

BARTON PARISH COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT UNTIL SIGNED

Present: Chair Walsh, Cllr Lee, Cllr Wool, Cllr Dobinson. Members of the Public: Ms Ava Bell

24th April 2025 7.00pm AT BARTON VILLAGE HALL

Charlotte Liversedge-Gell Parish Clerk

127 Apologies - with approval for apologies	CV Jones & Cllr Cross
128 Declaration of Interest – to receive & consider then decide upon any applications for dispensation	Members to declare any interest under the following categories; pecuniary, outside bodies and family, friend or close associates – none declared
129 Minutes	To approve the minutes of the meeting held 27th March 2025
130 Matters Arising	Matters Arising from the previous meeting minutes - none
131 Correspondence	<p>131(i) Telegraph Pole Concerns – email received regarding letters sent to residents in Church Lane and Church Meadows regarding the installation of new telegraph poles in certain parts of the Village coinciding with new Broadband cables being laid. Cllr Lee explained that notices put on existing poles states that permission had been applied for to Darlington Borough Council (which is incorrect as it should be NYC and/or the PC). It was discussed that it may in fact be cabling that is being laid rather than installation of new telegraph poles.</p> <p>Cllr Lee has asked the company in question – Quickline – for a map of where the poles are intended to be erected, if indeed at all. Clerk also to follow up with Quickline.</p> <p>Await response</p> <p>131(ii) Risk Assessment received for the VE Day event to be held at the Village. Ava Bell attended the meeting and asked if the electric point on the Village Green would be able to be used. This was agreed unanimously by the PC. The road closure application was not submitted in time for NYC to action but the PC can authorise road closures for such events. This will run outside The Half Moon down to the Village Green just before Jubilee Terrace.</p> <p>131(iii) Traffic and Speed Data – Matrix Board. Cllr Lee has emailed the company who the PC procured the Matrix Board from and has a link to download full monitoring data from it. Cllr Lee will look at the data and feedback to the rest of the PC.</p>
132 Public Participation	None (Ms Bell spoke in relation to item 131(ii))
133 Planning	To consider the planning applications within Barton Parish None
134 Long Bridge Update	Chair Walsh wrote to Historic England on behalf of the PC with regards to the application that had been submitted by a resident to make the Long Bridge a Listed Structure - hence halting the works that were imminent to refurbish the Bridge. The letter was

	<p>highlighting the journey that the PC and Barton as a Village has been on in an attempt to get the bridge fully refurbished. Awaiting response from Historic England.</p>
<p>135 Ashes Farm Development Response</p>	<p>A response was received to the questions sent following the PC meeting and Public Consultation around the Ashes Farm Development. Please see the response in bold below:</p> <p>(1) Drainage and sewerage. Questions were raised over where will the excess/additional water run off to? The Beck running through Barton is in question as to whether it can cope with additional water runoff and the risk of this flooding is a concern. There is also specific concern from residents of the Porch within Barton, who already have flooding on days with high rainfall due to existing inadequate street drainage. The fear is that any increased runoff from the development could exacerbate the flooding problem already experienced by those living on the Porch. Is sufficient drainage factored into the development? With regards to sewerage – are the current systems in place capable of processing additional sewerage/foul water that will be created by the development?</p> <p>Northumbrian Water didn't raise any objections to the outline application in 2019 and didn't identify drainage capacity issues within Barton. The outline planning permission was granted on the basis that the existing system could either accept the additional flows or be upgraded accordingly. The reserved matters application is supported by a full drainage design which includes an attenuation basin on site for the managed discharge of surface water. Both surface water and foul drainage would next to Northumbrian Water's system.</p> <p>(2) Access. There are concerns over the planned, single access point on Church Lane. Church Lane is regularly used by horse riders, walkers, runners, cyclists, children walking up to the Playing Fields and concerns were voiced over the increased traffic that access in and out to 32 dwellings would create. There is also a natural 'pinch point' in this road that can mean the need to reverse back towards the Village if you are met with a van/farm vehicle coming down towards the Village. This problem would only be exasperated with the increase in traffic going in and out of the development from one point on Church Lane. Is it possible to use the current Farm Lane opposite Marygate as a second access point – including during the construction phase as HGV's and tradespeople traffic will be very heavy. There could also be a possibility with Silver Garth – it would be straightforward to connect to the new site would it be possible or permissible to flow traffic onto Silver Garth. Silver Garth opens onto Silver Street opposite the village shop.</p> <p>Another opportunity would be to run a road westward and out</p>

