



## ***Public General Meeting, 13 December 2004***

### MINUTES

<b>Present:</b>	<b>Gillian Jones</b>	<b>(GJ)</b>	<b>Chairperson</b>
	<b>Heather Thomas-Smith</b>	<b>(HTS)</b>	<b>Vice Chairperson</b>
	<b>Andrew Walkden</b>	<b>(AW)</b>	<b>Treasurer</b>
	<b>Keith Grimshaw</b>	<b>(KG)</b>	
	<b>Gavin Dewar</b>	<b>(GD)</b>	
	<b>John Mathew</b>	<b>(JM)</b>	
	<b>Samantha Glossop</b>	<b>(SG)</b>	

---

#### **1.0 Apologies**

**John P Rodgers** (JPR)  
**Beverley Wrigley** (BW)

#### **2.0 Welcome and Introductions**

2.1 **GJ** welcomed everyone to the meeting, and expressed the intended format of 'we present, you respond' to the audience.

#### **3.0 Visit of the Rt Hon. David Curry, MP (HTS)**

David Curry MP attended a meeting with LoPRA at our request, and expressed opinions in our main areas of concern...

Long Preston would have been bypassed had the Conservatives remained in power. The exception sites policy is necessary, but he opposes development beyond economic potential. DC stated that urban need should not affect rural development, but can if urban redevelopment is not quick enough. Lon Preston has *real* green fields that need protecting, in addition to the chronic lack of employment sites in Craven that erodes any argument for more housing. Following a subsequent meeting with David Butterworth of the Yorkshire Dales National Park, David Curry wrote to tell LoPRA that DB concedes that there has been a recent spate of development in Long Preston, but that it is just coincidence that it has all happened in one go. The YDNP is set against any new developments.

**GJ** summarised the usefulness of the David Curry meeting, and the utility of being able to involve the MP.

**Hilary Baker** : “I was extremely impressed with David Curry. He’d done his homework on Long Preston, and listened to what people had to say.”

**Roy Grayson** : “Eldwick near Bingley did exactly as us, and now 1200 houses have destroyed the place 25 years on. Letters and promises from MPs will not avoid this fate”

**GJ** : “Long Preston is in a stronger position than Eldwick by being in the National Park”

**Roy Grayson** : “No building behind Hartley Green for 5 to 10 years means that in between 5 and 10 years time, there’ll be development. MPs will lie. His promise is a waste of time. Developers are unscrupulous, and need battling. Sheltered house specifications have been ignored by Northern Heritage. We’re going to avoid the real issues in this meeting”

**KG** : “The gentleman is right. If we have a small success, e.g., the planning inspector’s report, then it’s good for 2-3 years. To keep Long Preston as we want it, we need to fight continuously”

**(anon.)** : “We’re not all like Roy Grayson, and we appreciate the work you’ve done”

**GJ** : “We’re not able to fight individual battles. Individual battles need to be fought personally. We need to fight strategic battles first”

**Peter Scott-Smith** : “Long Preston are advantaged over Bingley by being within the National Park. LoPRA are being good at reaction, but need to become good at proaction. Why don’t we try to *reduce* the building line by lobbying?”

**Ian Evans** : “The Parish Council is for fighting individual battles. LoPRA is for larger scale lobbying”

**John Goodall** : “Was the A65 raised with David Curry?”

**HTS** : “Nobody is willing to take responsibility for the A65, as it’s being de-trunked”

**Karen Holmes** : “ I’ve had a Highways Agency chap down in 2000 who attended and wrote an unconvincing report said that it’d be useless after the de-trunking (which *still* hasn’t happened, 4 years later).

**Pat Allsop** : “As the Mary Russell report has been discredited, why has no new survey been conducted?”

#### **4.0 Affordable Housing**

**KG** : “On the matter of Local Needs housing versus Affordable Housing in the local plan. From the Planning Authority website (by Peter Watson) – ‘The Inspector Backs the National Park Housing Plan’ <read from website article – in brief, support for local people wanting to work and live in YDNP is boosted by inspector’s report. Report back restricted occupancy. New houses/conversions should be in villages with adequate services. YDNP unable to build enough houses on open market to bring prices down, so

supports only building houses for people who work in the National Park. Restricted occupancy policy only to apply to new-builds. Over 10k existing houses able to be sold on the open market.

