

**Minutes of the neighbourhood plan steering group meeting held on Tuesday 3rd of March 2020.
At Ingleby Cross Village Hall, starting at 7:40pm**

Attendees:

David Cook (DC)
Sophie Cooper (SC)
George Hunter (GH)
Kathryn Jukes (KJ) – Consultant
Susan Stephenson (SS)
Clive Walley (CW)
Hazel Warhurst (HW)

There are no apologies for absence

The minutes of the 17th of January 2020 meeting were agreed and signed.

Amendments to the minutes of 26 February 2020 to be made by HW, to be presented for signature at the next meeting.

There were no declarations of interest.

Consultation Statement

KJ explained what was required in the consultation statement. A draft was circulated by HW and RE to KJ for her comments. Further work was required on the statement particularly in preparing appendices substantiating all the various activities. GH offered to help on the document, and he will work with our RE&HW to finalise a further draft the circulation firstly to KJ and then onto to the steering group.

Website updating

HW had supplied to CW the 2016 agendas that she had available on her system. SS was asked to go through her 2016 minutes file and pull out and scan all the 2016 minutes that she could find. These were then be reviewed by CW and HW to see whether they were in order, after which they could be uploaded to the website.

SS confirmed that she had checked the website and was satisfied the Ken Jones dates and roles were correctly presented on the website.

SS will upload the invitation to the 6th of February 2019 open evening and the affordable brief that had been prepared by Amanda Madden.

It was agreed that the brief should be circulated to all residents along with the eligibility criteria for affordable housing when the next parish newsletter was circulated. Action on HW

RE had supplied a brief of her contributions to the open evening and HW provided CW with a copy of her submission at the meeting. CW then undertook to add the final section and circulate the brief for approval.

SS agreed that she would upload the brief when it was finally approved.

KJ said it was not necessary to upload the statutory responses to the web at this time and it was not required to have the resident's names on any responses that were uploaded. However HDC will require residents' names and details where they had agreed that such information could be provided.

RE confirmed that she had such a list available when required.

There was no further update on NYCC section 77 for approval.

There was nothing further to report on the Beyond's progress on evaluating the school and playing field sites.

The meeting then went on to consider the draft of both statutory consultees and resident's responses to the pre submission consultation draft.

KJ undertook to review and amend all the draft concept comments that have been that were on that document. Action on KJ.

The meeting discussed whether it would be appropriate to include a revision to the plan proposals to move the Ingleby Arncliffe bus stop nearer to the proposed school site. The consensus was, as previously discussed, that it would be inappropriate as there was not room for the bus to turn around in that vicinity.

The meeting then went on to consider the weighting that the draft neighbourhood plan would have in relationship to any renewed or new planning application in respect of the school site. KJ stated that at this moment in time the neighbourhood plan did not carry any formal weight as far as HDC planning Department were concerned. It would have to wait until the HDC statutory consultation was concluded. When it went from there to the examiner in her view it would carry an 80% weighting following post examination that would rise to 90%, passing a Parish referendum would get it will give it 100% weighting.

The meeting then went onto consider what steps could be included in any revised plan to strengthen the criteria and rules regarding who could occupy any new houses whether those houses were either affordable or open market houses.

KJ explained there was a difference between the way that HDC considered housing need and occupancy and the way that our plan was drafted. Our plan focused solely on meeting the needs of residents whereas the HDC view of housing considered internal and external migration.

KJ went on to explain that:

1. The 1985 Housing Act gave the power to impose a local occupancy condition on both new and affordable properties.
 - a. Local occupancy in the Act's context means they must have either lived or worked or had a local connection in the area for the last three years.
2. The Act's principle target was National Parks and KJ felt that given our Cross-Boundary situation and that the Plan's key driver was the provision of new housing for residents, we may be able to progress the case.
3. Further support may be taken from the status of the Parish as a rural Parish by virtual of the Section 17 of the Housing Act 1996. This defines the Parish as a rural parish and under section 37 of the Housing Act 1985, it may be the case that the local occupancy criteria do apply.
4. She explained that such conditions were normally included in section 106 agreements.
 - a. CW added that Amanda Madden either had, or was, drafting up such an agreement for the proposed development.
 - i. After the meeting CW contacted Amanda Madden to establish if the S106 agreement would cover all house tenures – affordable and open market¹.

The meeting discussed the implications of introducing such a clause at this stage and concern was expressed that it could compromise the project's viability. Clauses of this type are likely to lead to a 20% reduction in open market prices.

¹ Email correspondence with Amanda attached.

KJ also explained that if we wished to include the local occupancy condition as a new policy, it would be subject to consultation.

Please note Affordable Housing is unaffected by whether the policy under consideration is in or out of the plan, since there will be a local housing policy which will set out the eligibility criteria for affordable housing, which will have connectivity to the Parish at its heart.

The meeting then gave its view on such a move and except for DC, all other members rejected the proposal as a further delay to the plan was unacceptable.

SC asked whether there was another option.

KJ replied if we allow for inward migration by allowing more than 18 houses then we could incorporate the local occupancy conditions by amending the Plan's wording, without going to a new consultation. CW asked whether such an approach would be acceptable to an Examiner and was KJ confident. KJ thought she could amend the wording adequately. KJ said that we could try that as an approach and discuss with HDC prior to finalising the Plan.

KJ undertook to draft "some words" for Beyond to set out our thinking on "local occupancy", based on it not being a change in policy.

KJ stated that 4-year-old evidence of housing needs in the context of Plans was quite acceptable. RE brought out the point that it was only in late November 2019, that 19 affordable and 4 open market interests were noted as part of the Beyond community consultation.

