

# Linton Village Society

Draft

## Minutes of the Annual General Meeting

Tuesday 12 October 2021 at 7.30pm

Committee: Ashley Guise (chair), Geoff Wilkinson, Tony Riall, Jill Bolton, Julie Brown

Item 2:, Marianne Moses, Angela Martin of the Parish Council

Item 3: Councillor Ryan Stephenson, Julian Holmes Parish Councillor

### 1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Stephen Ballantyne, Jan Carnell and Millie Mylvaganam. Members were welcomed and the Chair discussed the agenda order

### 2. Projects

Jill introduced the projects which had arisen from the recent parish council survey. It was noted that during the drafting of the neighbourhood plan one of the key outcomes was a list of improvement ideas from residents. One suggestion had been to create a green space next to the tennis court, a group was set up and this was achieved providing a recreation space in the centre of the village. This was only possible with help from residents which was what was needed to push these new ideas forward.

Jill introduced Angela chair of the parish council and Marianne a parish councillor both of whom are from Linton.

Before discussing the projects, members were advised that there were vacancies on the Parish Council and an opportunity to increase the number of councillors representing the village to four. Historically there had been 6 from Collingham and three from Linton. Volunteers were sought: the council met one evening a month.

The survey was completed in March 2020 and elicited 3000 responses. Themes which emerged across the suggestions made were; connectivity, green spaces, and community. (A full list is detailed on the volunteer form attached.)

On connectivity one important footpath had been identified from Kiln Hill towards Wetherby and Kebbell have committed to funding this, as far as the Harland Way Crossing of Wetherby Golf Club, as part of the Ridge plan. Other connectivity improvements might include a footpath from Northgate Lane to Sicklinghall; improving existing paths along Stammerge Lane in order to avoid Main Street where there is no pavement; and improving or repairing signage on existing paths using heritage signs.

Community ideas included suggestions to alleviate loneliness such as a dementia café and Christmas Lunch, and more general community involvement such as a farm shop, and seed or produce swaps. Safety had been an issue particularly as Highway's legislation was complex and the processes lengthy. Things had moved forward with the additional SID (speed indicator) provided and double yellow lines introduced around the entrance to Beck Woods. Julian Holmes was the Parish Council lead on highways and was present. People had suggested 14 points for road crossings which would be a project for a sub-group if volunteers came forward. The survey also brought forward ideas for neighbourhood watch which was present but lacked cohesion and co-ordination.

Ideas linked under Green Spaces covered more floral displays (10 troughs were to arrive but would require watering and spring planting), litter picking, and seeking tree protection orders. Unfortunately, there were no volunteers as yet for litter picking from Linton although there was a group from Collingham. Leeds City Council were being asked to look at tree protection, although it was appreciated that much of the village fell into the conservation area which provided some protection.

Everything heard via the survey was important but the summary aimed to identify the most significant and to manage expectations: achievement would depend on the involvement of local residents.

In response to questions, it was noted that the Parish Council were fortunate to have an IT expert to analyse SID data. There was not yet any news on when 20mph zones might be introduced.

Volunteers were sought for all projects. A form with a full list had been provided to all attendees and people were asked to indicate where they could offer help. It was suggested and agreed that the form would also be sent out to residents.

Angela and Marianne were thanked for their contribution.

Helen Browne announced that Linton Village Fundraisers were organising events now that pandemic restrictions were lifted. A Christmas fayre was to be held on 27<sup>th</sup> November from 1pm to 4pm and contributions for stalls would be appreciated. The Santa Sleigh had been very successful last year and would be running again on 22 December from 6pm with Wetherby Lions assistance. The plan was to end at the Windmill for mulled wine. Proposals for next year were a Cheese and Wine Evening, a Fish and Chip van visit, a dance group and coffee, cake and chat sessions.

The chair noted that it was heartening that so many people had taken time to complete the survey but to move forward people needed to get involved and offer some time or other help. If villagers did not do anything, nothing would happen.