Affordable Housing is that which is likely to be provided by a registered social landlord, and is of adequate standard, and may use subsidised rent, shared ownership, or may be just a cheap house for sale.

Local Needs Housing is that which is not subsidised, but can only be sold in a market which is restricted to those categories of people who need to live in the National Park, i.e. farmers, paramedics, fire fighters, etc.”

**Jean Imrie** : “What is an affordable house in monetary terms?”

**GJ** : “Difficult to define. Peter Scott-Smith looked into putting a cost on it. Affordable Housing would be provided by a registered social landlord, and is cheaper partly because of cheap land. A deal must be done with the land owner at below the market land value.”

**Peter Scott-Smith** : “There’s no universal definition of affordable housing, but as a back of the envelope calculation, one could take three times the average salary in Yorkshire and Humber, and arrive at a figure of around £80k.”

**Karen Holmes** : “People are buying agricultural land under advice as investments.”

**Rob Cater** : “Local Housing is for people who *need* to work in the park, but Settle and Hellifield are not in the National Park.”

**GJ** : “The word ‘need’ is well defined in the inspector’s report document.”

**John Cressey** : “A farmer, say, does need to live very close to the farm.”

<many disagree>

**Maureen Ward** : “We could do with more employment in the village than just for plumbers, electricians, etc.”

## **5.0 Yorkshire Dales National Park Local Plan, and the Inspector’s Report**

**GD** : “Summarising the findings of the inspector’s report:

- 1) New build or conversions should only be allowed for low cost housing, and for local people
- 2) No new land for open market house building
- 3) Only infill or conversion for local needs
- 4) Have had 41 new houses in Long Preston in the past 2 years, and these have used all the available brown-field sites. Last opportunity was the British Fuels site, which now has 5 luxury houses planned, at £500k a piece
- 5) There is an identified need for affordable houses on exception sites
- 6) Any building application on green field must a) be for local people, and b) be on an exception site

This plan only lasts until 2006. A new local plan will be based on the old local plan.

The Rural Housing Enabler for Craven undertook a housing needs survey. It found that there were 50 houses needed. This figure was arbitrarily halved, and this figure is now in the public domain.”

**JM** : “LoPRA was founded because the developer and the Rural Housing Enabler wanted a secret meeting. The Parish Council has failed to convene a meeting with the author of the report. Mary Russell is leaving in January, so a meeting will be convened with the new occupant of that position. LoPRA believes that there is an affordable housing need, but nowhere near the numbers mentioned in the survey. The original survey is discredited, vague, and contravenes the guidelines for such surveys. LoPRA is shortly going to attempt to undertake a detailed analysis of the survey in accordance with the industry guidelines, by January. The supposedly proven need will be used to justify exception site development. It is rumoured that the present developer is planning to put 30 houses on Bob’s field, but the planning officer has confirmed that no application has been made. If local need doesn’t fill the houses, then they get offered to non local people. In time, the developer eventually offer them on the open market.”

**GD** : “The inspector verified the building line. The developer currently owns several green field sites, and is attempting to acquire more. Long Preston has a railway, and is now on mains water. We are desirable. We need members’ eyes and ears to help us.”

<applause>

**John Sellers** : “May I reiterate that that incredibly flawed survey will become important if not discredited soon.”

**Hilary Baker** : “That survey, even though not accepted by the Parish Council, is in the public domain, and can be used as ammunition in the planning process.”

**Peter Scott-Smith** : “The survey has already been discredited with Foundation Housing. My paper on the survey directly contributed to the withdrawal of Foundation Housing, and the resignation of Mary Russell. It is now my intention to put together a complete critique to arrive on desks by 2<sup>nd</sup> January to the Craven District Council, Yorkshire Dales national Park, and the Countryside Agency.”

**GJ** : “We need to act quickly on this, as Mrs Allsopp said. If we don’t persuade National Park members before January, they meet in January, and will accept the substance of this survey. We need a professional approach.”

**Karen Holmes** : “I have 2 concerns. 1) no right-minded developer will want to build affordable housing. We will have the same situation as in Ingleton. 6 affordable houses are built in exchange for the right to build a further 30 houses at full market value. 2) I worry about the policing of this, e.g., in Hellifield, fines of £30k were imposed for flouting planning guidelines. Useless. Horthorn Heritage sheltered housing is a long way from anyone else’s sheltered housing.”

