



MINUTES

Committee Present: Jill (Chair), Ashley, Geoff, Tony, Jill, Tony

Speakers: Councillor Ryan Stephenson, Julian and Angela from the Parish Council

Annual General Meeting: Tuesday, 8th November, 2022 at 7pm

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Helen and Gerald Brown Dorothy and Irving Weaver

2. Minutes of the last AGM – 12th October 2022

These were accepted by members as a true record.

3. Two Proposed Amendments to LVS Constitution were put to members.

- a. The first was that on committee meetings the wording was amended from ‘*The Committee shall meet not less than four times a year in the months of March, June, September and December and can meet more frequently if necessary*’ to ‘*The Committee shall meet not less than **twice** a year but can meet more frequently if necessary*’.

The Chair explained that this would prevent unnecessary meetings but enable additional meetings to be held as necessary. Members agreed the proposal.

- b. The second proposal referred to the timing of the AGM. The current wording read: ‘*The AGM shall take place in June of each year and not less than fourteen days’ notice of that meeting shall be given to members*’. It was proposed that this be amended to: ‘*The AGM shall take place **once** each year and not less than fourteen days’ notice of that meeting shall be given to members*’.

This change was agreed by members. Members also agreed the motion to ratify the late holding of the AGM this year.

4. Kebbell Developments – Ridge Meadows update.

The Parish Council had some time ago set up a sub-committee chaired by Julian, to discuss this development: this sub-committee had met immediately before this meeting with the Chair in attendance. Ryan and Julian had kindly agreed to attend the AGM to update members.

Julian summarised the situation. Outline planning was in place for up to 26 houses.

- Reserved matters application. There was a reserved matters application to be agreed: this covered such issues appearance, materials, and landscaping. The original was submitted 3 years ago and had been commented on by villagers and the Parish Council. Recently Kebbell had submitted an amended version considering some of the comments received and this was open to consultation. The planning reference should people wish to comment was 21/05590/RM. The sub-committee meeting today had been to finalise the Parish Council

response to those proposals. Some previous comments had led to improvements such as chimneys been added to designs, and improvements in the materials proposed.

- Planning Conditions. There was another application on the planning portal relating to planning conditions this was of interest as it indicated progress and pre-building preparations but was not open to comments. For example, it showed the archaeological surveys were completed, and gave results and follow-up of contamination surveys. The planning reference was 21/05525/COND.
- Construction Method Statement. This gave details of such matters as working times, access and exit routes, wheel cleaning, and liaison with neighbours. It did not cover all matters and in particular means of access and egress during the civil engineering phase. Ryan noted that he was to raise this with planning.

The concerns the Parish Council would raise included:

- the housing mix was unchanged from the original proposal and excluded bungalows which would be desirable to meet the needs described in the neighbourhood plan. This would be a request only as the inclusion had not been a condition of the planning approval.
- The visual review report contained summer illustrations which obscured the differing aspect for the 6 months of the year when deciduous trees were not in leaf: at those times the Conservation Area including Northgate Lane, and Trip Lane would have views of the houses.
- Kebbell had said that some houses would have ground floor bathrooms: this would help compliance with the neighbourhood plan need for accommodation offering homes for an ageing demographic. These were not included and again could only be requested at this stage.
- Landscape buffers were included to the northeast of the site but not the southwest facing Orchard Drive.
- Boundaries had now been softened: stone walls having been replaced but by stone columns and railings, and solid gates. A request would be made for a more open plan to improve the street scene.
- On the southern part of the site drainage was originally attenuated through ponds now replaced with underground tank topped with grass: it would be preferable to re-instate the ponds.
- A further attenuation tank was to capture water above Tip Garth to prevent flooding. This would be 18m by 18 m built into the hillside. Construction methodology was to be queried together with final appearance.
- The south facing roofs now had solar panels; however, tiles would be less intrusive. (It was noted that this would also be more attractive to purchasers.)
- Residents could still comment about improving design to meet the requirements of the village.

During discussion various questions and suggestions were raised.

- It was asked how effective comments might be and noted that to a large extent this was reliant on Kebbell or if there is a relevant planning policy LCC could enforce.
- It was agreed that street lighting is a concern given that the neighbourhood plan describes Linton as a dark village. A request would be made to eliminate any planned street lighting but if this were not deemed acceptable then the lowest level least impactful lighting would be pursued. (not part of the reserved matters application).
- Solar roof tiles would be preferable to panels especially if these matched the roof colour.
- Members were concerned about access and exit points for the site during construction. The intention was to use Tib Garth and, less likely, due to the need for discussion with landowners, the private lane from Linton Lane.

- The timescale was queried. Julian noted that the reserved matters had been submitted within 3 years and there was no other time related planning conditions.
- There were several concerns raised about drainage and the ownership or responsibility for maintenance of the attenuation tanks. In response it was noted that Yorkshire Water (YW) had approved the design. The valves of the attenuation tanks were of sufficient size: the design was intended to take drainage away from Muddy Lane in heavy water conditions using the attenuation tank to discharge low flow. The main route was down through Tib Garth. Foul water would enter a tank then be pumped to drains carrying the foul back to the top of the site where it would then be discharged into the existing foul water drains. In response, Julian noted the site of the tank would probably be owned by a management committee with easement for YW access. YW would own the actual tank. Ryan added that there would be a legacy liability on the developer for future performance. Julian agreed to ask for some clarity on maintenance responsibility – the site above being open space. He noted the pumps would almost certainly be adopted by YW. Confirmation of ownership and stewardship of systems would be sought.
- Access via Muddy Lane concerned some members who noted it was steep, dangerous and privately owned. A proposed footpath was the argument used by Kebbell to prove the site is within walking distance of a bus stop. In response, it was noted that this did not affect reserved matters but Highways had responded seeking confirmation of land ownership sufficient to tie the site to a public road via Muddy Lane. This is presumably to support a footpath. How the previous owner's access rights impacted the new householders would be a legal question for the various landowners
- Kebbell were reportedly trying to establish an access to the site for the civil engineering works through the private lane off Linton lane. Other potential routes were blocked by the relevant landowners. Julian noted that as the construction method statement did not yet include full details, the Parish Council would again ask about means of access.
- In answer to a member's question, it was reported that workers would all park on site under the current construction method statement. Obviously, this implied access was resolved but it was relevant that final agreement of the construction method statement would depend on LCC approval: without this LCC could enforce any works that may start to stop.

