

**Pannal and Burn Bridge Parish Council
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting
Held by Zoom on Monday 16th August 2021**

Present:	Mike Dando (MD)	(Directions Planning: Associate)
	Cathy Burrell (CB)	PC and SG Chairman
	Jane Chung (JC)	SG Volunteer - Chair of Environment FG
	Ethne Bartup (EB)	SG Volunteer - Chair of Facilities FG
	Howard West (HW)	PC and SG - Chair of Transport FG
	Geoff Catley (GC)	SG Volunteer
	Jane Marlow (JM)	Clerk

1 Apologies for absence - all present.

2 Declarations of business interest - there were none.

3 Minutes of meeting held 28th June 2021 - accepted as an accurate record.

4 Matters arising - Item 6) Policy Intentions Document (PID) Consultation: MD confirmed that 108 SurveyMonkey PID responses had been made with 5 received from statutory consultees which resulted in (to-date) +80-90% demonstrating support for 1) the vision and 2) all policies. He added that he is approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way through the analysis within a constructed grid which, at the present time, amounted to 114 pages. **Item 7) PID Consultation Event (including P Point presentation) 24th July 2021:** excluding the SG, there was one attendee who made a useful contribution.

Confirmation was given that the Girl Guides association had ownership of the telephone “book swap” kiosk which was proposed for inclusion within the Facility Group’s listings.

In response to query, MD confirmed that any Green Spaces should be delineated and assessed but that no extensive tracts of land be included - any Green Space must have its special value to the community identified if it should already fall within the Green Belt.

5 Minutes of Focus Groups - Facilities dated 9th July 2021 and Environment dated 20th July 2021 were submitted to the Steering Group.

6 Consideration of the Part 1 AECOM Report - MD informed the SG that this draft Part 1 is a description of the area with Part 2 to be more definitive. AECOM have requested detailed feedback with regards to this Part 1 which is required to be returned via an annotated .pdf document. HW requested MD to seek confirmation as to whether permission is required with regards to various photos.

The following constitute specific comments made by MD and SG members with regard to the report:

Page 6 - Background - 1st Para - delete “Bradford” and replace with Harrogate. Include in new first sentence as follows “*The Parish Council of Pannal and Burn Bridge within Harrogate, representing the villages of Pannal and Burn Bridge, the residential areas of Walton Park and Crimble Meadows together with the area of rural hinterland have established*”

2nd Para - typo, should read “*Burn Bridge*”.

Objective - delete “housing” from “any future housing development”. The point being that the Design Codes document should relate to all new development not just housing.

Methodology - first bullet point - change “an inception call was held with AECOM representatives and the Chairman of the NPSG” to “*an inception call was held with AECOM representatives, a member of the SG and the parish council’s Neighbourhood Plan consultant*”.

Document Structure - 04 Design Codes - remove "housing" from "any future housing development".

Page 7 - Study Area – line 3 - remove 'housing' and replace with 'development'.
to expand the final sentence to include *"but will also include rural areas of the parish with their scattered farms and dwellings and industrial / commercial developments on Leeds Road"*.

Page 8 - Planning Context - Policy GS2 Settlement Hierarchy – the last 2 sentences of this paragraph are inaccurate in that Burn Bridge is indeed part of the Pannal service village.

Page 12 - Historic Evolution & Heritage - 1st Para - amend "St Robert's Church" to "*St Robert of Knaresborough Parish Church*".

2nd Para - remove "The Carr" from "*Leeds Road (A61)*".

3rd Para - remove "Spacey Houses" and amend to "*which has served the villages of Pannal and Burn Bridge since 1848*".

- remove "The Carr" from "*Leeds Road (A61)*".

Page 13 - Map and photograph of church to be annotated as "*St Robert of Knaresborough Parish Church*".

JC to clarify the number of listed buildings – i.e. is it 10 (ref Historic England), 11 (ref AECOM or 12 (ref PID) and what are they?

Page 14 - Landscape - bullet point spelling to correct from "Wharf" to "*Wharfe*".
Map annotation of "Crimple Valley SLA" not included within the map area.

Page 16 - Route Hierarchy - 4th Para - map does not label Station Road but is included in text.
Both Rossett Green Lane and Yew Tree Lane to be included and labelled as secondary routes within map.
Four bus stops to be shown on Leeds Road and one on Rossett Green Lane.

Page 17 - Hill Top Lane photo looks north and out of parh - photo to be re-taken from driveway aspect to show southerly downward direction (and into parish).

Page 18 - Map annotation to be corrected to read 1) "*St Robert of Knaresborough Parish Church*" and 2) "*Crimple Valley Post Office and Farm Shop*" and to include in 2nd Para text "*There is a Co-op convenience store, Post Office and village shop, M&S Food supermarket and petrol station*".

"Spacey Houses" on map should read "*Walton Park*".

The mapped "Sports Facilities" delineation to include the driving range (between the golf course and Pannal).

Page 20 - Sense of Place & Wayfinding - 3rd Para - correct church name to "*St Robert of Knaresborough Parish Church*" in both text and on map.

Page 22 - View 10 - correct church name, as above.

Page 25 - Photographic Analysis & Observations - photo analysis to include new builds on Rossett Green Lane and also those on Walton Park, Crimble Meadows and Mill Lane.

Page 30 - Correct photo 14 "Spring Lane" which is wall-posted as Church Lane to be annotated as "*Church Lane with Spring Lane and Main Street*". Correct photo 15 "Spring Lane" to "*Main Street*".

MD's expectation of the report is that the whole parish will be covered by "character" areas with design codes of greater/lesser extent, as appropriate, pertaining to each. This will serve to guide any development in the more rural and fringe areas of the parish, including commercial areas, as well as the already built-up villages and residential areas.

HW commented that the future of the Methodist Church may be in question with MD adding that it could prove a “test case” going forward with one policy determining protection of the church as being of heritage value and a second policy providing protection as a community facility.

7 **Date of next meeting** - following discussion, it was decided to hold a preliminary meeting by Zoom on Thursday, 2nd September, 2021, at 6.30pm when SG members (only) would consider any community actions arising from MD’s PID grid results which he envisaged would be circulated by the end of August. MD would join the further Zoom meeting on Monday, 6th September, at 6.30pm which would include a discussion on any community actions with a planning implication as well as all other sections of the grid.

8 **A O B** - there was none.

JM / 170821