Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting #20

8th May 2018, Chapel Schoolroom, Hutton Rudby

1. Attendance & Apologies

In Attendance: Allan Mortimer (Chair), Karen Consterdine, Adrian Davey, Mike Fenwick, Emma Foden, Richard Readman, Derek Simpson
Katie Atkinson (KVA)

Seven members of the public

Apologies: Bridget Fortune, Liam Percy, Tom Pickering

2. Procedural Issues

a. Appointment of Minute Secretary

The Chair reminded the meeting that the minutes of the Steering Group (SG) meetings are not transcripts or verbatim records. They are intend to provide a record of who attended, the main points of discussion, any decisions made, and any conflicts of interest. They may incorporate contextual information to aid understanding. Where the same issue is discussed under more than one agenda item it may be summarised under a single heading.

At the last SG meeting a member of the public challenged the accuracy of the minutes of 5th March meeting, and suggested that someone other than the Chair should write the minutes. A subsequent email was sent by the same member of the public relating to the points raised in the meeting and has been circulated to all members of the Steering Group.

The suggestion of appointing a Minute Secretary is being acted upon. The Chair proposed, seconded by Mike Fenwick, that Derek Simpson should act as Minute Secretary. All members supported the proposal.

The minutes of 5th March had been accepted at the meeting of 3rd April, but are being reconsidered at this meeting in the light of the email.
There were two main issues raised in the subsequent email from the member of the public:

1) Whether the member of the public did or did not read out an email.
2) Whether some discussion points were recorded under the correct agenda item.

The Chair accepted that while the member of the public raised the issues covered by the email, he may not have actually read out the email.

The member of the public was asked whether he had any further comments on the minutes of 5 March. They had no further issues.

Having considered the email from the member of the public and the comments just made, the SG reconfirmed their approval of the minutes of 5th March.

b. Approval of Minutes of 5th Apr 2018 Meeting

The Chair asked whether any members of the public had any comments on the minutes of 5th April. The member of the public would have liked their email (discussed earlier) to have been attached to the 5th April minutes. As the email was discussed at this meeting, the Chair said the email would be attached to this set of minutes (with names redacted).

The minutes of 5th April were agreed by the Steering Group.

c. Planning Applications and The Steering Group

The Chair noted that those in attendance may be aware that a member of the Steering Group has submitted a planning application for a single dwelling.

The Chair reminded the meeting that it is not the Steering Group's role to publicise applications. SG members are not barred in any way from submitting planning applications, and as the SG does not have any role in determining planning applications no conflicts of interest arise.

The Parish Council are a statutory consultee but the SG is not. The SG will provide factual information from our evidence base or process to the Parish Council, planning officers etc. but do not make recommendations for or against particular applications.

Conflicts of interest can arise in connection with land ownership of SG members. If/when that land is being considered for allocation as development land, or designation as Green Space, members do not participate in any decisions related to their own land.
d. Actions from previous meetings

i) A response to the proposed Terms of Reference of the SG had been received earlier in the day from RPC / YLCA. Some minor amendments were suggested and these will be circulated to the SG and forwarded to RPC if acceptable to the SG.
   **Action:** Allan - circulate email

ii) Photographs of Mike Fenwick and Emma Forden are required for the website. The Chair will take their photographs at the end of the meeting.
   **Action:** Allan - take photographs and update website

iii) A review of the Questionnaire Schedule of Responses for outstanding issues will be undertaken this month.
   **Action:** Allan - instigate review

3. Costs / Budget / Grants

The administration on the first phase grant from Locality has been completed and the unspent funds of £3,064.50 returned. The close-out report has been accepted.

A new application of £8,893 has been approved and funds received – all expenditure from 18/4/18 is eligible. It is possible to apply for ca. £3k more if needed.

The only bridging cost to allocate to the HDC grant is the costs of the April SG meeting. (£134.90 – KVA + Room Hire).

The unspent balance of the HDC grant is £1,509.15.

No cost were incurred to the precept during the transition.

4. Feedback From HDC Meeting

A follow-up meeting with HDC had been held earlier in the day.

Attendees were:
- James Campbell  HDC Planning Policy Manager
- Hannah Langler  HDC Planning Policy officer
- Bridget Fortune  HDC Councillor & SG Member
- Mark Jones      RPC Chair
- Steve Cosgrove  RPC Vice Chair
- Ann Pyle        RPC Clerk
- Allan Mortimer  SG Chairman
- Derek Simpson   SG Member
- Katie Atkinson  KVA Planning Consultancy
It was a short meeting (less than an hour) with an agenda limited to the wording to be used by HDC for the sections of the Local Plan related to Neighbourhood Plans. HDC had circulated some examples from other authorities. The Chair had put forward another example from South Oxfordshire.

This wording is confidential until HDC officers submit the draft to cabinet which is scheduled for early June.

RPC/SG have been asked to provide a few brief key points on the main focus of our plan which may be incorporated into the Local Plan wording. HDC is not writing specific policies for each Neighbourhood Plan. The key elements are likely to come from the NP Vision Statement.

