

**BARLEY PARISH COUNCIL**  
**Minutes of meeting of Barley Parish Council**  
**held at the Town House on Monday 3rd June 2019**

**1. PRESENT**

Cllr Jerry Carlisle, Cllr Ian Turner, Cllr Brian Haughey, Cllr Bill Sterland, Cllr Yvonne Lee, Cllr David King.

**2. In Attendance**

County Cllr Fiona Hill, District Cllr Tony Hunter, Mel Chamings (Clerk), Tim Martin (RFO) Nick Shaw (Town House).

4 members of the public.

**3. Welcome and Apologies.**

Apologies were received from District Cllr Gerald Morris

**4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AGM 13<sup>th</sup> May 2019**

The Minutes of the AGM held on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2019 were read and approved. Proposed by Cllr Sterland and seconded by Cllr King

**6. MATTERS ARISING**

The clerk was asked to report on the action log which had been distributed with the agenda papers.

Cleared actions

The Clerk confirmed that:

- 1) The Defibrillator Awareness event had 14 confirmed attendees and that notice of the event would remain displayed on the notice boards.
- 2) PCSO Brabrook had taken forward the Children's Speed Awareness poster issues raised by the Council.
- 3) Work on the trees and clearance of rubbish in the car park had commenced.
- 4) Cllr Sterland confirmed the requirement for a shed on the allotment. A 7x5 foot shed would cost £480 including VAT and installation. The Council accepted the cost and requested, for security purposes, that the shed be erected as far from the roadside as possible.

Action carried forward

- 1) Cllr King confirmed the work agreed by the Council with Thornes would commence soon.
- 2) Cllr Haughey would organise a meeting with the NHDC officer responsible for street cleaning to establish the cleaning schedule for Barley.
- 3) Cllr Haughey also confirmed that he would be visiting Westcote, a manufacturer and supplier of an alternative ANPR camera, on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> June, to look into the merits of a slightly different type of camera, and costs, to that previously proposed and would report back to the next Council meeting. Cllr Hill advised that she had still not heard back from Highways about the use of the existing VAS poles and electrical supply for the new system, but hoped to be in a position to do so at the next meeting.
- 4) Nick White apologised for the delay in setting up the WhatsApp security group but confirmed that it was in hand.
- 5) Cllr Carlisle confirmed that he had the purchase of a second water tank for the allotment in hand.
- 6) Councilors had given availability for a day time meeting with Richard Tiffin (NHDC Planning) which Cllr Carlisle would endeavour to arrange for early July.

### Standing Orders

Councillors reviewed and agreed the revised Standing Orders. Subject to clearance of some formatting issues, Cllr Carlisle would sign the document. The revised Standing Orders would be adopted immediately.

### Highways Action plan

The Barley Highways Action Plan, which had previously been distributed, was agreed and the Clerk would send to Derek Jerrard of Ringway to progress.

Cllr Carlisle confirmed that he had met with the property owners concerning the hedges along London Road and subsequently written to Derek Jerrard to seek confirmation of the depth of the verge and hence the position of the boundary of the properties adjacent to the highway. Once received, he would arrange a follow up meeting with the property owners.

The School had recently commissioned a tree survey and, given that some of the trees were considered to be in need of remedial work to keep them safe and in some cases were adjacent to parish council land, and in the knowledge that school funds were limited, the Clerk was asked to request a copy of the survey report.

*Cllrs Hill and Hunter left at 21.10*

## **7. PLANNING**

*Full Permission Householder : Two storey and single storey front, rear and side extensions. 2 Wells Cottages, Smiths End Lane, Barley, Hertfordshire. Planning reference 19/01102/FPH*

Barley Parish Council (BPC) objected to this application and wished the District Council in arriving at their decision to take the following comments into account:-

It is the view of BPC that the proposed development does not accord with either existing planning policies under the current Local Plan nor those to be contained in the emerging Proposed Local Plan which is now moving close to adoption.

The property lies outside the Barley Settlement boundary under both the existing and proposed Local Plans.

The property lies within the current and proposed Landscape Conservation Area LC2 where, inter alia, development proposals which do not fit into the landscape because of their siting, design, materials, lack of new landscaping, and which do not positively enhance the landscape, taking the above factors into account, will be refused. Proposals in rural areas are also expected to add to the character of the landscape.

The property falls within the Barley Conservation Area and occupies a very prominent elevated site clearly visible when approaching Barley on the B1368 from the direction of Barkway.

The proposed development must, therefore, be considered not only in terms of its impact on the immediate area but also in terms of its wider visual intrusion into the landscape.

Historically, the property originated as three farm workers cottages, typifying the local vernacular architecture of this form of development, with local Cambridge Yellow stock bricks under a slate roof; creating a simple, uncluttered appearance reflective of their purpose as workers cottages.

Policy 30: Replacement or Extension of Dwellings in the Countryside of the Adopted Local Plan (1996) is particularly pertinent to this application:-

“For existing dwellings anywhere in the countryside outside excluded or selected villages, the Council will normally refuse proposals for their replacement or extension if a materially greater impact would result. A landscaping scheme related to the surrounding countryside will be expected. Also extensions will normally be refused if they result in a size, scale and design out of keeping with the original building and give the effect of a new dwelling.”

This proposal to create one single, very large and imposing dwelling will result in the loss, by integration into the bigger building, of a small 3 bedroom dwelling which is to be much regretted when there is already a lack of such sized dwellings in the area. Although referred to as an Annex in the Applicant's Planning, Design, Access and Heritage Statement, this “Annex” was in fact one of the original three cottages and remains totally self-contained with its own front door.