onto Silver Street at the existing access point opposite Tudor Lodge and the main entry into the Tower House, this is a straight stretch of Silver Street with good views in both directions for traffic and pedestrians.

The access arrangements have already been approved as part of the grant of outline planning permission and therefore cannot be revisited as part of the reserved matters application.

The access was looked at in considerable detail as part of the outline application and the highway authority raised no objection to the proposals on highway grounds. The Inspector's decision notice which forms that planning permission, clarifies at paragraph 2 that the '*application is for outline planning permission, with all matters except for access (our emphasis) reserved for future consideration*'.

(3) Hedgerows/habitat. The plans include the removal of a hedge on Church Lane and replacing it with another. The current hedge acts as a natural 'traffic calmer' as drivers can't quite see around the bend of the hedge and tend to slow up. If this hedge is removed and replaced with a straight hedge this benefit would be lost as well as the established flora and fauna that currently reside in and around the hedge.

Again, I can only reiterate that the access has been approved as part of the outline application which includes realignment of the hedgerow. This cannot be revisited as part of the reserved matters application as it falls beyond its scope.

The application is accompanied with an updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) to consider any changes at the site which may have an impact upon ecology, since the previous PEA in August 2019. The site is not ecologically sensitive and subject to appropriate mitigation for protect species and the employment of standard advice, the development would have acceptable impact on biodiversity.

(4)Self Builds. For the Self Build plots – if these are purchased is there a deadline/timeline as to how soon after the purchase the properties have to be built?

No. It would be unlawful for a planning authority to require completion of a development within a particular timeframe.

(5)Affordable Homes. Can some indication be given around the price brackets that the houses are to be put on the market for? What bracket are the affordable houses going to fall within? There

	<p>are concerns that there is an influx of large, detached homes that are not affordable for local residents or families that are wanting to stay in the area and to attract more younger families into the area. Are the affordable houses on the development going to actually be affordable and is there any scope to increase the number of affordable homes within the development to meet demand?</p> <p>The affordable housing contribution was secured via a planning obligation (S106) submitted with the outline application. The affordable homes will be made available to people in housing need with a local connection. The development will include some 'Discounted Market Sale' units which would be available to purchase at a discounted value (usually 20% below market value) in perpetuity. The remaining affordable homes would be available on a rental basis, via a Housing Association. Unfortunately, I am unable to quote prices for either the market or affordable homes at this particular juncture. There are too many variables at the moment in terms of timescales for construction and changing market conditions.</p> <p>(6) Bat and Bird boxes. Could we ask for bird and bat boxes to be erected on and around the site and buildings, the older buildings provide habitat which will be lost with demolition.</p> <p>Yes, that's something we can provide and its suggested within the PEA as part of a package of mitigation measures.</p> <p>(7) Recreational Space. There is no indication of recreation space on the development, is it possible to have some contribution to the improvement/enhancement of Barton's existing sports field and or play park.</p> <p>The site layout shows an area of on-site public open space adjacent to the site's northern boundary. Any developer contributions need to be secured at the outline planning application stage and must be triggered by a specific policy requirement within the Local Plan, which wasn't the case in this particular instance.</p> <p>(8) Bungalows. There are no bungalows evident on the plans. One or two bungalows would provide opportunity for older couples e.g. to free up family homes to move to single level living. Is there any possibility of these being factored in?</p> <p>The proposed scheme does not include bungalows. The identified need in this instance was for two-storey homes and self-build plots. The scheme also includes a proportion of smaller two-bed homes which would be</p>
--	---

