



## Tadcaster Town Council

The Ark, 33 Kirkgate, Tadcaster LS24 9AQ

01937 834113

[clerk@tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk)

[www.tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk](http://www.tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk)

Open Monday to Thursday 9.30am to 12.30pm

### MINUTES OF TADCASTER NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN - STEERING GROUP MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2022 11.00am AT THE BARN ST JOSEPH'S STREET TADCASTER

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<b>CHAIRMAN</b>	<b>D Gluck</b>
	<b>STEERING GROUP</b>	<b>S Cobb, F Greig, J Firth, K Poskitt</b>
	<b>CONSULTANT</b>	<b>M Dando</b>
	<b>DEPUTY CLERK</b>	
	<b>IN ATTENDANCE</b>	<b>P Tunney</b>

- 1. Apologies:** Jo Mottershead. It was noted that the Green Belt Protection Group had been invited to attend the meeting but had declined.
- 2. Declarations of interest:** DG declared an interest as Manager of the Barn as adoption of the NDP may result in The Barn becoming a protected facility. As a director of the Barn, FG declared the same interest.
- 3. Minutes** of meeting held 15/8/22: These were approved.
- 4. Matters arising** from the minutes: p2 "Magnesium" should read "Magnesian".
- 5. Eleven Arches proposal** - A wide discussion was held re the consultation days held by Gladman Associates about their development proposal. The consultation days were attended by KP, MD, JF and PT. They reported that of the personal present over 90% seemed to be in favour of the proposal. It was also noted that the Tadcaster Green Belt Protection Group (TGBPG) had attended and made clear their opposition to the plan.

In view of the suggestions from the TGBPG that the NDP is in some way favouring the Gladman proposals, DG asked MD for the precise limits of the remit of the NDP. MD stated that the Tadcaster NDP does not recommend or allocate specific sites for housing. It was stated by MD that Eleven Arches is essentially irrelevant to the Neighbourhood Plan. The plan must be in general conformity with the strategic elements of the Selby Local Plan, both the currently adopted and latest replacement Publication Version of which identify the Eleven Arches site as both Green Belt and Locally Important Landscape Area (LILA). As such, the plan must be in line with these designations. It could not, even if the steering group/town council/community wished it, include a policy in support of Eleven Arches as this would be in direct conflict with the Local Plan and be deleted at examination. The steering group agreed

that this should be the stance on Eleven Arches as far as the Neighbourhood Plan is concerned.

KP and MD emphasised that there is no connection between the NDP and private housing developers.

- 6. Selby local Plan Publication Version** – TTC response: There was an extensive discussion re the housing needs allocation in the SDC Local Plan. It was noted that the latest version of the LP shows a drop in allocation to under 400 houses needed. PT reported that at the LP consultation event that this drop was said to be due to a drop in employment opportunities within the town.

PT said that this information came from Caroline Skelly of SDC.

It was agreed that the NDP recommend that TTC accept and endorse the Housing Needs Assessment once finalised and submitted to full Council.

- 7. The NDP pre-submission document** - There was an extensive discussion re prohibition of flood defences and on other building and on insulation projects in the Conservation area. DG questioned whether a policy would be appropriate which allowed for flood and other sustainability improvements to be made in the Conservation Area as this is currently difficult through the current Local Plan.

Other points were discussed concerning development on green spaces and how the Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Project would affect future development plans.

Housing: MD has drafted and read out a new policy line re NDP approach to possible housing sites - ***“as long as they conform to all other local plan policies the NDP are not opposed to such sites”***. This wording was agreed by the meeting to be appropriate.

Pp 36-39: Re the 6 housing sites allocated in the LP. MD has drawn up a policy directly in relation to the housing sites listed in the LP (H1, H2 H3 H4 H5 H6) to be clear on our view on the design of housing on these *particular* sites. This was confirmed as being stated in the draft HNA in relation to design and density.

There were questions re specifics and MD asked members to consider conditions in respect of Butch’s Field and 46 Wighill Lane, and the former Coal Yard. MD raised the question of including points on specific possible housing sites. He asked members to consider 3 sites in particular:

- a) Butch's Field (boundary trees)
- b) 46 Wighill Lane and The former Coal Yard (Old Barn shares wall on frontage to Wighill Lane and the frontage of the cottages)
- c) Fircroft and former Barnardo's Home on Wighill Lane (possibly 112 Wighill Lane?) – is this a non-designated frontage? Disputed footpath from viaduct.

There was agreement to alter wording from “pedestrianised” to “low traffic area and pedestrian priority in relation to Kirkgate.

MD asked for information on probably location of the Brewery Heritage Museum – it is still unclear.

**8. Any other business** – there was none.

**9. Date of next meeting** – 23/1/23