



Public Meeting, 15 March 2005

MINUTES

Present:	Gillian Jones	(GJ)	Chairperson
	Heather Thomas-Smith	(HTS)	Vice Chairperson
	Andrew Walkden	(AW)	Treasurer
	Keith Grimshaw	(KG)	
	John Mathew	(JM)	
	John Rodgers	(JR)	
	Alan Simpson	(AS)	Chair Gargrave PC
	Stuart Smith	(SS)	Ctte Mbr Gargrave PC
	Helen Firth	(HF)	Councillor
	Chris Moorby	(CM)	Chair Long Preston PC

1.0 Apologies

Gavin Dewar	(GD)
Malcolm Beresford	(MB)
John Finnigan	(JF)

2.0 LOPRA's Meeting with the YDNP

GJ : LoPRA met with David Butterworth (**DB**), and Peter Watson (**PW**) last Wednesday (09/03/2005) evening. A previous meeting with **David Curry** MP had set this up, and **DB** expressed delight that such an organisation as LoPRA existed. We wanted to know the timescales relevant to the Local Plan. Last year, the inspector scrutinised the Local Plan, and the YDNP is currently discussing the inspector's report. We expressed concern over the YDNP not yet having adopted the local plan, presenting a loophole for developers submitting plans for development before the new local plan is adopted, knowing that the plans they submit would fall outside what the next version of the local plan is likely to permit. **DB** accepted this as a possibility, but was pleased with Ian Evans' letter to the Craven Herald that had highlighted such perils. **DB** went on to add that the Local Plan will be discussed at their April meeting, but may take as long as until August to come into force.

By 2006, the YDNP will be revising housing policy in the National Park. Given the *recent* revision of the housing policy, **PW** didn't anticipate any changes to the policy in 2006, and thought that the village building lines should remain tight.

Among other things, the new Local Plan stipulates that new houses will have an area of less than 90 m², and there shall be at least 35 houses per hectare, meaning that new

houses will be smaller, and hence more affordable. It is anticipated that developers will still test this, so there is still a need to remain vigilant.

With respect to the Housing Needs Survey (HNS), **DB** made it clear that the YDNP needs to encourage vibrant and sustainable communities. Within that context, they need to place affordable housing where it is needed. The HNS is only one part of a picture. They also need to consider housing lists, council house availability, average house price, economic data, etc. **DB** was amazed at the HNS finding of a need for 50 new affordable houses in a village with only 305 extant houses. 50 in this context, is a figure that defeats itself, especially when considered against the larger Grassington, for which 8 affordable houses are being sited.

PW and **DB** stated that the YDNP always attempts to negotiate a resolution with a developer with whom they are in conflict with, for reasons of speed, cost, etc. The number of enforcement officers is rising from 1 to 2 as a result of enforcement being given higher priority, and hence more budget from April 1 2005. **DB** also said that they can only consider each case in isolation, and not bias against builders who have proven themselves to be unreliable in the past.

DB was positive about the Skipton Building Society's proposal to fund £10M worth of affordable housing in the region, however, the YDNP needs to define the term 'key worker' before the Skipton Building Society can proceed, so they know who to make the new housing available to. **DB** also stated that as 99.7% of all land within the National Park is in private ownership, so compulsory purchase orders may need to be served to find the land for affordable housing to be built on.

3.0 The Housing Needs Survey

LoPRA have asked the Chief Executive of Craven Council on two occasions about the HNS. I spoke again to the receptionist this afternoon, and discovered that Craven Council will be meeting to discuss the HNS this week.

HF : The Planning Department of Craven Council acknowledge that the old HNS will be superseded by the new HNS.

GJ : Will there be a new survey for Long Preston?

HF : Yes. Every village will be covered in a district-wide survey.

GJ : Will that be fed through the PC?

HF : No. A letter of notification will be sent out, but the consultants have not been appointed yet.

Helen Woodcock (HW): Can we be assured that the methodology of the new survey will be better?

HF : The survey will be different from last time, but the methodology is being put out to tender. It's up to the officers at the council to choose the methodology. The previous survey was nothing to do with Craven District Council.

KG : I suppose we have to accept the councillor's assurances and hope for the best.

Peter Scott Smith (PSS) : The previous survey was cooked up by a junior in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and took no account of market practise. The flawed survey is still likely to be used in Long Preston.

GJ : It's going to be very difficult to get buy-in for the survey if it's not made available for acceptance by the PC.

HF : Are you wanting the PC to be consulted on the methodology?

GJ : Yes. Informed, so they can take a view on it.

HF : If it is agreed that the previous survey is good, by another consultancy, then it must be good.

PSS : Nonsense. That would just mean that two bad companies had come to the same conclusion.

GJ : Will the meeting endorse if we can have some discussion with the officers at Craven District Council regarding the survey?

HF : Don't call Craven District Council bad if you haven't the decency to talk to the officers.

4.0 The A65

JR : Thanks for coming. We invited Hellifield and Conniston Cold to come, but they couldn't attend.

Public notice was posted on 25 February 2005, for the revocation of the A65 bypass order. This would enable the disposal of land along the proposed bypass route. Anyone can object to this revocation order. If there are enough objectors, then a public enquiry must be held to discuss the matter. Once the land is sold off, it can't readily be reinstated. We need to prepare a valid legal objection to the revocation of the order. Revocation will obfuscate all the past work. If the land is released onto the open market, it's not unreasonable to assume that speculative developers will buy it up. If the bypass land purchase orders are revoked, then a change of heart will not be enough to get a bypass. 88% of 111 votes in the village plan were in favour of a bypass.