	<p>attractive to first time buyers and those downsizing.</p> <p>(9)Asbestos. There is a considerable amount of Asbestos sheet cladding and roofing on this site we would like to ensure a plan for safe and secure removal is in place.</p> <p>Asbestos removal is managed by health and safety legislation rather the planning process.</p> <p>(10)Planning borders. There have been some concerns over the red boundary line of the development. The plans in the recent publication show the development is smaller than the outer boundary of the Planning. Is there assurance that more houses will not be applied for to stretch out to the outer boundary? There are also concerns over whether the farm buildings and machinery will still be present/visible. Can we please have some clarification around what of the existing farm buildings/machinery will be dismantled?</p> <p>The application site boundary is defined by the location plan included with the approved outline planning application and we cannot deviate from it. Some parts of the farm are outside of the application site boundary but the haulage yard and buildings forming the main farmstead are within the boundary. The various buildings, structures and hardstanding areas within the site would be cleared to allow for the proposed development to be laid out. The application site boundary, as shown on the site layout is consistent with the application site established as part of the outline permission.</p> <p>The proposals only relate to land within the application site itself, and sufficient open space is provided within the site to ensure an attractive site layout, and a usable amount of open space is created. It is unnecessary to provide any further open space outside of the application site boundary as suggested by one of the respondents.</p>
136 Bench Relocation/Repair	<p>Discuss quotes and action for the repair/relocation of damaged bench:</p> <p>Rob Skelton quoted £200 with labour being waved as a Community Donation</p> <p>DL10 Bathroom & Joinery £190-£250</p> <p>It was suggested to take the bench out of the Bus Shelter and replace the damaged bench with it. A new bench would then be built within the Bus Shelter.</p> <p>Cllr Lee asked if it would be possible to create a hole/window in the Bus Shelter to be able to see if a bus is coming as there currently is not one. Quote to be obtained</p>

137 Parish Council Website	Formalise Barton PC website to comply with Transparency Code. Quotes received and it was agreed to go ahead with WJPS as the quote was competitive and positive feedback from other PC's using this company. Cllr Wool asked to check that there are no hidden exit costs should be needed. Clerk to start to action.
138 Grass Cutting Height	The height at which the Village Green grass is cut was discussed. Chair Walsh confirmed that all areas of the VG are cut at the same height and it should remain at this height.
139 Police & Crime Update	1 crime in the parish in March – theft from a vehicle
140 NYC Update	<p>NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCILLOR'S REPORT APRIL 2025.</p> <p>A66 UPGRADE AND SCOTCH CORNER We are now being told by the Government that the decision on whether the upgrade of the A66 will proceed will be made at the end of June. Apparently this decision will be made as part of a strategic review, but National Highways have repeatedly said that it is the largest road project in the north with a budget of £1.4 billion. I cannot in all honesty say that I am wildly optimistic about the prospects of it proceeding, but we can only live in hope. And of course because of the doubt of this much needed upgrade, Scotch Corner roundabout and its much needed upgrade hangs in the balance. Tied in with this is the Designer Outlet which requires the roundabout upgrade to be completed prior to its opening, still sees no progress. I was assured by the developer very recently that work will recommence in May following a financial restructuring. I hope this will be the case! I am frequently asked what NYC will do with the steel if all else fails and the answer is I don't know. But I hope it doesn't come to this.</p> <p>PLANNING AND 'CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS'. There have been at least 2 applications that I know of in my division for a Certificate of Lawfulness for domestic properties which the owner wishes to open as a children's home. One is at Whashton Green and the other at Aldbrough. There may be others in the pipeline. Why these issues have surfaced now, I don't know. The applicant is I understand a firm from Penrith. These applications have caused great concern among local residents and this has led to considerable criticism of the Richmond Planning Office. My understanding, after consultation with not only the Richmond Planning Office and other avenues, is as follows: A 'certificate of lawfulness' is a formal document issued by a local planning authority confirming that a proposed or existing use or development is lawful in planning terms. This provides assurance that it meets legal requirements and won't be subject to enforcement action. Unlike planning permission applications, there is no formal consultation process for a certificate of lawfulness. This means that neighbours cannot object to the</p>

