**RYBURGH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**10th April 2019**

**MINUTES**

Present: Andrew Purdy, Graham Taylor, Mike Rundle, Hugh Lanham, Gill Waldron, Ian Wilson, Neil Dandy

Apologies: Algy Williams.

**Item 1 Introductions and apologies**

Apologies from the above were received. Mark Noble has moved from his post as general manager with Pensthorpe to another job but retains a connection. An e-mail to his replacement Adrian Ramsey was met with a response that Adrian has not taken up Mark’s role and that Mark would be in touch to advise who would be best placed to take his place on the Working Group.

No agenda had been prepared.

**Item 2 Meeting with NNDC of 20th March.**

Andrew opened the meeting by reporting that he, Mike and Michael Rayner had met with Iain Withington of NNDC at Cromer on 20th March. He thought the meeting was positive. Only one NDP (Saxthorpe and Corpusty) has so far been approved by NNDC and we are the most advanced of the other applications that have been received to produce NDPs. He did not think the planners welcome the interference in planning of the NDP groups but accept it and were on the whole constructive. Iain said that the emerging local plan would not begin consultation until May and would probably not be adopted until 2020 and accordingly he recommended that the Ryburgh NDP does not await the emerging local plan, but precedes it. Iain cautioned about the manner in which we refer to the existing local plan in our NDP for fear that the wrong wording might render a provision redundant, once the emerging local plan has come into force. The policies before the 20th March meeting were those that Mike has circulated with his e-mail of 8th April.

Iain has provided a copy of the current emerging local plan (available from Mike to anyone wishing to see it) which was before the meeting.

Since the meeting with the NNDC we have received an amended housing policy from Michael Rayner (which was also circulated with the e-mail of 8th April) and the meeting agreed to consider each policy in turn, starting with Housing.

**Item 3 – Housing**

Andrew explained that Community led development, which may not necessarily correspond to the other policies of the emerging local plan, is a feature of the emerging local plan (Policy SD2) and provides the opportunity for our NDP to propose a scheme of our own for development in the village. Michael Rayners draft policy proposes a policy supporting infill housing.

It was agreed that the identification of the area within which infill housing may take place is likely to be difficult. There may be those, during the consultation upon the draft NDP, who will want the boundary altered to include areas otherwise excluded and vice versa. It was suggested that the line should be drawn to an agreed number of metres behind each existing building, and we could then “join the dots”. Rayner proposes that the line should be no more than 50 metres from a neighbouring house. Hugh felt 25 metres might be more appropriate. Rayner proposes that any infill development should be limited to one to ten dwellings. It was agreed that this should be altered to make clear that infill development shall mean no more than five units.

Hugh suggested it might be advisable to have an annual limit. Ian raised the desirability of setting standards for the delivery of best available techniques of energy conservation in any new building. Mike was instructed to consider inserting wording to introduce these ideas into the draft policy.

Andrew will prepare a draft of the plan showing the boundary of the village for the purpose of this policy, for circulation amongst the working group and for written comment.

**Item 4 – Traffic Safety.**

Mike asked Graham the weight of the HGVs that the Maltings use. He said the total weight is some 44 tonnes, of which some 28/29 tonnes is the weight of the load and some 15 tonnes is the weight of the vehicle. Andrew calculated that the current limit of 115,000 tonnes of product would involve movements, given a working week of 261 days and one movement in of the raw material and one out of the product, of 31.47 movements a day.

Neil advised that he had undertaken some kerb to kerb measurements as follows

77 Fakenham Road – 5.7 metres

Madeleine’s House – 4.7 metres

40 Fakenham Road – 4.7 metres

28 Fakenham Road – 4.4 metres

And, using basic vehicle data – the standard width for a typical 40 tonne HGV is 3.15 metres and the standard width for a typical family vehicle is 2.00 metres – he had reached the conclusion that the only location surveyed at which an HGV and a car may safely pass each other is adjacent to 77 Fakenham Road. In all the other locations one or other vehicle must mount the pavement.

Graham expressed unhappiness with the way in which the draft policy is presently drafted. He pointed out that not all materials were transported by rail, prior to the railway closing. He did not accept that the HGV traffic is incompatible with the safety of person and property. Gill suggested that reference to the Maltings by name in the draft policy was not necessary. She asked whether the policy might be drafted so as to provide - that proposals for development that increased safety risks would not be supported – which might be a more acceptable alternative. Mike stated his view that what is needed is a policy that prohibits development that would generate HGV movements through the village additional to existing levels.

Hugh pointed out that the roads referred to in the draft policy should be amended to include “Bridge Road” and that the word “additional” might usefully be included between the words “sustained” and “HGV”.

Mike recounted the NNDC comments upon a policy drawn in these terms; that it is not “positive” in nature, that an analysis of traffic movements would be appropriate, that traffic is already considered with an applicants traffic impact assessment being required upon each application. Andrew thought that Iain had expressed the view that a policy such as presently drafted would be rejected upon examination. Mike did not recall Iain having been that definitive.

Mike indicated he would redraft the policy to deal with the concerns, so far as he is able.

**Item 5 – Protection of the Landscape**

The draft policy was approved. It was recognised that adjustment would be necessary to reflect that the “Policy ENV2” is a policy in the emerging local plan and is not/will not be in force and will need to be referred to as an emerging policy.

Where possible reference should be made to the page/paragraph in Yardley’s report that supports the claimed “great scenic value” of the “valued views”.

**Item 6 – Protection of the Environment**

A draft of the plan showing the defined “habitat areas” was before the meeting. Graham drew attention to the inclusion within the green line of a part of the Maltings lagoon and of a number of buildings in the area of the tributary behind the Maltings. Graham objected to the inclusion of this tributary area within the area affected by the policy. He pointed out that there is another tributary area that has not been included and that this is inconsistent. Mike will reconsider with Rob Yaxley the importance or otherwise of the inclusion of the tributary areas.

It was suggested that the phrase “significantly outweighs” be substituted for “clearly outweighs” where it appears in the draft policy.

Ian pointed out the importance that should be attributed to the habitat value of scrub to wildlife. Mike was asked to give thought to incorporating wording in this policy or in the schedule of Aspirations (whichever is most appropriate) to encourage the creation/preservation of scrub.

Hugh said he recalled mention of an aquifer, somewhere within the river valley, and thought it might be something we would benefit from referring to, but he did not know where it is or what its qualities may be. He will confer with Graham who has an Environment Agency map that he thinks may assist.

**Item 7 – Open Land Areas**

A draft of the plan showing the defined “Wensum Valley and its tributaries” was before the meeting. Mike explained the planning significance of the planning designation as Open Land as provided in Policy ENV7 of the emerging local plan – that development on visually important Open Spaces will not usually be supported. He referred to the area shown on the plan within the green line and suggested it be reduced to limit the same to areas visible from the public road. The meeting preferred that we proceed with the entire area and only reduce upon a justified challenge.

Graham objected to the inclusion of the tributary area behind the Maltings, within the area affected by the policy.

**Item 8 – Protection of the Historic Environment**

Mike said that Iain does not think the current draft policy to be workable because he does not believe the Norfolk Historic Environmental Service will be willing to consult on archaeological assessments or field evaluations. Mike is to make enquiry into whether that is the case and intends to redraft, if not.

**Item 9 – Next Steps**

Mike will prepare a fresh draft of the NDP and circulate to the members of the Working Group for commentary, with the objective of the draft and its supporting reports appearing on the Parish Council web site as soon as possible and for submission of the Plan for consultation to NNDC by the end of May.