The footpath is not wide enough for prams or wheelchairs, the road is breaking up, manhole covers are broken, and on weekdays from 4:30am, quarry traffic, etc. is using the road in this state. Weekend use is frequently even heavier, with no relent through the day.

Susan Brookes (SB): Thanks for your excellent report. How many objections are needed?

JR : I don't know that figure exactly.

Ian Evans (IE): There are two classes of objectors : i) statutory objectors, e.g. councils, land owners, and ii) non-statutory objectors (everyone else). If any statutory

objector objects, then there must be a public enquiry. Non-statutory objectors are almost ignored, and only count in volume.

Robert Cater (RC): A colleague of mine objected via e-mail. E-mail objections are OK, but he was the first one to register such an objection.

PSS : So who can we write to?

SB : (reading out of the Craven Herald)

Highways Agency
Operations Division
Room 710
Sunley Tower
Piccadilly Plaza
Manchester
M1 4BE

GJ : We'll put the e-mail address on www.lopra.org.uk

KG : DB hadn't heard of the revocation order. We need to publicise this, or else it'll slip through by stealth.

IE : It may not be sufficient to simply say 'I object'. We may need a legal background for objecting. I don't know. I'll post to the website when I find out how to object.

KG : There are European policies for footpath widths, etc., which may back up our arguments.

John Goodall : The Winchester bypass was objected to on conservation grounds with no success. If we object on emotive grounds, the objection will fail.

RC : The issue now is to get a public enquiry. The content of the enquiry will differ from our objections to the revocation now, but the object is to get to the enquiry in the first place.

GJ : Does the council have any view on this important matter Cllr Firth?

HF :No.

RC : Will the council be meeting before 22 April?

HF : Yes.

GJ : When?

HF : I don't know. I'm trying to get it discussed on Thursday night.

GJ : What's the PC view?

Chris Moorby (CM): We haven't discussed it yet, but I expect we'll object to the revocation.

JR : Hellifield will probably be objecting tonight (as they're meeting tonight).

AS : Same here. We haven't discussed it yet in Gargrave, but will probably be objecting.

GJ : Has anyone sought NYCC views?

AS : I've *heard* that CDC, NYCC, and YDNP will be objecting, but paperwork can be slow in getting to Gargrave.

GJ : DB was very interested on the matter of detrunking a road in a conservation area. "Let me know what LoPRA want to happen", is what he said.

JG : There's a dangling carrot. If revocation takes place, Long Preston gets a new road surface. Does this mean that if revocation doesn't happen, we don't get a new road surface?

RC : The letter suggests that by 2006, the road is to be resurfaced either way, unless when the funds are passed on to the NYCC, they're consumed elsewhere.

John Clark : The bypass was first going to be built in 1935. Can we have a standard letter produced for objection?

SS : The original plan of the bypass was continued from Keighley to Ingleton by the railway.

Hilary Baker : Please don't produce a standard letter, as it'll be ignored.

GJ : It's probably better to produce a bullet point list for guidance to objectors, and who to send it to. Should LoPRA object to the revocation order for the bypass?

<vote> more than 90% vote for LoPRA to object </vote>

CM : The PC will discuss the bypass on 4 April.

GJ : The A65 working group will contact NYCC, YDNP, David Curry MP, regarding the revocation.

RC : Who comprises the NYCC Craven Area Committee?

HF : It's the councillors for the Craven area.

RC : How many of those are there?

HF : There are 6, including Ms. Graham, who's the councillor for this area, and she can be lobbied.

Elizabeth Gray (EG): Enough members are here to help with delivering mailshots.

PSS : I'm happy to print off 305

SB : Don't assume everyone has e-mail.

(Elizabeth Gray, Dr Imrie, Helen Smith volunteer to deliver mailshots)

EG : We could even try to involve the school.

5.0 Village Plan

HTS : The Parish Plan was printed 3-4 weeks ago. The Planning for Real event fed into this in 2003. Initially, it was ready in June 2004. Craven endorsed it quickly, but the Countryside Agency wanted some extra information. The final copy is around 130 pages, and is available to be signed out from the Post Office.

CM : There are 2 copies in the Post Office, and each can be signed out for 3 days at a time. It's also in electronic form on the LoPRA website. The PC will need a lot of help with actioning the plans. The annual Parish meeting is on 16 May, and we're hoping for a decent turnout.

Concerning the intended work at Gallaber, the Long Preston PC didn't originally receive any copies of the planning application, but we now have, and are having a meeting on Thursday night. We'll look at the plans, and after that, put the plans on the table for anyone to inspect without discussion. The meeting will just discuss the Gallaber plans, and some plans for Townhead House.

HF : The Local Development and Employment Pact (LDEP) provides money for such as is proposed by the Village Plan. LP needs a member on the LDEP committee to harvest money for LP. It has 3.5 years to run, and meets around 5 times a year. The meetings start at 18:00-18:30, and run for about 90 minutes.

6.0 Discussion and Feedback

HW : Where are the 21 social houses mentioned in the HNS?

GJ : There are 6 old persons bungalows, 7 Alms Houses, some on the Ribblesdale Estate, Home Housing association owns one.

HW : The perception that the Alms Houses are hard to let is wrong, as I'm the secretary, and they're not.

PSS : The only objections in my critique, are to building houses on greenfields.

HF : Craven Housing participate in the council house right-to-own scheme, but also claim to have a duty to provide increasing numbers of affordable houses.

SB : The deadliest road in Britain is apparently the A682. Surely that must have some impact on the decision on whether to revoke the bypass order?

JG : The number to ring for complaining about the condition of the road through Long Preston is 0845 955675 (the National Highways Authority).

John Sellars : Church Street is getting a road sign by Easter, which will incorporate a 'no turning' aspect.