

BARLEY PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of meeting of Barley Parish Council
held at the Town House on Monday 11th February 2019

1. PRESENT

Cllr Jerry Carlisle, Cllr Yvonne Lee, Cllr Peter McPartland, Cllr Ian Turner, Cllr Brian Haughey, Mel Chamblings (Clerk), Tim Martin(RFO),

2. In Attendance

Cllr Tony Hunter, Cllr Fiona Hill, Cllr Gerald Morris, Nick Shaw, Chris Braybrook.
2 members of the public

3. Apologies

Cllr Bill Sterland

4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Cllr Brian Haughey declared that he was a shareholder in a management company that, by virtue of the owner of the Gables also being a shareholder in that company, had an indirect connection to the Gables planning application to be discussed later on the agenda. The declaration was considered and it was agreed that Cllr Haughey was not compromised by this common shareholding and was free to participate fully in discussion of the planning application.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 7 JANUARY 2019

The Minutes of the meeting held on 7th January 2019 had been circulated prior to this meeting and were agreed as a true record. Proposed by Cllr McPartland and seconded by Cllr Haughey

PCSO Chris Braybrook arrived at 8,20

6. MATTERS ARISING

Police Liaison

The report on his recent police liaison meeting by Graham Clark was noted. There were two items of particular note: 1) Possibility of arranging further speed checks and 2) The proposition that if sufficient parishes were prepared to input to a fund then as part of a collective we may be able to increase patrols in and around the parishes and thus the visibility of police in the rural parishes by paying the cost of the necessary overtime. This was further discussed with PCSO Chris Braybrook who was asked to find out and report on how many parishes may be needed for this to be viable; how much would each be required to contribute and how much police time could potentially be funded in this way. Once this information was available then our Clerk would contact other parish clerks to determine the likely level of support for such an initiative to enable further discussion with the police to take place.

PCSO Braybrook advised that the new sergeant was keen to increase footfall in villages and for police presence at local events but that with police resources being under pressure at the present time this was not easily achieved.

Separately PCSO Braybrook asked that residents were made aware of the current preponderance of thefts from motor vehicles and to ensure that cars were not left unlocked.

Cllr Haughey reported that the speed sign on the outskirts of the village beside the Chequers had been deliberately vandalized. Although repairs to the sign were not expensive and it was not proposed to make a claim it was nevertheless felt prudent to inform our insurers that a crime had been committed and PCSO Braybrook would provide a crime number for such purpose.

PCSO Braybrook provided a quote for a banner for the proposed school safety campaign. Cllr Fiona Hill stated that some funding towards the project may be available from her locality budget.

It was noted that the decision on the parish application for the enhanced speed camera was due to be finalized on 18th February 2019.

The new clerk would take control of the village email list, from Tim Martin

Cllr Fiona Hill confirmed that she had emailed Derek Gerrard to arrange a meeting with herself, Cllr Carlisle and Cllr Haughey as a matter of urgency. Cllr Hill also informed that the NHDC road sweeper had regular scheduled attendance in the village.

7. PLANNING

The Gables High Street Barley, case references 18/03349/S73 and 18/00003/S73

Two further planning applications for changes to the Gables development were discussed and the meeting unanimously agreed that the proposals were unacceptable and that the Parish Council advise NHDC that we object to both applications on the following basis:-

The Parish Council, and indeed many villagers, is extremely concerned at the submission of yet two further applications. The proposed development on this prominent site has been contentious from the outset with the applicant testing the patience of all concerned and affected by the proposals.

In our opinion a Section 73 application is not the appropriate vehicle for the applicant to be using to seek these alterations to the consented scheme and we take issue with his interpretation of Section 73 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as set out in his covering letter; the proposals under both applications do change the **description** of the development.

Description a detailed account of the certain salient aspects, characteristics or features of a subject matter.

By changing variously the location, massing, bulk, design and materials of the original composition that was consented, as set out and confirmed by the applicants planning consultant, Brighter Planning Ltd, in their Planning Statements dated January 2019 supporting both applications, these changes are clearly not “minor material amendments” but rather are more fundamental. In terms of the so-called Option 1 application only 3 of the 8 units are unaltered. Similarly with Option 2, although dismissed in the applicants’ letter dated 24th December 2018 as merely changing the design of plot 7, the reality is that 5 of the units in the consented scheme are proposed to be altered (the materials proposed to be used, the size and location). Patently the described development has been changed and the amendments proposed are such that new applications should be submitted.

We also consider the use of S73 applications in this case to be disingenuous on the part of the applicant; where an application under S73 is granted, the effect is the issue of a new planning permission, sitting alongside the original application which remains intact and unaffected. This means if granted there would be three valid planning permissions on the site – which one would ultimately be implemented? If after many iterations and now 5 separate applications the applicant still doesn’t know what he wants to build, where is the certainty that the planning system is supposed to provide to communities? It is our view that the applicant should make his mind up about what they want to build and apply for permission accordingly – not to make two applications that are to run concurrently which are very different in their effect on the nature and character of the development of the site.

