



Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting #18

5th March 2018, Chapel Schoolroom, Hutton Rudby

1. Attendance & Apologies

Attending: Allan Mortimer (Chair), Adrian Davey, Mike Fenwick, Emma Foden, Liam Percy, Derek Simpson

5 members of the public

Apologies: Katie Atkinson (KVA), Karen Consterdine, Bridget Fortune, Tom Pickering

2. Procedural Issues

a) Minutes Of 5th February 2018

The minutes were agreed subject to one correction as described below.

A resident said that a question he had asked at the last meeting about the rationale for housing numbers proposed for each of the preferred sites and the response to it had not been recorded in the minutes. The resident read out an email he had sent containing this question along with two others and requested a written response (text of email attached as Appendix 1).

The Chairman apologised for the omission and confirmed that a written response would be provided to the email as a follow up to the verbal response summarised below which was given during the meeting.

i) Rationale for Proposed Housing Numbers

For S/125/003 the number of ca. 15 homes was based on an approximately pro-rata split on Parish population North and South of the River Leven in reflection of the community preference for distribution of housing around the Parish/Village. This formed part of the discussion at the site selection meeting of 25th October.

For S/073/003 the view of the Steering Group as expressed at the site selection meeting was that "partial development of the Western end of the site would be most favoured". The

indicative capacity of 40 to 60 given by HDC in their assessment was, therefore, scaled back to 15 to 20 reflecting the reduction in area.

For S/073/005, 006, & 012, the provisional allocation was the balance of 35 to 40 needed to achieve a total of 70 homes. It is envisaged that development within this group of sites will be delivered in two phases / blocks to reflect the community preference for keeping individual developments under 25 homes.

This is the basis on which the decisions were made on 25th October, and is no way "trying to justify the decision after the event".

ii) Treatment of Potential Footpath Improvements in Site Assessments

The chairman reminded the resident that he had raised the same question at the last meeting and received an answer which is recorded in the minutes, and would also be sent a response to the same question raised in his email.

The scoring of S/073/012 (the larger site between Paddocks End and Langbaugh Road) as GREEN is a straightforward application of the criteria definitions as it would clearly shorten walking distances e.g. to/from the SPAR for residents of Langbaugh Rd, the Lindens and Belbrough Lane.

The scoring of S/073/010 (the larger site at Belbrough Lane) as GREEN is not strictly in accordance with the criteria definitions in that a footpath/cycleway in this location would not shorten walking distances. However, the opinion of the Steering Group is that the safety benefit of such a route would fall within the broader intent of the criteria. The rationale is stated in the site assessment document and was affirmed at the site selection meeting itself.

Neither of the two sub-sites at Paddocks End/Langbaugh Road (S/073/005 and S/073/006) were credited with the ability to deliver improved connectivity as they do not span the full distance between the two locations. For the same reason the smaller site at Belbrough Lane was not credited with the ability to deliver the safety benefit.

iii) Highway Safety etc.

This was discussed during agenda item 3 - feedback on the consultation events.

b) Actions from Previous Meetings

i) Website Bio / Photo

Photographs and personal statements for some SG members are needed for the website.

Action: Emma, Mike, Tom – provide statements & photographs

Action: Allan – update website.

ii) Questionnaire Schedule of Responses

The schedule of responses to the 2016 questionnaire should be reviewed to identify any outstanding actions. To be progressed in parallel with consultation responses.

iii) TOR Drafting of Proposed Changes

Draft has been submitted to RPC, and it has been forwarded to YLCA for review. Comments from RPC/YLCA are awaited.

3. Feedback from Consultation Event (Sunday 4th March session)

The Chairman reported that 87 people had signed in to the event. This has been our best attended consultation event so far, and there were participants from all parts of the village. The level of engagement is very encouraging with no signs of 'consultation fatigue' setting in. Many participants spent up to an hour reviewing the information provided, discussing issues, and writing up their comments.