CW to look to expand on Page 17, in relationship to the post 5-year demand.

There was a short discussion on the design and KJ asked could we not expand on what is meant by local character, page 25, second paragraph. After discussion, GH agreed to draft an extra paragraph².

It was agreed that an OS map should be obtained with a simple red line to show the extent of site (6). CW to action with Beyond. The Plan's present Indicative Layout, as Appendix A would remain for information purposes only but in supporting text.

It was agreed that no specific reference would be made to the availability of parking at the front of the school entrance.

It was agreed that the wording should be corrected as commented on at item 23.

There was a brief discussion on PV panels, SC and KJ both explained that the difficulty with them was transferring the energy back to the grid.

KJ made the meeting aware that one cannot allocate more land that covered by the SEA/HRA work. Any increase would have to be subject to further consultation and another SEA/HRA work.

HW agreed to review and strengthen the wording on CAP IC1. Action on HW.

CIL funding, (payable at £55 per sq. metre for new open market housing) would if applicable be around £6,000 or £10,000 if the Neighbourhood Plan was approved. HW would like to improve the footpath down from The Parklands to Ingleby Cross again using CIL funds. It was decided not to specify how the funds would be spent at this stage.

² George's proposal attached.

KJ will revise the Plan itself ensuring we receive her draft before our next meeting.

All KJ's suggested changes to our draft Plan in respect of HDC's comments were accepted for incorporation into a further draft of the Plan and then subject to the Steering Group's consideration. Action on KJ.

Anyone who has specific questions or concerns on this approach, should contact KJ directly to raise their points on KJ's proposed amendments.

KJ made the point that HDC emerging plan had still to be examined so its policies may change and in any event, their examination was likely to last until February 2021. So, it was sensible to keep our plan referring to both existing and emerging policies.

The point was made that compared to Emerging policy HG3, 5.42 which sought an equal sub-division of the 30% affordable amount as between, rented, social rented and shared ownership, our proposed split was differentⁱ. Action on KJ.

Some discussion on whether the existing draft policies P2 and P3 were effectively setting out the sole responsibility of the Parish Council to instigate housing needs surveys.

GH said that to avoid predatory outside developer was a factor, he thought this was agreed to be introduced into our policies or at least into their justification.

The meeting was open to reorganising the order of policies, to firstly set out what would drive any housing development in the Parish, replacing P1 in terms of the ordering of policies.

KJ felt it was legitimate to have policies that focused on resisting a loss or change.

KJ had checked that CAP were in fact subject to referendum although they are not planning policies. It was agreed to leave them in the document since moving them to an appendix would only affect their respective weighting.

Mike Dando (MD) will prepare the Basic Conditions statement, but he needs the policy wording to be agreed and an updated version of the plan.

KJ to email CW with costs to date and estimated costs to complete Final Plan, Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions.

Next meeting, Thursday, 19th March at 7:00pm Village Hall. SS gave her apologies she would not be able to come until 7:30pm.

Signed: 

Date: 19/4/20

ⁱ The emerging policy goes onto state "An alternative mix may be supported where there is evidence that the proposal will meet local housing need".

< This e-mail was classified as: OFFICIAL >

I will ask our legal team and come back to you Clive.

Amanda Madden
Rural Housing Enabler
Richmondshire District Council

t: 01748 901117
e: Amanda.Madden@Richmondshire.gov.uk
w: www.richmondshire.gov.uk



The information contained in this email is confidential. It is intended only for the stated addressee(s) and access to it by any other person is unauthorised. If you are not an addressee, you must not disclose, copy, circulate or in any other way use or rely on the information contained in this email. Such unauthorised use may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please inform the sender immediately and delete it and all copies from your system. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Richmondshire District Council.

All e-mail traffic may be subject to monitoring/recording in accordance with relevant legislation.

Richmondshire District Council, Mercury House, Station Road, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL10 4JX.

From: Clive Walley <walleygreenwoods@hotmail.com>
Sent: 05 March 2020 18:00
To: Madden, Amanda <Amanda.Madden@Richmondshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Ingleby Arncliffe

< **WARNING: This e-mail originated from outside the Richmondshire District Council corporate network** >

Amanda

Just recording my earlier telephone call.

Our Neighbourhood plan consultant has raised in response to our concern over what (if any) steps can we take to ensure open market houses (in addition to the affordable) go to residents meeting local occupancy conditions.

She mentioned that it could be in a section 106 agreement. I was enquiring whether in the agreement that you are drafting whether such a condition is there or could be there for open market housing.

Clive

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Hi Clive,

First attempt at an introductory sentence/paragraph to describe the property in the parish against which any new houses must "blend in".

Its too long to be part of P4 but it could be the introduction to P4.

George

Property in the Parish of Ingleby Arncliffe

The parish is made up of the two settlements of Ingleby Arncliffe and Ingleby Cross, each with their own distinct character, and now joined by Cross Lane . The first properties built in the late 16th C. were small cottages built in local Yorkshire stone for workers employed in the agricultural industry. This style of cottage housing predominates to this day in Ingleby Cross, where there has been no significant developments for over 100 years.

Ingleby Arncliffe has seen more development over the years, and employing a broader range of building materials, but the rural character of the main street has remained unchanged. In the 1960's a substantial development of some 30+ modern properties, built mainly in brick, were added to the N.E. periphery of the village and behind the main street. The lane connecting the two settlements was also developed with 8 new properties using mainly brick or rendered construction.

The overall nature and "feel" of the parish is still essentially that of a rural village with character and individuality, made up in the main of small cottage style houses built in local Yorkshire stone.

Any new housing development will need to blend in with neighbouring properties in order to maintain the rural character of the village.