**Ian Sturrock** : “There’s been no mention so far of the local school. Having talked to developers, they say that they cannot build at the end of Hartley Green as the school is too small to support the extra families.”

**Mary Grimoldby** : “Often in this village, we’ve seen damage being done before anyone has noticed. A while back, the agent of the Meerbeck Estate suggested that the track by my house could become a roadway again, suggesting that he wanted the land behind me as a building site.”

**GJ** : “Meerbeck Estate has objected to the building line near Mrs Grimoldby. The objection was refused in the inspector’s report.”

**Mary Grimoldby** : “Is the flood water from the fields a good excuse to refuse permission to build on the land?”

**Karen Holmes** : “There is no obligation to consider soak-away when granting planning permission.”

**GD** : “Access across Mary Grimoldby’s track is across village green, so we must be cautious of this.”

**Mary Grimoldby** : “Sheep and cows are all that used to use the track.”

**Elizabeth Kelly** : “Should people make representations individually about development on Greengate Farm?”

**GJ** : “Yes, individual letters are much better than co-signed letters.”

**Hilary Baker** : “Where is Church Walk?”

**GJ** : “It may mean Chapel Walk, the fuel depot. Bringing forward item 7 on the agenda, are there any nominations for 2 committee members?”

John Finnegan nominated by Ian Evans, seconded by Cynthia Johnston  
No Nominations received for Secretary  
Additional membership status of ‘Affiliated Member’ voted in

## **6.0 LoPRA’s Priorities for the next 6 months**

### **7.0 A65**

**GJ** : “Not much to report, except that it’s due to be de-trunked in 2006”

**Robert Cater** : “I met the route manager for the A65, and although it’s being de-trunked, work hasn’t stopped on the road. There’s a safety survey currently underway. A reduction of the maximum speed between Long Preston and Settle from 60 m.p.h. to 50 m.p.h. could be lobbied for. The Highways Agency is soon to start selling off the bypass land, and once sold, it’s gone. I’ve spoken with the county councillor Beth Graham, about this. Outside Hartley Green, there’s a refuge (bollards?) to be built. If extra development is to happen, the junction at Hartley Green needs much improvement.”

**John Cressey** : “I agree with the bypass, but if we do get a relief road, we no longer have the, “we can’t take the extra traffic” argument.”

**Karen Holmes** : “I’ve spoken with numerous people over the junction at Hartle Green asking for silent tarmac resurfacing. It was scheduled for 5 years ago. I also asked for a single line of cats-eyes, as the double line gets traversed by lorries, causing vibration damage. The request was declined to inadequate lighting. The lighting is now fine, so why no single line, and why no refuge?”

**Ian Evans** : “I used to be in favour of the relief road, but am no longer. The post office and pubs would suffer economically if there was a relief road. There are other ways to improve roads, e.g., in Holland, some areas have removed all road signs and markings to encourage slower driving.”

**John Goodall** : “While I was in the A65 action group, I spoke with the Highways Agency in Manchester. There was objection to the idea of a refuge, because of people potentially becoming sandwiched between wagons, slowing of traffic on Bank Holidays, etc.”

**JM** : “We should all remain thankful that the village has a 30 m.p.h. speed limit, as all those villages on the A65 north to the M6 have higher speed limits than this.”

**Steve Lockley** : “I ‘phoned the Highways Agency to try and get access into my back yard for parking (on Kayley Hill). No chance. You need to have 90m visibility each way from the access. We went to Hartley Green, and there’s no more than 20m visibility in each direction.”

**Hilary Baker** : “John Blackie of the Yorkshire Dales National Park overruled all (including the Highways Agency’s) objections to the building of Hartley Green.”

**Steve Lockley** : “A pothole that was repaired 3 years ago on Kayley Hill has reappeared, and nothing has been done about it.”

**GJ** : “Is there anyone who’d be willing to form an A65 working group?”

Rob cater willing to help out.

Karen Holmes unwilling to help out because she’s been overlooked by officials, for being a woman, in the past.

**Rob Cater** : “We must respond to the Highways Agency re: the A65 before the safety survey is completed. I’ll take the timescales off-line with GJ>”

**Peter Scott-Smith** : proposes a vote of thanks to the committee.

## **8.0 Membership issues**

(Covered previously – action to create a new membership status of Affiliated Member. £2 annual membership. Newsletter to be posted to Affiliated Members.)