	<p>application. However, they may still raise concerns if they believe the development is not lawful, which could lead to further investigation. So in the two cases mentioned above, if they were private dwellings being occupied as domestic accommodation, and that continues to be the case, then there is nothing neighbours can complain about to the planners. The reason for the consultation by the planning office was so that neighbours could give any valid reason why the certificate of lawfulness should not be granted, for example if the applicant was running a shop from their front room without planning permission. If the property is used in future as a home for children and anyone feels that rules are being broken by the owner or occupants, then the matter may be reported to the enforcement team, in our case at Richmond, who will investigate. I can appreciate that the many who objected to the Whashton certificate of lawfulness application may feel frustrated by the above, but this is the law of the land as things stand.</p> <p>In terms of planning in general, I'm afraid despite the backlog of cases in Richmond Planning Office decreasing by 22% since October, there appears to be little if any improvement in the service we are receiving from them. Validation of new applications is now taking 5 days and a customer service improvement plan is being put in place. Windows 11 can access the old district systems so this should mean offices outside Richmond can now be used to help out with their backlog of work. Yet I made no apology when I reported to a Senior Member of NYC Planning that the position in Mercury House is every bit as bad as it has been over the last 5 years and I am seeing a gradual increase in the number of complaints constituents are bringing to my attention asking me to put pressure on to the planners so that progress can be made towards determination of their case.</p> <p>I am receiving a large amount of complaints about the conservation team who are involved alongside Richmond planning staff when for example listed buildings are concerned. I am currently doing further investigations in respect of this department and will report my findings in a future report. I will also investigate as to whether the standards which are being applied to Richmondshire applications for listed buildings are being applied across the county. These standards are leading to what appears to be a large number of refusals for what on the surface appears to be petty reasons.</p> <p>SECOND HOMES COUNCIL TAX.</p> <p>The doubling of council tax on second homes in North Yorkshire has now been introduced with the new fiscal year. Many if not most councils have gone down this route as a way of discouraging second home ownership in rural villages and hamlets especially in the North Yorkshire Moors and Dales where property prices are now such that the younger generation find it virtually impossible to get a foot on the property ladder.</p>
--	--

	<p>This may seem unfair to some, especially where a person has very recently inherited a property. No doubt the debate will go on with Airbnbs being part of it too. The additional revenue to NYC from the above is estimated to be £42 million over the next 4 years and this is to be ringfenced and spent on 500 new affordable homes across the county.</p> <p>BOUNDARY COMMISSION</p> <p>The draft of the report from the Boundary Commission differs quite considerably from that put forward by the Council. The proposal for my division of North Richmondshire is to split the existing division in 2 using the A1 as the dividing line. So villages from Manfield to Newsham will be in North Richmondshire and villages east of the A1 but including Skeeby will be in a new division to be called Brompton and Scorton. This will take in Barton, Stapleton, Middleton Tyas, Moulton, North Cowton, Dalton-on-Tees and Croft, as well as Scorton and Brompton-on-Swale.,</p> <p>We are now in a consultation period which ends on 9th June. Please feel free to write in to give your views. The final recommendation of the Boundary Commission will be published on 2nd September. Only Parliament can make any variations to their recommendation.</p> <p>HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT.</p> <p>I have severe reservations about this policy which has attracted much criticism in my division. This I fully understand especially when you have situations where families with a child at say Richmond School, find that they can only get funded transport for a younger child to a school in Co. Durham.</p> <p>We are having an EGM to debate the issue on 21 st May. When we had the vote to move to the new policy last July, there was a large majority, reluctantly in many cases I have to say, in favour of the new proposal where we would only fund transport to the nearest school as the crow flies (which is the DfE's minimum requirement), rather than to the catchment school as was the case. But most of us voted that way on the belief that this would give significant cash savings.</p> <p>I think the vote in May will be much closer. I am currently doing work to establish much more regarding the new policy and will hopefully be in a position to give you more detail than I can today. However the waters are being muddied by the position where Richmond School is full. Part of this will no doubt be due to the fact that they have been and still are 'poaching' pupils from Bedale, Catterick and Northallerton which are all outside their catchment area.</p> <p>In summary, I am not happy at all with the position we are in and won't support it in any vote in favour of the new policy as things stand. There are a number of reasons for this on which I will advise you when I have the final details, but principally because we were told that there would be substantial financial</p>
--	--

