	<u>£1,064.00</u>		

Grand Total £1,740.00

Estimated balance of HDC grant remaining at 31st March 2017: **£1,260.00**

Note: Previous estimate of £1,750 consultant costs in period assumed earlier appointment date.

Preparation for the My Community / Locality Grant application needs to be progressed. The rules of the current funding round (which commenced 1st Feb 2017), are that any grant awarded must be used within 6 months or by 31st December 2017 whichever is earlier.

Action: Allan Mortimer

4. Planning Consultant Introduction (Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning)

Allan Mortimer welcomed Katie Atkinson to the meeting. Katie who is based in Helmsely gave a summary of her experience of Neighbourhood Planning.

5. Questionnaire Results

Allan Mortimer presented the results of questionnaire to the meeting for review and discussion. These had previously been distributed to Steering Group Members, and will be made available on the Neighbourhood Plan website after the meeting.

5.1 Background

Prior to presenting the results, Allan Mortimer described the steps taken to reach this point:

- Last summer the main focus was on providing information about Neighbourhood Planning and identifying key issues. This included providing an information stall at the village event, and holding workshops sessions. The main issues identified were:
 - Community
 - Housing
 - Development Sites
 - Traffic and Transport
 - Environment
- In October there was a well-attended community workshop, through which the proposed Vision Statement and the question detail behind the issues were developed.
- The questionnaire was made available from 22nd November until 19th December in both paper and on-line format.
- Results were collated by Hambleton and the summary provided to the Steering Group on 17th January.

5.2 Role Of The Questionnaire

The principle aims of the Questionnaire were:

- To test community reaction to the Vision Statement
- To determine whether the key principle of Neighbourhood Planning is supported (i.e. it is about guiding development, not a means to prevent it).
- To quantify opinion on various issues to determine where there is consensus and where there is not.
- To gain further insight into community views on the issues through the comments.

A secondary objective was to continue to build awareness and understanding of the Neighbourhood Plan and engage more people in the process. As a result of the questionnaire, the email contact list has grown from 208 to 330 members.

It should be noted that the Questionnaire results include some issues which fall outside the core remit of a Neighbourhood Plan. The Steering Group will prioritise Neighbourhood Planning issues, but will also work with the Parish Council and other community groups so that any points raised which fall outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan are directed to an appropriate place for attention.

5.3 Questionnaire Results

Full details can be found at: <http://plan.rudbyparishcouncil.org.uk/wp/questionnaire-results/>

The discussion points which arose during the presentation were as follows.

Q1. & Q2 – Who Responded

One paper copy was distributed to each of the 979 addresses in the parish, and a total of 399 responses were received. The Steering Group had been advised that 20% to 30% for a survey is a good response rate. The Steering Group are, therefore, satisfied that an acceptable overall response rate has been achieved.

Most responses (93%) were from “Parish Residents”, and in particular from long term residents (10 years to whole life) who provided 73% of the responses.

The only area of concern was that the response rate amongst under 40s was estimated to be only around 5%. It was agreed that during subsequent stages of consultation that there needs to be specific focus on improving engagement with this group.

Q3 – Vision Statement

There was an overwhelming endorsement of the proposed Vision Statement: 361 respondents agreed with it, and only 10 disagreed.

A few of the 60 comments received on the vision statement suggested some adjustments to the wording. However, ***it was agreed not to refine the vision statement given there was such a large majority supporting the proposed version.***

All comments including these will be individually reviewed and a written response published on the Neighbourhood Plan website.

Neighbourhood Plans give communities influence over the type of development in their area, but cannot be used to block it. The Steering Group view the endorsement of the Vision Statement (which includes a commitment in principle to some form of development), and the responses to Q11, Q12 and Q13 (which show that a large majority support some form of development) as strong evidence that ***the majority of the respondents have views compatible with this fundamental principle of Neighbourhood Planning.***

Q4 – Local Services

The services viewed as most important, with almost a tie for first place, were the GP, the School and the Village Shop. Not far behind were the Post Office, the Pubs, the Hub and the Churches/Chapel. A bit further back was Hairdressers which still was rated as important or very important by 2/3rd of respondents.

The only service that didn't receive a positive rating is the planned petrol pumps at the new SPAR site (36% unimportant vs 31% important).

Q5 – Participation In Clubs Etc.

Almost half (48%) of respondents participate at least weekly. It was suggested that people who are active in the community might be those most likely to respond to the questionnaire.

Q6 – Outdoor Recreation Facilities

Footpaths and Children’s Play Areas were seen as the most important.

Tennis, Cricket, Bowls and Football came next with similar levels of support.

The BMX track while still positively rated received least support. This may be a reflection of the low participation rate in the Questionnaire from under 40s who are most likely to have young family members interested in using the facility.

There was quite a high “Don’t Know” rate for the Trim Track which might indicate a lack of awareness of this facility.