### **3. Kebbell update**

Councillor Ryan Stephenson noted first that 20mph zone was coming but the organisation had to be on a whole ward basis and movement was, therefore, ward by ward. He thanked members for the invitation to attend noting Linton always had good wine and a good evening.

As people might know, Kebbell's original outline planning application was rejected by Leeds City Council but won on appeal which gave authorisation in principle to the number of houses and their size. The current application was a 'reserved matters application' which meant that the battle to stop the development was lost but the work now was to shape the final plans including design, material and lay out.

Identified issues included access for construction vehicles and supplies. The developers' views were not known as the applicant would detail such issues in the construction method statement. The Council would comment on appropriateness; however, as the statement was still awaited Highways were unable to make any objections or comments. Our concerns have been raised with councillors.

Muddy Lane had been raised during the outline planning application with an indicative plan for a footpath access; the developers had been told that that the planning application could only include land their owned, therefore, the footpath was not feasible. The owners of Muddy Lane do not want this, and that point is recognised. As information was placed on the planning portal members could comment and Councillors would do their best to secure some wins.

Julian Holmes from the Parish Council noted that as with all planning applications there was date set as a deadline for comments; however, any comments after that date would still be considered by the planning officer up until the point that the final report is written.

Drainage of ground and foul water was discussed. The plan currently appeared to utilise connections to Tib Garth pipes. There was some discussion about the difficulties of using Muddy Lane. The audience noted that some foul water appeared to be discharging down Muddy Lane and there were concerns about the design. There needed to be assurance the system would be fit for purpose. Yorkshire water should block this proposal if this is not the case. Julian said that Yorkshire Water would look at it very closely: residents were not convinced as Yorkshire Water were already having issues clearing the system.

It was noted that all the agencies involved must ensure that a new development does not exacerbate existing problems. Members noted existing issues with blocked sewers on Northgate Lane. Julian suggested we need to gather together issues on water and sewerage. The chair asked that people send information to him to collate.

An audience member noted that a house built on Muddy Lane had been required to install a back drop system. Given that current pipes only served four houses this appeared to indicate a precedent that a back drop system would be the only way forward. Such systems were more expensive and more complex.

The chair suggested it needed to be clarified if access was owned by Muddy Lane residents so that there was no right of way for new users: the developers cannot institute a pathway as it is not their land. The inspector who passed the plans obviously thought otherwise as this footpath along with the relocation of the bus stop enabled the development to meet access guidelines. The question was would the new residents have access and even if so did that make it a public right of way: the Highways comment on the planning portal makes it clear that it is their belief neither is correct and nothing is possible without the Muddy Lane owners' permission. Similarly on drainage, the developers cannot dig up Muddy Lane as there is no acquired access for new dwellings. In building all problems may be overcome but the solution can be so difficult an alternative becomes more attractive. As aforementioned, statutory agencies have to ensure nothing makes existing problems worse.

A question was raised as to whether the Parish Council had been consulted on the reserved matters application. The response was no but Ryan said there had been a pre-consultation based on the neighbourhood plan as previously agreed by the village. This had been advertised in the Parish magazine and on the website but this had not led to responses from Linton: the reasons for this would be considered. A sub-committee was formed and asked for a public consultation meeting. This was not forthcoming but the indicative layouts were provided. These have reflected some of the sub-committee's comments but not all e.g., no bungalows are included for downsizing, but some houses were adapted to provide ground floor bathrooms. The layout was changed but not completely.

Julian pointed out in response to questions that construction access had not been discussed. There was a view it would be better if Northgate Lane had to be used for access, then this should be from the north entrance for Northgate Lane rather than through the village. Ryan noted that planning procedure was statutory and Leeds City Council cannot ask for details of construction access as the applicant has to submit first and then the Council will assess their plans. If any submission was unreasonable, the Council would indicate why and ask the developer to submit another attempt, avoiding dialogue. The Council can and does draw attention to the neighbourhood plan and sensible approach. The possibility of access from Linton Lane was discussed using 'Duffy Lane'; however, John Duffy was present and said that he had had no approach from the developer. The entrance to the site at the top of this lane would be too narrow for construction vehicles in any event.