5. **Steering Group Activities & Resourcing**

   a. **Schedule of responses to March Consultation.**

      A working session on the responses from the last consultation will be held this week with follow up sessions in each of the following two weeks. Proposed dates were Thursday, 10th May (09.00), Wednesday, 16th May (19.00) and Tuesday, 22nd May (19.00).

      A member of the public asked what was involved in responding to the comments. As with the original questionnaire, each comment (over 300 comments) will be considered and all the responses will be published on the NP web site.

   b. **Village Event Stall. (June 30)**

      There is a need to plan and organise a stall for this year's event. Karen will provide the gazebo as in previous years.

      A number of SG members (Mike, Emma, Derek) are unlikely to be available due to other commitments.

      **Action:** Allan - check availability of SG members

   c. **Settlement & Landscape Character Assessment Document.**

      The main focus for the next month will be pulling together all the consultation evidence on views, frontages, buildings, Green Spaces, etc. into a proper documented form. This can be done without waiting for the release of the Local Plan.

      A request has been received for the Leven valley field to be considered for Green Space designation and this will be undertaken alongside the other Green Space proposals. There will not be an extra consultation to test support in principle for this
proposal. As this field is owned by a member of the SG, they will not be involved in the assessment.

d. Policy Drafting.

Cannot make much progress on this until we see the shape of the Local Plan. Hopefully at the end of the month.

6. Preferred Sites Update

Once the settlement character work has been completed and HDC policies are released, work on the Site Design Briefs can begin and a dialogue with the site promoters can be opened up.

a. Enterpen

The Heritage Assessment is in progress and the report is expected towards the end of the month. No action will be taken until the report is received and published.

b. Stokesley Rd

The appeal for the five self build houses has been dismissed (i.e. the Inspector did not grant planning approval). The Inspector upheld the rejection on the grounds of settlement character / housing mix issues.

The applicant also withdrew their alternative application which was due to be heard at HDC's Planning Committee last week. Mike was going to speak for the Parish Council at this.

The site is now back to a “blank page”; that is, the basis considered at the site selection meeting.

c. Langbaurgh / Paddocks End

There is nothing to report at present

7. Issues To Refer To Rudby Parish Council

The updated TOR subject to SG committee's approval

8. AOB

None
9. Next Meeting

Time & Date: Monday 7pm, 4th June 2018
Location: Chapel Schoolroom
Appendix 1: Text of email referenced in section 2 a) & 2 b) of these minutes.

I refer to the meeting of the Hutton Rudby Neighbourhood Plan Committee on Tuesday 3rd April when I queried the accuracy of the minutes of the previous Neighbourhood Plan meeting held on 5th March. I attach a copy of the minutes published by the Committee for reference. On the 3rd April the Chairman did not appear to accept the previous minutes were inaccurate and therefore I am writing to clarify the inaccuracies.

Accurate minutes are a sign of good governance, regrettably there has been mistakes in both the minutes of the meeting of 5th February for which the Chairman apologised and now in the minutes of the meeting of 5th March. I haven't been present at all the meetings of the Steering Group but suspect because the Chairman who is running the meeting is also generally taking the minutes this is bound to happen. The Chairman gave this as an explanation to the mistake in the February meeting and this was accepted. It is regrettable that no one else on the Steering Group has offered to assist the Chairman at least in this respect.

The points below relate to the minutes of the 5th March meeting attached:

2.a) Minutes Of 5th February 2018 - I did not read out an email as stated in the minutes. I offered to pass a hard copy of the email to members of the steering group, however the Chairman refused this request and advised a written response would be given in due course to the email.

2 a) i) Rationale for Proposed Housing Numbers - The minutes of 5th March advise that a pro rata split was discussed at the meeting on 25th October. I was at that meeting and do not recall what is stated in the minutes during the 5 hour discussion, which I am advised was audio recorded.

2. a) ii Treatment of Potential Footpath Improvements in Site Assessments - This matter was never discussed at the meeting on 5th March and therefore the minutes are completely inaccurate in this respect.

2 a) iii) Highway Safety etc - As mentioned above my email was never read out and therefore it is totally inaccurate to suggest otherwise.

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

It is correct that I said that I thought Road and Pedestrian Safety had not been given consideration in the Selection criteria. The Chairman had previously agreed this point at the consultation event. During the session on the feedback from the Consultation event on 4th March I did not, at that stage of the meeting, as is minuted suggest that a road safety audit should be commissioned, although I did point out some of the potential benefits of considering the provision of footpaths from Station Road to Drumrauck and along Stokesley Road to Cleveland Views Hill Park. I agree that the Steering Group did respond that they were not clear how road safety would fit into the Neighbouring Plan process as they clearly would have done so already if they thought appropriate.
8. **AOB** - it was under AOB that I raised the suggestion of a road safety audit, and was certainly not the case of me reminding the Steering Group or repeating myself.

**Appendix 1:** Given the fact that at the beginning of the 5th March meeting the Chairman rejected my request to read my email of 4th March, I was surprised that an edited version of that email was attached to the minutes of the meeting.

A response to my email of 4th March was sent by the Chairman on 20th March to which a further response will be sent at an appropriate time in due course.

The issue at present is the inaccuracy of the minutes of these Steering Group meetings.