Q7 & Q8 – Indoor Facilities / Meeting Places

The Village Hall, Pubs, Hub/Chapel Schoolroom, and Church House all received strongly positive ratings. The Village Hall come out on top with 96% saying it was Important.

The quantity and range of meeting places were rated as Good by 92% of respondents.

Q9 – Range of Community Facilities & Activities

The facilities and activities available for Adults, for the Whole Community, for Children, and for the over 75s all received strong positive ratings.

The only group seen as poorly served was Teenagers.

There were relatively high “Don’t Know” response rates for Children, Over 75s and Teenagers. The explanation for this was thought to be personal situation (i.e. if your family or friends don’t have young children you are less likely to be aware of the activities available for them).

Q10 – Comments On Leisure & Recreation

Not discussed.

Q11 Type Of Housing

There were very clear preference on type of housing, and **93% of respondents supported at least one type of housing.**

Most popular were 2-3 Bed Homes with 88% favouring this type of housing. Retirement Homes (73% in favour) and Supported/Sheltered living (69%) were also popular choices. One Bed homes received more limited support (50% for vs 24% against).

Self-Build came in with marginally more people supporting (33%) than opposing (31%), while 4 bed homes had more opposition (37%) than support (31%).

Park Homes and Holiday Homes were very unpopular with 82% and 81% opposing these types of accommodation.

Q12 Tenure

All types of tenure received more support than opposition, and 89% of respondents supported at least one of the forms of tenure. A small number (4%) opposed all tenures with the remaining 7% made up by a combination of don't know, neutral and no response.

Affordable Housing to own/part own was the most popular form with support from 75% and opposition from only 10% of respondents.

The least popular was Open Market Homes to Rent which was supported by 43%, but opposed by 28% of respondents (approximately 3 supporters for every 2 opponents).

Q13 Development Type

At least one type of development was supported by 86% of respondents, only 4% opposed all types. The other 10% were neutral, don't know or did not respond.

The most popular option was Community Led development which was supported by 64% and opposed by only 10% of respondents. It was noted that delivery of this type of development needs a lot of commitment from the community over an extended period of time so it is not an easy option.

Next most popular was Housing Association with 54% in favour and 19% against.

Small market developments had slightly more in favour (37%) than against (31%).

Larger market developments were opposed whether with 30% or 50% affordable housing. There was slight more resistance to the higher level of affordable housing (50% against vs 22% in favour) than for the lower level (47% against vs 25% in favour). Given that the answers to Q12 indicate a lot of support for affordable housing, while the answers to Q15 indicate large developments are unpopular, it was suggested that the negative reaction to these options might be mainly because of development size rather than because they include affordable housing.

Q14 – Comments on Housing

Not discussed

Q15 – Development Location Strategies

The responses to this question do not present a clear set of priorities, and there are some conflicts which will need to be resolved. Distribution around the Parish/Village is favoured but development on the Village Edge/Greenfield is opposed.

Probably the clearest message is that there is support for sites under 25 houses (67% for vs 18% against), and strong opposition to larger sites (80% against vs 7% for).

Meeting Hambleton's target of 70 houses would require at least 3 sites if 25 houses were to be the maximum permitted size.

It was suggested that a workshop could be used to generate options for further consultation.

Q16 – Site Selection Criteria

The criteria were ranked as follows:

Flood Risks	93% Important vs 2% Unimportant
Environmental Impact	89% Important vs 4% Unimportant
Major Hazards	85% Important vs 5% Unimportant
Footpath Connections	85% Important vs 6% Unimportant
Landscape/Vista Impact	84% Important vs 7% Unimportant
Strong Boundaries	81% Important vs 4% Unimportant
Access To Road Network	82% Important vs 6% Unimportant
Close to Village Services	62% Important vs 15% Unimportant

Q17 & Q18 - Comments on Site Selection & Potential Additional Sites

Not discussed.

Q19 – Including Design Criteria Within Neighbourhood Plan

There was 83% support for including design preferences, and only 4% opposing this.

Q20 - Design Criteria

There was not a strong differentiation between the various criteria but parking, landscaping, and housing density were rated highest; with renewable energy and secure storage lowest.

Q21 - Pace Of Development

There was a strong preference for development to be spread over the plan period (72% favoured this option).

Q22 - Traffic Issues

Again there was not a strong differentiation between the most and least significant issues.

Speeding in the Village, and Winter treatment came top with 93% rating these as Important issues, while Parking in the Village in last place was still Important for 81% of respondents.

Q23 - Strategies To Address Traffic & Parking Issues

More Parking Provision in New Developments was the most favoured option with 91% support, followed by while HGV restrictions in the Village Centre (76% support) and Reduced Speed Limits (64% support).

Opinion was divided on Parking Restrictions (47% for vs 30% against), Traffic Calming (46% for vs 35% against), Priority Signs/Traffic Lights (34% for vs 40% against), and Traffic Free Zones (30% for vs 38% against).

Q24 - Safety & Suitability Of Roads, Pavements & Footpaths

The majority opinion is that pedestrians are well served (56% good vs 20% poor) and connectivity is reasonable (50% good vs 23% poor).