Julian noted that there was a construction method statement in the original plan but this was not included in the planning inspector's decision, hence the need to start again currently all excavated matter may be removed by road as there was nothing in the plan to use it on site. The Chair suggested a wall of silence had arisen, concerns had been raised and conversations had been held but no solutions had been received from Kebbell. Ryan noted that sometimes there were so many rounds of consultations that objectors became fatigued which worked in the developers' favour.

A member asked if it was possible to prevent further extensions to the new houses. The reply was that covenants were not part of the planning process; however, one could withdraw permitted development rights so that the owner cannot do anything without planning permission. A member also noted the 2-metre bund did not extend all the way around the site, and that there were several plots that were very close to the boundary on the south side of the development. Ryan said that a conversation was required on bunding and ground maintenance: usually there were maintenance fees for communal areas in Leeds but the Council needed to be clear how this would work for example who would ensure the mix of trees. Another member was worried about the safety of land at the edge of the site such as an embankment and trees on their land. Ryan responded that this should be covered in the construction method statement: the work should cause no damage to land not belonging to the developer. He added that the Council wanted to see what the site looks like once the leaves drop as protection of the ridge line is in the neighbourhood plan – it had been hoped to have single story construction against this line. Julian added that the audience member was correct that there was no complete bund currently and this was being commented on: the Chair noted that there was nothing in the inspector's decision about height. Ryan explained that unless a matter is included in the Council's current handbook of adopted policies it is negotiable and there must be dialogue. He had spoken with planning officers who were judging the application and they were noting several concerns. Ryan said of the 14 villages he represented, each with a Parish Council, none had the level of expertise present in Linton and Collingham.

There was some discussion about how long before construction might start. Ryan said if the construction method statement arrived in the next 6 weeks the reserved matters might be agreed by the end of the year but that was unlikely. Work might more reasonably start next summer. Julian commented that there was no rush from a planning viewpoint once the reserved matters application was submitted. The developer might take 2 to 3 years or more to complete the site once building started.

A last question was whether it was possible to excavate from Tib Garth. If this was not possible, then access appeared very problematic. The Chair noted an archaeological survey was being carried out and the equipment had been taken on to the site via Muddy Lane.

The Chair thanked Ryan and Julian for their contributions and reminded members to let him know of any issues with drainage of foul or surface water and the Society would take this forward. People were also asked to continue making points on the planning portal.

#### **4. LVS last AGM 4th June 2019 approved EGM notice 17th September 2019**

This was approved and seconded

#### **5. Financial update**

Tony noted that subscriptions had been waived during the pandemic as the Society had 22K in the bank and little expenditure.

The committee had made one undertaking to underwrite any loss incurred on a book about the history of the Windmill. This was to be written by Bob Soper and all profits would go to Martin House the undertaking was up to £500. There were no other commitments.

The Chair proposed that membership fees were suspended until the amount in the bank account falls to the agreed min level in the constitution of £12,000. Monies could be utilised to support any projects that moved forward with volunteers from the village. Previous spending had included a contribution towards the village hall extension, and village planting projects.

At vote this proposal was approved and seconded

#### **6. Re-Election of the LVS committee and the appointment of Jill as Chair**

At vote the committee was proposed and re-elected. The Chair wished to step down after 4 years in post although he would remain on the committee. Jill was proposed and seconded as Chair.

#### **7. AOB**

Geoff noted that current proposal for connecting the hard foot ways on Linton Lane left a gap from Harland Way to the golf club, he was looking at making hard pathways to bridge that gap

The planning application for the house on agricultural land off Trip lane decision was awaited. There had been 34 objections. The landholding was only 26 acres and already held two barns. The planning officer had recommended refusal.

Jill thanked Ashley on behalf of all members for his work as Chair over the last four years.