The chairman said that as the consultation was still in progress that it would be premature to discuss results as the balance of views might change over the course of the second session.

A resident asked if the worksheets with comments etc. from participants in the first session would be available at the second session. The resident thought that it was helpful to see what other people were thinking. The chairman said that this was the practice that had used for all previous drop-in consultation and it seemed to be very effective. The worksheets from the first session with all comments, "votes" and mark-ups will be set out for the second session.

A resident commented that he thought the question about replacement of trees in the conservation area was strange. Why would we let trees be cut down? The Chairman explained that there are frequent planning applications for tree works/felling in the Conservation Area. Sometime trees need to be removed for safety reason (age, disease etc.). Over time this could lead to gradual loss of tree cover and impact on the character of the village. The purpose of the question was to determine whether there was support for a pro-active tree replacement policy.

A resident commented that he thought that the question about Green Space at Hundale Gill was inappropriate. The Chairman said that while all candidate Green Spaces had been reviewed in a workshop in 2017, this consultation event was an opportunity to take views on Green Spaces from a larger group of residents. Questions were asked about community support for all the candidate Green Spaces, not just Hundale Gill.

The resident who had emailed the questions referenced in section 2 of these minutes said he thought that road & pedestrian safety had not been given proper consideration. People are concerned about lots of issues such as gritting on Campion Lane, gaps in footpaths, speeding, congestion, parking etc. The Steering Group responded that many of these issues fall outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan as they are not land use issues. They are acknowledged as genuine concerns and the Parish Council are taking various actions such as lobbying NYCC for gritting improvements, and setting up the Community Speedwatch group.

Site specific road safety issues are addressed within the site selection criteria, and proposed access arrangements must be reviewed and approved by NYCC. The Steering Group were of the opinion that the road and pedestrian safety is being addressed within the Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate. The resident suggested that a road safety audit should be commissioned. It could look at things like moving speed limits or traffic calming. The Steering Group responded that they were not clear how this would fit into the Neighbourhood Plan process or whether it was within their scope, but would give it consideration.

A number of the residents attending the meeting had participated in the consultation event. The Steering Group asked for their feedback. The response was that it was positive to take a step back and give the community opportunity to review the project, but the real test will be how the Steering Group respond to the consultation results. A lot of information was presented but it was much more focused than earlier in the process and so was easier to understand. There was a good balance between targeted questions and opportunity for free expression.

4. Meeting With HDC Officers

HDC planning policy team have requested a meeting with representatives of the Parish Council and Steering Group. The purpose is an exchange of information, and it is not a public meeting. HDC's proposed agenda is:

- Update on Local Plan timetable
- Update on Neighbourhood Plan timetable
- Understanding of Neighbourhood Plan site selection process
- Conformity of Neighbourhood Plan with Local Plan/LDF

RPC representatives will be the Chair (Mark Jones), the Vice Chair (Steve Cosgrove), and the Parish Clerk (Ann Pyle). It was agreed that the Steering Group representatives will be the SG Chair (Allan Mortimer) and either Derek Simpson or Liam Percy.

Enquiries will be made about HDC's latest thinking on housing targets for the district and parish, affordable housing quotas expected in the new plan, and whether HDC expect to include discounted market housing within their affordable housing quotas.

Our current estimate of a November referendum is based on the assumption that HDC will release the publication version of the emerging Local Plan in early April so that we have access to policy information for the drafting our plan.

5. Costs / Budget / Grants

Apart from room hire for this meeting there has been no expenditure since the last meeting. Due to the deferral of policy drafting work to match HDC schedule and to allow time to carry out the additional community consultation work we will not spend all of the Locality Grant before the deadline of 31st March. We will have to complete end of grant reporting and return any unspent funds in early April.

