**RYBURGH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**12th December 2017**

**MINUTES**

Present : Andrew Purdy, Adrian Dyter, Algy Williams, Ian Wilson, Mike Rundle, Hugh Lanham, Chris Buxton, Kate Young and Mark Noble

Apologies: Chris Hobson.

**Item 1 Introductions and apologies**

Chris had written to give apologies for non-attendance. Andrew presented the meeting with an Agenda.

**Item 2 Recap of last meeting, minutes and actions arising**

The minutes of the last meeting were accepted.

**Item 3 Public Meeting 22nd November**

Andrew reported that some 35 people signed the attendance pad that was passed round the meeting. Further submissions were invited but none have been received to date and he felt we will probably not get any more. He felt the difference between planning policies and aspirations was made clear. Attendees were able to view all submissions made and Mike described the types of policies that other NDP’s have adopted. There was an opportunity for questions from the floor. They were limited to whether the NPD would affect the Maltings planning application when made.

Andrew said that Aspirations will have to be taken forward separately. Hugh points out the importance of not marginalising the Aspirations. He says future S106 Agreements may address one or more of the Aspirations but only if the planners know what they are and that it is important therefore that they are included in an annex to the NDP. Andrew says he will pursue the Aspirations with the Parish Council in due course. Ian agrees to raise the pursuing of the Aspirations at the next PC meeting. Ian says he has a contact in the County Council which is looking at an initiative to use disused railway lines as cycle paths and he will raise the Ryburgh – Fakenham route with him. Mark pointed out that a cycle path along the disused railway might become a route for trespassers to enter Pensthorpe. He said Pensthorpe supported the development of Ryburgh but access by trespassers would disturb the conservation and wildlife initiatives, be a risk to bio security and to the security of Bill and Deb’s home. He accepted that the boundary formed by the disused railway line is not presently secure and that if it could be made secure as a part of the cycleway initiative that might be an improvement.

**Item 4 Meeting with Deb Jordan**

Mike reported that he and Andrew had met with Deb Jordan and Mark Noble at Pensthorpe on Tuesday 5th December in response to Bill Jordan’s letter of 6th November and there it had been a useful opportunity for Pensthorpe to explain their concerns and for the objectives of the NDP to be explained. Pensthorpe made its support of any initiative to protect the landscape and ecology of the Wensum Valley very clear. It was indicated that Mark would attend the working group meeting tonight on behalf of Pensthorpe.

**Item 5 Drafting the Policies**

The exchange of e-mails between Mike and Iain Withington (NNDC Planning Officer) had been copied to all members of the Working Group in which NNDC had been asked to suggest experts for professional reports to assist in the drafting of policies in relation to traffic, housing, landscape and ecology and Iain had replied suggesting steps to be taken and people to consult, before commissioning experts to prepare reports (herein referred to as “Iain’s Work”).

There was discussion upon whether we should draft policies before following Iain’s advice, or afterwards. Mark pointed said that he had experienced contradictions between NNDC environment policies and development policies and therefore had little faith in what the NNDC may have to say by way of advice about planning policies. It was also said [origin please?] that we have to know what we want and not be led by the NNDC. Hugh commented upon the NNDC requirement that the NDP should not rehearse existing NNDC policies and said that we should be wary of this because the NNDC policies may change over the life of the NDP and it is therefore of importance to state the context of the NDP policy. Andrew thought this concern could be addressed “in the crafting of the way you write the policy”.

The meeting reminded itself of who had taken responsibility for what subjects for the public meeting in July so that we might bear this in mind in the allocation of Iain’s Work. Chris B had dealt with History/Archaeology, Ian had taken Environment, Algy Building/Development, Graham Infrastructure and Mike Business/Industry. Persons at the meeting were invited to indicate which planning subject arising in Iain’s e-mail they would be interested in taking on. It was agreed that two persons should be allocated for each subject of Iain’s Work. It was implied if not expressly stated that those persons taking on Iain’s Work on any particular subject would make the enquiries that he suggests and report back to the Working Group when it next meets. A short report in writing would be most helpful.

**Graham (by Adrian in his absence) and Andrew** volunteered to take the subject of **Traffic/Highways**. *[Secretary’s note can you get to the bottom of what is a designated HGV route if there is such a thing]*

The subject of **Housing** and what form of expert report we may need if any, was discussed at length. Hugh thought that the message from the village submissions was that there should be no major new development, only infilling and that the brief for the expert should be to review the LDF for the village. He also said he is against “social engineering” of the type that devises a planning policy for particular types/sizes of housing. Andrew felt the report might address how Ryburgh might grow to be a sustainable community in the next 20 years with/supporting the much valued shop, pub, butcher etc. Mike suggested the report might address what the effect of 50 new houses would be on the community. It was pointed out that the intended Maltings application for 50 new houses and business expansion would be done and dusted before the NDP and its report are completed. Adrian confirmed that no work has been done in connection with the intended application upon the social effects of the development on the village. There was discussion as to whether if the Maltings housing is permitted it will be a precedent for further applications for housing. Andrew suggested we need a report to show that we do not need further development. No conclusions were reached and **Mike and Algy** volunteered to explore the issue of what report may be desirable for the NDP, given the particular circumstances of the village, with a consultant, if a consultant can be found to give his opinion for free relying upon the possibility of getting the work.

Kate pointed out that Mike had ill-advisedly used the words “disregarding Highfield Close” at the public meeting on 22nd November. Mike regretted any hurt feelings caused by this and pleaded that the words were used in the context of the number of houses built in the village over the last 20 years, within which Highfield Close was an uncharacteristic blip.

Ian volunteered to do Iain’s Work in relation to the ecological assessment and said that **ecology and landscape** are subjects that overlap and should be dealt with together. This was agreed and the work will be done by **Ian, Mike and Mark** (who will assist if time allows) having regard to Pensthorpe’s special expertise in the subjects.

It was agreed that there are other issues that will be the subject of planning policies which cannot be dealt with now, having regard to the absence of capacity within the Working Group, but which will be returned to in due course.

**Item 6 Other Business**

Ike was asked to proceed with the preparation of a new grant application, so far as possible.

Chris B indicated he would talk to Paul Rhymes about policies relating to historical/archaeological conservation and Mike said he believed the NNDC have an unpublished list of heritage assets t do not qualify for listing or special status that he might ask for in relation to Ryburgh.

Ian said that we do not yet have a complete list of businesses in the NDP area and the number of employees they support and that the information would be of great use in the NDP process. He also mentioned the importance of infrastructure to business and thee case for infrastructure such as broadband/mobile phone coverage could be better made if we have a grasp of our business community.

**Item 7 Dates of future meetings.**

The next meeting of the Working Group will be at the Maltings Board Room at 7.30pm on Tuesday 13th February 2018.