However, there is a very different view for use by wheelchairs (11% good vs 46% poor) and mobility scooters (11% good vs 49% poor).

There are mixed views on winter treatment of roads with 43% rating it as good, and 31% rating it as poor. This might simply be a reflection of the fact that some roads are gritted while others are, so personal experience of routes used on regular journeys are varied.

The worst rating was for winter treatment of pavements with 63% poor to 12% good.

Q25 - Frequency Of Use of Public Transport

Not surprisingly, given the level of service, usage of public transport is low. Almost 90% of respondents rarely or never make use of it.

Q26 – Public Transport Improvements

While a service to Yarm was the most popular option, there were still 60% of respondents who say they would rarely or never use it. Whether there is sufficient interest in such a service to make a business case is unknown.

Q27 – Cycle Routes / Cycle Lane

Although supporters (60%) outnumber those opposing (18%) by roughly 3 to 1, the comments suggests this is quite a divisive issue with strong opinions on both sides.

Q28 Comments On Traffic & Transport

Not discussed.

Q29 - Infrastructure Services

Most people seem satisfied with these services, and very few unsatisfied.

Mains Water	68% Good Vs 2% Poor
Electricity	64% Good Vs 1% Poor
Mains Sewerage	61% Good Vs 3% Poor
Gas	48% Good Vs 3% Poor

Dissatisfaction was higher for these services

Broadband	60% Good Vs 6% Poor
Storm Drainage	60% Good Vs 7% Poor
Mobile Phone	48% Good Vs 13% Poor

It was remarked that “Do not use” seemed surprisingly high for some services. However, the explanation is that as the table combines “Don’t Know” with “Do not use” (which is not clear from the column title) that many of these responses are probably “Don’t Know”.

Q30 – How Important is the Natural Environment To The Identity and Character Of The Parish

While those who think it is important (81%) are comfortably in the majority, there is a sizeable minority (16%) who think it is very unimportant.

Q31 – Change In Size or Quantity Of

Most people (64%) want to see No Change in the allotments with only a few wanting a decrease (5%) and a slightly larger number (16%) wanting an increase.

For the Conservation Area, No Change (47%) was the most popular choice, but almost as many (44%) would like to see an increase. Views were similar for Public Open Spaces with 51% wanting no change, and 44% wanting an increase.

For Green Spaces / Corridors, the balance of opinion is different with a majority (56%) wanting an increase and 39% wanting no change.

A workshop session on the Settlement Character will be used to identify area where people would like to propose any expansions. Discussions have taken place with Hambleton and a process agreed for creating a Settlement Character Assessment covering both Hutton Rudby and Rudby that can be shared by the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan.

Q32 – Development Impacts...

With the exception of impact on Archaeological Sites, there was very little differentiation between the various criteria, with all the rest rated as important by around 90% of respondents.

Impact on Archaeological Sites was some way behind, but still rated as important by 71% of respondents. It was suggested that this might be explained by the fact there are no high profile archaeological sites in the Parish so respondents see less relevance in the criteria.

Q33 – Commercial Renewable Energy

More people (47%) oppose commercial Solar Farms in the Parish than support them (33%) – a ratio of roughly 3 opponents to every 2 supporters.

Opposition to Wind Farms is much stronger with 72% opposing and only 14% supporting - 5 opponents for every supporter.

Q34 – Conversion Of Use Of Buildings

Most people (77%) support conversion of agricultural buildings to support small scale businesses, and only a few (6%) oppose this.

Converting vacant retail space to residential use was also supported but was slightly less popular with 64% supporting and 15% opposing.

Q35 & Q36 – Comments

Not discussed.

6. Project Plan

The preliminary assessment of the questionnaire results suggests that while there is a strong consensus on some issues (e.g. the type of housing the community would like), there is much less clarity on others (e.g. distribution of development sites). This suggests that there will need to be an extension to our project plan to allow for additional consultation steps. A revised project plan with a target referendum date of March 2018 will be prepared for review at the next Steering Group meeting.

Action: Allan Mortimer (with assistance from Katie Atkinson).

Each of the 772 written comments submitted with the questionnaire will be reviewed and a response recorded on how all issues raised will be addressed. When complete this will be published on the Neighbourhood Plan website as a “Schedule of Responses”.

Key Dates / Events

13 th February 2017	Rudby Parish Council meeting
2 nd March 2017	Hambleton Planning Committee (possible decision for the Wickets)
6 th March 2017	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting
13 th March 2017	Rudby Parish Council meeting
TBD March 2017	Neighbourhood Plan workshop.

Key Tasks

Review & update project plan	Target: 6th March 2017
Prepare grant application	Target: 6th March 2017
Review comments & prepare Schedule of Responses.	Target: TBD
Publicise and prepare for workshop	Target: TBD

7. Issues To Refer To Rudby Parish Council

None.

8. AOB

None