

## MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 14 DEC 2018

Those present: Martin Banks, Chris Blythe, Derrick Evans, Bryony Lebeter, Robert Marshall, Simon Myers, Janet Turner, Janet Sugden, Peter Ward

### Background

Following recent and ongoing concerns about the Gargrave Neighbourhood Plan (GNP) by many residents of Marton Road now known as MRWG, the Parish Council agreed to undertake a review of the concerns raised by the group with regard to the Marton Road site.

### The Meeting

JT opened the meeting by clarifying the timescale and criteria of the questionnaires issued to all parishioners at the outset of and during the GNP process. This was for clarity of the group as a whole, but, in particular, for those councillors either not present at the last PC meeting and/or those new to the PC who have had no involvement with the GNP process.

The first questionnaire, dated May/June 2015, was the Informal Questionnaire. Following receipt and examination of these documents, discussions were held as to which of the various sites should be put forward for consideration of development.

JT explained the criteria of the questionnaire and the aspects on which residents were invited to comment. One of these criteria was the general vision for development in the village. The feedback on this was 42 in support and 2 objecting. This figure was inadvertently transposed and used in relation to the Marton Road site in the GNP.

There has now been an exhaustive re-examination of the returns by JT and PW, and again by MB and BL, as the latter were not on the PC at the time and had had no involvement with the GNP. The revised figures were 36 in support of and 9 objections to the Marton Road site. The Inspector has been notified of the error.

At this point, SM said that there seem to have been misunderstandings about the figures. He had received an e-mail from a parishioner regarding the Skipton Road (Cricket Field) site. This query stemmed from a failure to distinguish the GNP figures and the number of objections received by CDC. In relation to the planning application. CDC received 88 objections, the highest response concerning any issue in the village in his time, but this process and the number of responses are entirely separate and different from the GNP.

The Skipton Road site issue is now with the Secretary of State. The fact that many objections to the Marton Road site have only been received in the past two months at PC meetings, with little input during the preceding months and years of public consultation was discussed. It was felt that this issue seems to be linked with the Skipton Road site.

There followed a discussion about a Highways Report, a report which had been mentioned by parishioners at the PC meeting. JT said that this report, sent by Johnson Brook on 21<sup>st</sup> Dec 2015, had been kept with the Regs 14 questionnaires and paperwork from 5 Nov-1 Dec 2015 (titled 'Representation Form'). This form followed the Summer 2015 questionnaires.

These forms are in the GNP. As already mentioned at the PC meeting of 3 Dec, not all those involved had read every document, and this was an independent report, not the NYCC Highways Report used by the GNP, as required of those sites involved. Furthermore, as pointed out by JT, this report had a large illustration of the Skipton Road site on its cover. However, within the document, Bryan Hall comments on both the Skipton Road site and about land west of Walton Close.

MB mentioned at this point that Marton Road residents believe that 75% of votes were objections. He summarised that Marton Road residents are complaining about:

- a. the apparent lack of a complete set of questionnaires
- b. the fact that their analysis differs from that of the PC

Of the 113 Informal Consultation forms received into the PC offices in 2015, 7 appear to have been mislaid, despite hitherto very careful maintenance of paperwork. SM pointed out that, even if all of the missing 7 returns had been objections, the resulting figure would not result in a different ranking of sites for development from that in the GNP. JT and JS agreed to come back in the evening to investigate.

At this point, other sites initially postulated for inclusion in the GNP were mentioned. The Saw Mill site had been well-supported. It was put in as a possibility because it would have afforded better housing than caravans. However, the Saw Mill site was removed at the request of the Environment Agency. Highways turned down an Eshton Road site, referred to as G2/9 and GA/27 (not to be confused with the larger NYCC Eshton Road site for care provision). Thus, both the Saw Mill and the Eshton Road site at the eastern edge of the village ceased to be a part of the GNP.

SM commented at this point that it had been said at the recent PC meeting by a parishioner that the Council had received funding from the European Council to support objection to planning application for the Skipton Road development. This was not true. Monies had been promised to CDC in connection with Sustrans for development of the towpath in the next financial year 2019.

Following the above discussion, PW returned focus to Marton Road issues.

As concerns have been raised regarding sewage problems at Marton Road, the PC should contact Yorkshire Water to request a survey of the sewerage situation on Marton Road. If capital expenditure will be required to rectify the problem, any development on Marton Road should be delayed until work has been carried out.

SM said that Yorkshire Water can make development/planning procedures dependent on the state of sewerage. He also mentioned that CDC and PC would make a concerted effort to look at the whole issue of sewerage.

PW referred to PC Standing Orders which state that, when a new planning application is received, sewerage should be considered as a concern.

He also mentioned that Yorkshire Water will only spend money once planning is submitted not as a basic procedural matter.

RM pointed out that sewerage would be an issue for *all* sites as other areas of the village have had problems in the past in relation to sewerage.

MB mentioned that one of the parishioners had requested a Sewerage Report for Marton Road. This had been sent to SM and SM is to send a copy of the Marton Road and area sewerage system to the PC.

At the Oct PC meeting, the main points raised by the Marton Road group were:

1. Sewage – Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) .PW said that the developer has to install tanks on a site to cope with any excess top water from a development so that it does not overload the sewerage system or may be diverted to the river in this case.
2. Wildlife – This is an issue for *all* sites. The PC does not itself look into wildlife issues as CDC has done this via HRA and SEA. JT mentioned that the PC had asked, at an early stage, if it could fund a wildlife investigation itself, but was informed that it was required that the GNP be part of CDC's HRA/SEA. This has been done.
3. Footpaths – Footpath upgrading should be done as part of any new development. Deep verges are already present on Marton Road and could be used as pavements.
4. Lighting – lighting will be part and parcel of any new development on any proposed site.
5. Traffic – The subject of Church Street bridge was discussed. Some parishioners had argued that traffic lights would have to be installed if there were to be an increased level of traffic. It was felt that a priority system could be installed. This might also slow down traffic in general in the village. The issue of Walton Close would also be dealt with as part of any planned development. The PC is still pursuing the issue of traffic as it affects the village as a whole. Whilst this is really a CDC issue, the PC is trying its best to improve matters and will continue to pursue this issue vigorously. Realistically, progress is slow, but this will not prevent the PC from treating this as a priority.

The issue that nobody wants development in proximity to their own home was discussed. However, the villagers themselves had expressed their opinions and the GNP had been formulated on the basis of their wishes. The villagers have been the driving force not the PC. It was also pointed out that the number of houses required had changed because Gargrave is now designated as a Service Centre.

## **SUMMARY**

Having reviewed the issues raised by Marton Road residents, PC's recommendations are as follows:

- Sewerage – PC and CDC will refer to Yorkshire Water and press for action regarding both current issues and potential issues, should development take place. ( Due to SUDS regulations, new development should not add to existing problems.)
- Wildlife – This has already been investigated by CDC's HRA and SEA documents.
- Footpaths – Deep verges already in Marton Road could be used to create pavements.

- Lighting – This would be dealt with by the developer.
- Traffic – Please see detail in Point 5 above.

#### AFTERNOTE

Following a further examination of documentation after the meeting, the matter of the 'missing' returns has now been resolved.

The minutes of the GNPWG dated 24/6/15 Point 2 recorded that 'Cllr Janet Turner advised the meeting that [the number of forms received] now stood at 113. There had actually been 104 forms back but 113 names. A discussion then took place on whether, if there are two names and signatures on one form, this constitutes one or two comments.'

In the list of forms returned the following forms included two names: 43, 46, 50,82,83,84,89,100 and 104.

This is thus the derivation of the number of 113.