

# Meeting with Ian MacKay, 28<sup>th</sup> July.....

---

You will remember that at our last NP meeting we promised an early update with Ian MacKay – to get his feel for progress to date and to consider and share thinking on next steps.

Richard and I met with him yesterday – a lengthy meeting in Leeds. Interestingly, Ian brought with him two young ‘intern’ types who he wanted to expose to a team that were doing the work well (so, enjoy some praise from LCC!), not least the agenda surrounding the good discussions with the Community.

So, there were two broad issues,

- **Whether to carry out a brief, but significant ‘key community leaders’ consultation based on an ‘intentions statement’.** He liked our written work – the summary note and a more recent ‘themes’ note from Richard. He believed that these could be pulled together into an intentions statement (and he has provided examples from other neighbourhoods, attached – so, **Aberford** – basic, simple and straightforward; **Clifford** – slightly fuller, a bit more complicated – but covers the essentials and **Otley** – not too far off a full neighbourhood Plan and , perhaps, unnecessarily detailed for this purpose). The benefit of doing this, well, it gets everything on the table **before** formally going for the final referendum and it would allow some changes before the final neighbourhood plan report; it allows LCC (they would receive a copy of the intentions – as would other external key departments, and indeed, adjacent Parish Councils as well as the local Parish) to make any early comments – and us to respond accordingly. In short, it derisks a possible adverse/ unconvincing response from the referendum. Ian confirmed that the combined two documents would almost get us quickly to an Aberford/Clifford level – and much of the input would be about formatting and sequencing the balance of objectives/policies/principles and vision. He believed it to be an in house piece of work – not a consultancy requirement. He also made sure that we understood that this (intentions note) was his suggestion based on other best practice – not an LCC requirement

So, two proposals,

*We prepare such a document and circulate to the relevant audience by 3<sup>rd</sup> week in August – with an email reply address. We include the full village (so, a village ‘drop’) plus externals as advised by Ian.*

*We identify appropriate consultancy support and commence the Plan writing by mid-September.*

- **How detailed should the final Plan be?** Much of our NP team conversation has previously been around how much do we need to do; how much do we need to put in – particularly on the allocation sites (so, questions of drainage etc). The answer to that lies entirely with us. So, at one extreme, a high level report that lets developers and planners argue out the detail at a later stage; at the other end, a report that seeks to provide such detail that could subsequently potentially influence the shape/make up etc of the build proposals. We do need to discuss this – particularly on one or two of our specific site allocations. The more detailed, then the greater requirement for investigations etc. Ian was easy with either alternative – and the more detailed does not bring guarantees with it.

So, a proposal,

*We meet briefly in August to cover off this discussion – and I would ask you to consider your availability on any of 8th, 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> August. Venue to be agreed. Please let myself and/or Richard know what would be possible. If you are not available, then written views welcome (essential please).*

Thereafter we had a number of other discussion points,

- Money was available to support this work - £9,000, plus, additionally, £6,500 (because we are making allocations).
- They think our consultation process has been excellent.
- They recognised the particular issues on the coal yard and would want to think further about that – particularly when we come back with our intentions more formally (Stephen, we made your points clearly). This also led to a conversation around building on conservation areas.
- Value in speaking with Neighbouring Parish teams (indeed, the 'requirement' to do so).

Overall a very positive and encouraging meeting – and the continued offer of help and advice. We are seen as a positive partner in this process.

Brodie.

29<sup>th</sup> July.