

MINUTES FOR THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF RUDBY PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY 7TH MAY 2024 IN THE LEVEN ROOM, VILLAGE HALL, HUTTON RUDBY STARTING AT 7.30PM

In attendance: Councillor Mortimer (Chairman), Councillors Bragg, Jopling, Puttick, Saxton, Simpson, Tate, Titterton and Voke. North Yorkshire Councillor Hugill and approximately 45 members of the public.

1. To approve apologies for absence and agree a minute taker.

RESOLVED to accept the apologies of Councillors Barker and Horvath.

In the absence of the Clerk due to illness, the Chairman proposed that Councillor Simpson should take the minutes. Seconded by Councillor Jopling and agreed unanimously.

2. Declarations of interest.

None were declared.

3. Opening Remarks by the Chair

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that the sole purpose of the meeting was for the Parish Council to decide on its response to the latest consultation on the planning application for 50 homes at Paddocks End (planning reference number 21/02719/FUL). The next normal Parish Council meeting would be held as scheduled on Monday, 13th May in the Hub at 7.30pm for all other business.

The Chairman introduced the councillors in attendance and explained where this application was in the planning process, and what was likely to happen next. He then summarised the history of the application and how it relates to the (unfinished) Neighbourhood Plan.

The position of the Parish Council when last consulted was explained. New information was now available and there are new councillors, so a different decision might be made. This would be a perfectly legitimate outcome.

The Chairman explained that NY Councillor David Hugill would be given the opportunity to make some opening remarks but as he may be involved in the decision at North Yorkshire Council, he is constrained in what he can say. The landowner of the proposed site would then be given the opportunity to make opening remarks prior to taking contributions for anyone else attending who wished to address the Parish Council. Following contributions from the public, the landowner and Councillor Hugill would have the opportunity to make any closing remarks.

The Chairman asked the public to treat all contributors courteously and not to interrupt speakers. If a member of the public wished to make a counter point, then they were asked to raise it after the speaker had finished. After everyone who wished to speak had spoken, the meeting would be closed to the public and no further contributions would be taken from the floor.

In accordance with the law, only councillors in the room have a vote, however, statements from some councillors who are not present will be read out before the Parish Councillors who are present debate the application and come to a decision.

4. Meeting open to the public.

NY Councillor Hugill joined the meeting at this point (7.52pm).

Councillor Hugill confirmed he was constrained in what he could say by being on the Planning Committee. He said a site visit is normally held on the Monday before the Planning Committee on the Thursday. He would try and arrange for a Highways representative to attend the site visit. It is anticipated that the application will go to the Planning Committee on Thursday, 13th June (10am) at Stonecross.

The landowner then addressed the meeting and raised a number of issues including

- his time in the village and his involvement with various organisations and building projects
- Broadacres Housing survey and the needs of young people and the more elderly
- he considered the application to be inline with the Village Design Statement
- the role of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the portion which would come to the Parish was outlined
- available School capacity
- no public subsidy would be involved in the proposed development
- the mix of dwelling types
- need 50 dwellings to be economically viable
- in the last 45 years, the village has had 50 new dwelling
- in discussions with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) concerning the land to the west of the proposed development
- plans of the proposed development were available for inspection

Issues raised by the public included

- the role and state of the Neighbourhood Plan
- the Broadacres Housing needs survey was undertaken by a commercial organisation and the sample size
- how long does a housing needs survey cover?
- the Neighbourhood Plan came up with the need for 25 dwellings
- what is social housing and what is affordable housing?
- affordable housing includes social rent (60% of private rent), affordable rent (80% of private rent) and shared ownership
- NYC's policy for allocation of social housing
- NYC "busing" people in from outside the village to fill the social housing
- the housing mix of the proposed development
- the number of bungalows and what constitutes a bungalow
- impact on the sewerage facility and the potential increase in sewerage overflows
- a range of highways issues including access, speeding on adjacent roads, increase in traffic, change speed limits
- low level of traffic is why people speed
- the Parish Council has signed up to 20 is plenty
- North Yorkshire is considering its speeding policy but won't be signing up to 20 is plenty
- footpath access to Langbaugh Road
- the state of the area to the west of the proposed development and its role in nutrient neutrality and biodiversity offset
- access to this area would be permissive access and could be withdrawn if abused
- nothing would be confirmed concerning the area until a section 106 agreement was agreed which is likely to be after the Planning Committee
- the Parish Council has not been involved in the discussions between the landowner and the LPA concerning this area
- no guarantee an agreed section 106 will be reached or for how long
- the main concern was over the number of houses and not the location
- the positive housing mix
- location was inline with the Neighbourhood Plan
- the delay in building out the extant approval on the opposite side of the road
- the extant approval has been taken over by Brierley (previously Broadacres)

- massive development locally (e.g. Kirklevington)
- request for a show of hands over the application
- the current Local Plan and the forthcoming North Yorkshire Local Plan
- this application is made under policy HG5 (Windfall) and is towards the upper end of that policy and may be over
- the economic need for 50 dwellings was queried
- Ingleby Arncliffe Neighbourhood Plan has been approved but has hit a buffer over development
- the role of 1 and 2 bedroom properties

In his closing remarks, the landowner recognised that most people opposed the proposal but highlighted the elements that people supported (e.g. housing mix, location) and the benefits he believed for the village.

NY Councillor Hugill said he was in attendance to hear peoples' views.

As requested, the Chairman asked for a show of hands concerning the proposed development. Approximately 30 people opposed the proposed development, approximately 12 supported the proposed development and two abstained.

The Chairman then closed the meeting to the public.

There was a short break while those who wished to leave the room before the Parish Council discussed the application could do so.

5. Councillors' Decision on the Application.

The Chairman read out a statement from Councillor Horvath who could not attend the meeting. Councillor Horvath supported the application.

Councillors had a lengthy discussion on the application and the issues raised by the public. The Chairman opened the debate by inviting each councillor (in reverse alphabetical order) to give their views on the application. Discussion continued after these opening statements with councillors making supplementary or counterpoints.

Councillor Simpson then proposed that the Parish Council should object to the application on similar grounds to its previous submissions. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Titterton.

Councillor Jopling proposed that the Parish Council should support the application. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Tate.

Councillor Simpson's proposal, being the first submitted, was put to a vote. The proposal to object to the application was **passed** by five votes to four. As a proposal was passed, Councillor Jopling's proposal fell and was not put to a vote.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their time and constructive discussion.

Meeting closed 22.35