	<p>savings to be made by adopting the new policy. Any evidence to date of this is extremely vague to say the least.</p> <p>FINANCES.</p> <p>I occasionally receive complaints that the service that taxpayers receive from NYC isn't as good as it was from RDC. If you take Planning out of the equation because it is every bit as big a mess as it was under RDC, it maybe that there are odd occasions when individuals have a grievance which would have been sorted out more efficiently during RDC days. For example, I had a constituent who couldn't get any response from any department regarding closed churchyards. Gary Hudson would have dealt with this in old days. But when I tell you that the savings to date on a recurring basis through forming the new Unitary council were £40 million last year and are now projected to increase to £60 million per annum next year, then surely we can agree that Local Government Reorganisation in North Yorkshire has been a huge success? Without it we would have been going out of business.</p> <p>As I have said many times before, the new Government will not help us at all. They see us as a leafy shire county who have been very good at putting efficiency savings in (£230 million over the 13 years to 2023), and will only target any monies spent on local government on what they see as deprived inner city areas run by Labour councils. The Government contribution is currently £410 per head to North Yorkshire. The AVERAGE council in England receives £571 per head of population per annum. When a special one off grant was announced in the budget last October of £500 million to local authorities to be spent specifically on pot hole repairs, we got £16 million ie. 3.2%, despite having more miles of roads than any other county.</p> <p>Finally, the inclusion of various sales of buildings and other figures such as the now £60 million per annum savings through the Unitary, we as things stand, now have usable reserves to cover the deficit for 4 years. Not a good position to be in but we are in a much better position than most councils.</p> <p>If you would like to be on my circulation list for these reports which I usually issue every other month, please email me on cllr.angus.thompson@northyorks.gov.uk., and I will add you to my list.</p> <p>Best wishes Angus Thompson. 12th April 2025.</p>
141 Play Area Inspections	<p>Play Area deep clean was discussed. Quote from Mr Steam was £466.80 as the PC paid £275 last year. sadly this company is no longer in business.</p> <p>Ms Bell suggested the PC and Community do it ourselves.</p> <p>Chari Walsh discussed the possibility of buying a battery powered pressure washer and a rolling water tank to spray the equipment with Traffic Film remover and then pressure wash it off.</p>

	<p>Chair Walsh will monitor to see if pressure washers become available in any upcoming sales.</p> <p>Cllr Dobinson informed the PC that the school that she works at is closing and there are some playground items available – stilts/netballs etc. and would the PC like them for the Play Area.</p> <p>Chair Walsh highlighted that the PC are liable for any items that are within the Play Area so they may not be suitable but they may be suitable for the Playing Fields. Cllr Dobinson to liaise with Playing Field Committee</p>
142 Financial Matters	<p>141.1) Salary Payment & Accounts Payable. Clerk Salary £271.36, YCLA £347. Clerk to send the login details for YCLA to rest of PC</p> <p>141.2) To receive (an update with regard to) the current bank balance £8224*</p>
143 Next Meeting	<p>To confirm the date of the Annual Parish Council meeting due to be held on Thursday 29th May 2024 at 7pm followed by the normal Parish Council Meeting in the Village Hall</p>