There will be a new grant programme for the period from 1st April but no details on process or eligibility criteria have been announced yet. RPC have agreed to carry over the £5,000 provision in the precept so that work on the Neighbourhood Plan can continue while we await details on the new grant programme and our application under it is processed. It is hoped that the new regime will be sufficiently similar to the existing one so that the Neighbourhood Plan can be almost fully funded by grants.

Estimated Expenditure and Cost forecast at 31st March

Cost to precept	£116
Expenditure recovered from HDC grant	£1,356
Expenditure recovered from Locality grant	<u>£5,792</u>
Total	<u>£7,264</u>

Estimate of Locality Grant to be returned £3,065

Estimated additional cost required to complete £9,585

Unspent balance of HDC Grant £1,644

Locality funding available under current rules £9,208

The completion cost estimate assumes a November referendum, but will need to be updated to account for any schedule adjustments arising out of the co-ordination meeting with HDC.

If the new Locality Grant regime is similar or better than the existing one, then the cost to the precept should be minimal although we may need to draw on it for some “bridging finance” while a fresh application is made under the new Locality Grant programme.

The worst case scenario is that no more funding would be available from Locality in which case approximately £8,000 of funding from the precept would be required to complete.

6. Project Plan

The project schedule which will be put forward for discussion with HDC is based on the following major milestones:

Completion of draft Neighbourhood Plan End May 2018

Statutory 6 week community consultation June/July 2018

Referendum Nov 2018

The main dependencies on HDC are timing of their release of the publication Local Plan (expected April), and HDC planning policy resource availability for an informal review prior to the community consultation and formal statutory review post consultation.

A second quotation for the Heritage Assessment is expected this week, and a preferred supplier will be selected on receipt of this. Approval in principle to progress the assessment has already been obtained from the Parish Council.

7. Issues To Refer To Rudby Parish Council

Request approval for recommended Heritage Assessment supplier.

8. AOB

The resident who had raised the road safety issues, reminded the Steering Group of his suggestion for a road safety audit.

9. Next Meeting

Time & Date: **Tuesday** 7pm, 3rd April 2018

Note that the April meeting is one day later than the normal schedule to avoid meeting on the Easter Monday Bank Holiday.

Location: Chapel Schoolroom

Appendix 1: Text of email referenced in item 2a)

I refer to the last steering group meeting when I asked a couple of questions.

I'd appreciate if I could have a written response from the Steering Group on these and one further question from today:

- Can you please explain the rationale why a footpath has been required by the Steering Group between Paddocks End and Langbaugh Road across part of the land which is not proposed to be developed by the Steering Group while it was not considered that the site at Belborough could require the provision of a footpath between Station Road and Drumrock? I'd be surprised if the landowner at Belborough would not be prepared to concede to this if the smaller site was allocated for housing. As you will be aware there are often pedestrians and cyclists on the road between Station Road and Drumrock and a footpath/cycleway would be a major improvement on road safety in that area, for primary school children and dog walkers, particularly with lorries going to and from Potto. There is an existing footpath between Paddocks End and Langbaugh Road, albeit it is by Garbutts Lane, Doctors Lane and Belborough. I know many people who walk and enjoy this route every day.
- Can you please explain the rationale for the allocation of numbers of houses between the various sites currently proposed. I understand from what you said at the Steering Group meeting I attended in February 2018 the number in Rudby related to the the percentage of population in Rudby relative to the number of people who live on the Hutton side of the village, but would be pleased if you could clarify this and the numbers on the other sites proposed. I attended the meeting in November 2017 which suggested the various allocation numbers but it was not clear how these numbers were determined and population numbers of Rudby were never mentioned! Is it a case of trying to justify the decision after the event?
- Highway Safety, Pedestrian Safety and Cyclist Safety are issues which are normally key to residents. Today when we discussed this with Mr and Mrs XXXXXXX, you advised that these were not a criteria that were considered by the Steering Group?. Can you please advise if the Steering Group have considered Highway safety in their questionnaire to the village, as it wasn't displayed at your Consultation today. Can that really be reflective of the residents of Hutton Rudby?