Despite the fact that the other two cottages have more recently been used as one dwelling and the third cottage as a separate annex, they can still be read in their original context – simple farm workers cottages in scale, bulk and visual amenity. The proposed substantially enlarged property destroys any appreciation of the original purpose and functionality – the resultant size, scale and design is so out of keeping with the original building that it gives the effect of a new dwelling.

This application is not only contrary to local planning policy but it is our view that it runs contrary to both statute and national planning guidance. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be given to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area; whilst NPPF requires proposals to preserve and enhance the quality and character of the conservation areas. These principles are not adhered to in this application:-

- The overall bulk and massing of the extensions are totally out of character for both the cottages and the surrounding area – which contrary to the assertion in the Supporting Statement is not characterised by large detached properties in large plots.
- The introduction of additional materials – timber cladding, stone and flint – will further increase the visual intrusion and dominance of the proposal.
- The introduction of heavy stone/flint square bay windows together with a portico entrance destroys the simple character of the existing buildings.

These buildings were farm workers cottages, simple uncluttered structures. The proposals contained in this application destroy any appreciation of their original purpose and functionality: creating instead a visually very dominant property, with excessive bulk and massing, emphasised by the introduction of a mix of new materials and design features, with no supporting major landscaping, resulting in an illiterate over bearing property.

BPC ask that the application is refused.

It was noted that the NHDC website only one consultee is recorded – Barley Parish Council. Bearing in mind that the proposed development falls within the Barley Conservation Area we would have thought that the NHDC Conservation Officer would have also been consulted.

## **8. FINANCE**

Mr. Tim Martin (RFO) reported the following payments were due to be made:-

Parish Council payments

T Martin	450.00	RFO duties for May
T Martin	81.00	Reimbursement re website domain Name for 10 years
M. Chammings	446.18	Clerk duties for March +expenses
Marks Gardening Service	45.00	Grass cutting/bin emptying
G Booth	373.00	Grass Cutting churchyard
Playsafety	103.20	Play area and Plaistow inspection
Came & Co	28.00	Town House additional Insurance
Paid between meetings		
Marks Gardening Services	97.50	Grass cutting, strimming, bin emptying

It was agreed that all of these payments should be made.  
Proposed Cllr Turner, seconded Cllr Sterland

Town House payments

C Robinson	80.00	Cleaning for May
R Saklatvala	277.80	Letting Officer fee for May and wedding Attendance.

It was agreed that all of these payments should be made.  
Proposed by Cllr Lee, seconded Cllr King

**7. TOWN HOUSE**

Nick Shaw reported that there were no outstanding issues to report. A new brochure had been produced which Geoff Cash had paid for and the Council expressed their gratitude for this donation.

Cllr Carlisle noted that a drain at the rear of the building required attention and Mr. Shaw said he would deal with it.

**8. RECREATION GROUND**

Cllr Turner outlined the main points from the recent RoSPA visit report. All sections of the report were deemed as low risk. However there were four minor items to consider and rectify. These were:

- Replacement of a fence post
- Check and refit a gate post
- Remove rust and repaint the base of goal posts
- Adjust one of the gate closures.

The council asked Cllr Turner to attend to all of the items noted.

Work on the shelter for the tennis club had commenced.

**9. HEALTH & SAFETY**

The Clerk confirmed that the Town House monthly check was satisfactory. Cllr Turner had completed the Plaistow check and noted the comments from the RoSPA report as stated above.

**10. CORRESPONDENCE**

Nick Shaw alerted the Council to the issue of straw being dropped from transporters as they passed through the village. The Council was aware of the problem but considered that it was impractical to contact every haulage contractor, even when their identity could be established, to request that their loads were suitably netted. The meeting also noted that there appeared to be some doubt as to whether haulage contractors or farmers were legally required to net such loads.

## **11. ANNUAL MEETING FEEDBACK**

The idea of planting bulbs around the verges was agreed as being good idea and the Barley Gardening Club had agreed to take the idea forward. In the event of the Club being unable to acquire a free source of bulbs, the Council would consider funding the project.

Some of the benches around the village required attention. Particular note was made of the lack of a bench to replace the one damaged some time ago by the war memorial. Cllr Haughey agreed to investigate.

It was agreed to replace the gate nearest the Townhouse and playground area to allow for disabled access to the Plaistow. The entrance at the High Street was double gated and it was agreed that the inner kissing gate would be removed.

Jan Mc Gill and Cllr David King volunteered to take the lead on running the Village Show next year, and on engaging further volunteers to assist.

## **12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Cllr Lee had been alerted to the fact that the Scouts were considering replacing the existing Scout hut. As the council was already planning to build changing rooms behind the Scout hut, it was considered sensible for the Council to work with the Scouts on this project. Cllr Lee agreed to find out more details about the Scouts plans.

Cllr Lee, prompted by an email from Cllr Haughey about reviewing the Village Plan, suggested that the Council should consider developing a Neighbourhood Plan. The Clerk was asked to get details of the framework for developing such a plan for the next meeting.

Cllr Turner said that he had agreed that the school could borrow/hire one of the Councils' marquees for a school wine event and that the church could similarly borrow/hire one for the church fete to be held in Geoffrey Wilkersons garden at Homestall. The Council's view was that while they were delighted to be able to help, and that no charges would be made, organisers of these events should nevertheless be made aware that the Council would require them to be responsible for all health and safety matters in relation to the use of the marquees.

An agreement to such effect would be drawn up. *[Subsequently the Clerk sent the safe working document on marquees to Cllr Turner to issue to organisers for use until a revised agreement was drafted]*

Mark Davis Gardening Services was in attendance, and complained of the fact that dog owners were not clearing up after their dogs and that this made the job of maintaining the footpaths very unpleasant. The Clerk was asked to draft a note for inclusion in the next Diary edition to alert dog owners to their responsibilities in this regard.

The meeting ended at 22.05pm