

Notes of Cooperation Meeting – 22 May 2018

Pannal Village Hall

The following are the notes and key points arising from the cooperation meeting on Tuesday 22 May, where the following Parish Councils and Resident Associations were represented:

- Pannal & Burn Bridge Parish Council.
- Beckwithshaw Parish Council.
- Harlow & Pannal Ash Residents Association (HAPARA).
- North Rigton Parish Council.
- Harlow Moor Road Action Group.
- Apologies were received from Hampsthwaite Action Group.

1 There was a general discussion on how best we could work together towards when the Planning Inspector would be considering the Local Plan. Whilst we all had issues specific to our patches, common problems such as traffic, lack of infrastructure and landscape matters united us all. There was also a strong feeling that we could not bank on the local councillors supporting our cause, even though they `purported` to be on our side. As matters progressed a way of appealing over the heads of our councillors might need to be determined, as so far the Local Plan process had seen them sticking to the party line and residents comments largely ignored..

2. HAPARA then gave a presentation, broadly relating to their area, on the expected traffic impact that could be expected from the potential developments being proposed in the Local Plan. Key points were:

- 2.1 That the Jacobs Model Option 3a was being used in traffic calculations.
- 2.2 That the figures being used seemed to be on the low side.
- 2.3 That the same figures were being used for every proposed development in the plan, no matter what the size or proximity.
- 2.4 That there were no cumulative impact calculations.
- 2.5 That main route congestion never went beyond 100%, the assumption being that the side roads and lanes would absorb any increases in traffic.

3. Pannal & Burn Bridge asked that the slide showing the various developments be expanded to include their sites and that it should also include Penny Pot lane. This would then show the whole of the western arc of Harrogate.

4. The BWB Consulting Report, commissioned by Pannal & Burn Bridge, had looked at traffic and safety implications for the three Pannal sites. The brief issued to the consultants had not asked them to look at the cumulative impact of all the Local Plan implications west of Harrogate. However, to do this would require a new brief and cost additional monies, and it seemed to make sense to `piggy back` onto the work already done, rather than to keep reinventing the wheel. All the organisations represented at the meeting agreed in principle, that it made sense to collectively fund such an approach, although Harlow Moor Drive Action Group indicated that they would move under the umbrella of HAPARA.

5. Following on from Point 4 there was also the matter of how such work would be presented to the Planning Inspector. It was one thing to ask BWB to undertake an expanded study, but if they were (prepared to) to represent us at the hearing, then this would incur further costs. The approach that was agreed to determine whether a broad based study to cover the west of Harrogate was feasible was as follows:

5.1 All parties represented would exchange ideas on what should be included in an expanded brief. This would be done over the coming week.

5.2 Ways in which the Jacob Model assumptions could be challenged would be part of an expanded study.

5.3 Pannal & Burn Bridge and HAPARA would work together to create a collective brief.

5.4 This collective brief would be taken to BWB to determine whether they were prepared to carry out this work, and to determine the cost.

5.5 Another Cooperation meeting would be held in the second half of June to make a decision on whether we go ahead with this work. If need be a representative from the consultants could be invited to this meeting.

5.6 That Cardale would be contacted to see if they wished to be part of this collective approach to the traffic problem.

6. Both North Rigton and Beckwithshaw indicated that they also had traffic data that they could provide.

7. Finally, given that the Local Plan timescale shows the Planning Inspector considering the document towards the end of 2018, then (assuming the decision is made to go ahead) we should be briefing consultants on the traffic study in July. This would give them time to complete the study, and us time to build up our case.

8. There was then a brief discussion on Landscape matters, but it was felt that to commission consultants to look at this would be beyond our financial means. For the time being it would be the traffic implications we would concentrate on. But it was felt that the Landscape aspect should not be ignored as the Duchy Residents Association had had success in appealing on these grounds. It was therefore agreed that the Smeeden Foreman and DraW reports would be looked at again, to determine whether their key findings could be `plagurised` and applied to the whole of the west of Harrogate.

9. There was also a brief discussion on the housing numbers, but no actions were agreed.

10. It was agreed that another meeting of the group would be arranged for the second half of June. Venue to be determined.