**Murton Parish Neighbourhood Plan Working Party**

**Report to the Parish Council May 9th 2018**

1. **Grant from Locality**

It was noted that the Parish Council at its meeting of March 14th agreed to apply, on behalf of the Working Party, for a new grant from Locality. The Working Party is working with Dave Chetwyn, our consultant, on the new grant application. Bids were allowed from April 1st. We have now written to express our wish to apply for another grant and we have been informed that we qualify to apply. Good news! However, the less good news is that that the maximum is £2400. We are working out with Dave Chetwyn the best strategy for the use of this money.

1. **Our Neighbourhood Plan report**

We sent the draft of the main report o Dave Chetwyn for comment.

The report is divided into 6 sections:

**Section 1 Introduction**

**Section 2 Our vision**

**Section 3 The Murton Neighbourhood Plan: Its context**

 **3.1 Introduction**

 **3.2 The two settlements in the Parish**

 **(i) The village**

 **(ii) On the southern boundary**

 **3.3 Businesses in the Parish**

 **3.4 Murton Parish: Is population, a profile**

 **3.5 Housing in the Parish**

 **3.6 Community facilities**

 **3.7 Murton Parish: its environment and green infrastructure**

**Section 4 Community and stakeholder engagement**

**Section 5 Murton Neighbourhood Plan: Policies**

 **5.1 Introduction**

 **5.2 Murton Parish and the Green Belt**

 **5.2.1 Introduction**

 **5.2.2 Policies**

**5.3** Our environment

 **5.3.1 Introduction**

 **5.3.2 Policies**

**5.4 Employment in our Parish**

 **5.4.1 Introduction**

 **5.4.2 Policies**

**5.5 Murton Parish: Our housing, community and well-being**

 **5.5.1 Introduction**

 **5.5.2 Policies**

**Section 6 Other issues**

For example, traffic

We get a fairly good mark for the report except for Section 5, the policies. Here Dave Chetwyn wants a total restructuring so that the each Policy is *preceded* by sub-section which give the purpose and then a sub-section which gives a rationale and supporting evidence. Then, *after* the policy, there should be an explanation and interpretation. We find this difficult without repeating oneself!

Dave Chetwyn would also like to see a clearer hierarchy of headings.

The other comment of note is that we should weave more of the VDS into the main body rather than use it as a supporting document.

We are discussing these points with Dave.

1. **Other submissions with the main report**

There are several other documents that we need to prepare.

These are

1. **A Consultation Statement**

We have an outline in the main text (Section 4) but this needs to be fleshed out showing clearly with whom we have consulted, their comments and how we have dealt with them. These will range from individuals in the parish to large bodies such as a Water Company and Historic England

1. **A Basic Conditions Statement**

This is a statement that confirms that we are meeting all regulations as laid down such as those from the EU and National, Regional and Local Policies.

1. **Strategic Environmental Assessment**

This assessment deals with the environmental impact from our policies. Although we have no policies that have an impact on our environment, we have to show that they do not. We could model ours on that produced by Earswick. This came to 44 pages.

We will need expert advice for these, from Dave Chetwyn and from Rebecca Harrison (CYC).

1. **Funding**

We recommend that the Parish Council sets aside a contingency budget of £1000 to cover emergencies over and above the funding that we have received from CYC and Locality.

1. **Present planning issues**

The recent Inspector’s report on the planning application for two buildings at Redthorn is of interest to our interpretation of the Green Belt and the village envelope. He appears to be giving greater weight to the Green Belt issues than the Council did, even though the Council properly refused permission for the buildings. He draws attention to paragraph 89 of the NCCF and in particular the third bullet point

89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

* buildings for agriculture and forestry
* provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it
* the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building
* the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces
* limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan
* limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development

It is also of interest that he referred to the VDS.