The chair thanked Julian and Ryan for their attendance, input and efficiency and noted that it was frustrating to have so many issues unresolved. Julian said that he would include all members comments in the Parish Council response. The Chair agreed to disseminate any updated information as soon as it was received.

5. Village Drainage Survey

Since the previous AGM, there had been concerns about to drainage related both to the Kebbell development and to issues with blockages and leaks. Ashley had been in discussion with YW who had confirmed that the system in place down Northgate Lane had capacity for the new development. YW had check all surface and foul water drains as far as the Memorial Hall on Linton Lane with cameras and no issues were found. YW had agreed that their diagrams of the route near the Manor House were wrong and corrected these. At the point that the drain goes downhill and to the back of people's gardens after the Muddy Lane surface water joins the flow the pipe becomes a council issue. LVS had requested a written report from YW several times: this had yet to be received. It should be noted that several of the older properties on Northgate Lane would have surface water draining to foul drains as this was permitted at the time. YW would keep an eye on the previously blocked area near the Manor House. A member queried whether the next part of the route should be checked as there had been two floods of foul water in the last year in the village hall. Ashley undertook to ask for a further check by YW from the Hall onwards to the large drain.

It was also raised that the north end of the bridge had flooded recently. The problem had been resolved by the cleaning of the gully under the road previously but had recurred: Ryan was asking for this to be cleaned again.

6. Village projects:

a. Linton Lane Footpath – Phase 1 and 2

Geoff reported that the Parish Council survey had identified connectivity as important to residents. An interconnecting hard footpath was required to connect existing tarmac areas over the grass verges as particularly during the recent pandemic an increased number of pedestrians had led to wear of the surface, and people walking in the road unsafely. He had taken the project forward and with grants from our three Harewood Ward Councillors and also our the Parish Council, stage 1 was achieved, and had been well received.

Phase 2 which would comprise Harland way to the Memorial Hall was outstanding. This route is included in the Kebbell Homes planning obligations via a Section 106 agreement. This does not require payment to LCC to build the footway until housing is built. Julian has asked if there is any possibility this could be brought forward and Kebbell has not discounted this entirely. Ryan will investigate the possibilities of LCC starting the footway ahead of the funding in the full knowledge the funding would be received in due course.

The Chair and members thanked Geoff for his efforts and dogged determination

b. 20 mph speed limit and gateway features

The 20-mph zone process was underway and due to be completed this financial year. Ryan reported that this was a national campaign postponed in Leeds due to objections from some parishes – LCC were now been asked to move forward where there was agreement. In a minor amendment the 20mph zone was now to be extended to Tib Garth. Julie noted the gateway features were linked to 20mph zone completion: the Parish Council would review the drawings once designs were proposed (note these only cover highway infrastructure such as signs and markings). Once the Highways work is completed a separate project to provide a pleasing visual impact at each location would be investigated. LVS has already indicated their support this project with some funding.

7. Financial update

Tony noted that at the previous AGM it had been decided to waive fees for a further year, therefore there was no income. There were some expenditure items: charity book donation, and gazebos for the Jubilee celebration. Fixed costs were indemnity insurance and web site fees only

LVS had committed to fund landscaping around the 3 proposed gateway schemes and tree planting for the community. Three to five thousand pounds was earmarked.

Angela noted that there are projects within the Parish Council village survey if further spending was planned. Julie mentioned a current project which was to look at the feasibility of running a Memory café which was a popular choice in the survey.

During discussion, the committee confirmed that they could authorise expenditure up to £5K on one project in one year without seeking approval via membership meeting. This was covered within the constitution as was the requirement to retain £12k for contingency e.g., to seek advice on planning issues.

8. Membership fees for 2023

The committee were proposing not to charge fees again this year until funds reduced to the £12k level. After discussion, it was agreed that this could be reviewed next year by planning a budget including projects that members might suggest, and then presenting a plan with funding proposals and fee suggestions. It was noted that only 21 members were present at the meeting and only about 25 per cent of households were signed up members. The committee were concerned that without increased validation the future of LVS would require review.

It was proposed and agreed that there would be no fees charged in the 2023/24 financial year.

9. Election of LVS Committee

Jill noted that a leaflet had been delivered to all households advising of the AGM and asking for new committee members. There had been no response.

There was a need to widen the appeal beyond the same committee and same attendees. Recruitment might be perceived to have more value linked to projects new members wished to take forward, as per the previous item. Members carried the motion to re-elect the committee in their current roles. The Chair stated that she wished to complete the Kebbell project owing to long involvement but intended to stand down the following year.

10. AOB

A member noted the continuing prevalence of dog poo. It would be a suggestion for the next newsletter to plea for good mannered disposal. Julie noted some reported issues with professional dog walkers and suggested advising the Companies concerned or the villagers using the service if this was an issue.

The Chair thanked all for attending and particularly Councillor Ryan Stephenson, Julian and Angela for their participation.

Meeting closed.

JB.18.11.2022