Setting aside consideration of the vehicle that the applicant has chosen to use to seek to achieve two new and different development schemes, the content of these revised schemes is we consider unacceptable. Whilst the Parish Council was not supportive of the consented scheme in May 2018, the design nonetheless reflected the guidance provided by officers, although its impact on the conservation area remains contentious. Indeed despite the discussions and negotiations with NHDC officers, prior to the consented scheme being approved, the Conservation Officer remained opposed to the grant of consent. These two new proposals appear to ignore all of the conservation, and the urban design and conservation advice and guidance given. The impact of these proposals goes beyond being questionable; they would cause further demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the village, the enjoyment of the adjoining green lane and the quality of the Barley Conservation Area. This is particularly so in relation to the proposed changes to Plot 7 (both Options 1 & 2) which was originally proposed to be a 2 storey 3 bedroomed barn style house but which now becomes a 3 storey house of 5 bedrooms with a significant increase in the bulk and perceived height of the proposed dwelling, not to mention the radical change in materials.

The Parish Council asks that the applications are refused.

Cllr Carlisle informed the meeting that there was a Planning workshop, organized by NHDC to be held on 27th February at the Council Offices in Letchworth starting at 6 pm. Cllrs Turner and Haughey agreed to attend. It was further suggested that Richard Tiffin, who had been unable to attend this evening, be asked again to attend a specific Barley meeting, at a time during the day that would best suit those councilors who worked full time. An early morning session was suggested, *Cllrs Tony Hunter, Fiona Hill and Gerald Morris left the meeting at 9 pm*

8. TOWN HOUSE

Nick Shaw reported that the valley and other gutters had been cleared of moss and other debris from the roof and that the ground and first floors would be refurbished in the spring. He also informed the meeting that new terms and conditions had been drafted to provide greater clarity to hirers.

It was noted that a workshop was being arranged for regular hirers to explain the new terms, the new electronic booking system and to remind everybody of H&S requirements (a condition on the Town House (TH) insurance policy).

Cllr Carlisle queried if all invoices were up to date and Mr Shaw agreed to check the position with the TH Hirer.

9. FINANCE

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

Parish Council payments

Maryna de Clerk	474.00	Clerking duties January
T Martin	258.00	RFO January
DBA Safety	17.50	Health & Safety
Marks gardening Services	30.00	Litter and bin collection Plaistow
Ian Turner/AVS Fencing	134.33	Reimbursement: gate Closures

Payments authorised between meetings by Cllr. Carlisle and Cllr Turner

Maryna de Clerk	228.40	Clerking and PAYE rebate
NHDC	500.64	Emptying dog bins

It was agreed that all of these payments should be made.

Proposed Cllr Haughey, seconded Cllr McPartland

Town House payments

A Stacey	100.00	Wedding attendance and caretaking
Drage security	144.00	Annual alarm testing
N Shaw	272.41	Reimbursement Dec Jan: Cleaning, advertising and maintenance
R Saklatvala	254.25	Letting Officer fee Jan & wedding attendance

E Saddleton	150.00	Return of wedding deposit
Alderton	150.00	Return of wedding deposit

Payments authorized between meetings by Cllr Carlisle and Cllr Turner

Prompt Fire protection	62.28	Replace Fire extinguisher
B Hickford	48.00	PAT testing

It was agreed that all of these payments should be made.

Proposed by Cllr Turner, seconded Cllr McPartland

With regard to the renewal of the Town House insurance policy in April it was agreed to instruct Messrs Savills to carry out a formal fire insurance reinstatement valuation for the Town House. Their proposed fee of £750 + VAT but inclusive of expenses was agreed. Cllr Lee was asked to instruct Savills accordingly.

Mr. Martin confirmed that he was in the process of resolving the issue of insurance with the regular users of the Town House.

10. RECREATION GROUND

Cllr Turner explained that he had been unable to resolve the ongoing issue of the conflicting H&S reports that had been received from two different companies. It was suggested that as Fields in Trust were our partners and that one of the reports had been procured on their behalf that Cllr Turner would contact them with a view to agreeing that only one report was required and determining which company should carry this out in the future.

Cllr Turner would check the base of the goal posts in the Plaistow and ensure that they were not eroded and were safe.

11. HEALTH & SAFETY

The clerk would arrange for a further meeting with DBA Safety to carry out the Fire Assessment in the Town House,

12. ENGAGING WITH THE COMMUNITY

Given that council elections were due to be held in early May, it was felt that it was timely to ensure that the parishioners of Barley were abreast of the work of the council and to try to encourage people to stand for election. As Peter McPartland has advised that he will not be standing for re-election then assuming the remaining councilors are prepared to stand for election again then 2 additional nominations will be required to ensure that an election will take place. It was agreed to hold a village engagement event with drinks and nibbles on 18th march in the Town House at 7.30pm. The clerk would get a piece into the Diary and the budget for the event would be finalized at the March council meeting.

13. AOB

It was raised by the public in attendance that there was an issue about litter in the village and a suggestion was made that a litter party could be organized (as a village event) to clear it.

.