

Barley with Wheatley Booth Parish Council (BPC)

Minutes of the Extra-Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on at 1930Hrs on  
Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> May 2022 at Barley Village Hall

**Present:** Cllr. D. Heap (Chair) Cllr. R. Seymour Cllr. J. Connor  
Cllr. T. Cartmell Cllr. N. Dewhurst Cllr. D. Goldsbrough

**In Attendance:** C. Heap Acting Clerk

**Public:** Phil & Janet Garvey, Mike Watson, Dorothy Lyons, Sue Coupe, Janet & Bob Pemberton

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 1. 1 | <p><b>Apologies:</b> Cllr. L. Hunt                      <b>Absent:</b> Cllr. C.Lionti</p>  |
|      | <p><i>Members are reminded of the legal requirements concerning the declaration of interests. A Member must generally declare a disclosable pecuniary interest which he or she has in any item on the agenda. A Member with a disclosable pecuniary interest may not participate in any discussion of the matter at the meeting and must not participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting. In addition, the Council's Standing Orders require a member with a disclosable pecuniary interest to leave the room where the meeting is held while any discussion or voting takes place.</i></p>   |
| 2.   | <p><b>Councillors Declaration of Interest: None</b></p>  |
| 3.   | <p><b>Public Participation –</b><br/>The Chairman asked if any members of the public wished to speak – the following spoke on the Whitehough planning application below:</p> <p><b>Mike Watson expressed concern on: -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit sight line obscured onto Barley Road with increased traffic this would require widening.</li> <li>• Access bridge would require double carriageway.</li> <li>• 20 Ton limit to bridge</li> <li>• 5 large dwellings are excessive and the properties are too large.</li> <li>• The access road would need to be upgraded to LCC standard and adopted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Phil Garvey:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not a 'modest' development it increases the number of properties by 35%.</li> <li>• Repairs promised to bridge but developer doesn't own the bridge. Residents need guarantee of upgrade.</li> <li>• The development is incongruous and appears like a modern cul-de-sac with no resemblance to the original Whitehough development. On original deeds it states all development has to be within the Hamlet.</li> <li>• Concern over the development as plans show no architectural merit.</li> </ul> <p><b>Janet Garvey: -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application states that the bridge has been declared 'unsafe' by LCC which is untrue and residents, delivery vehicles and transport vehicles have all been using the bridge.</li> <li>• The properties are not affordable housing and the development is within AONB.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sue Coupe: -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over increased traffic and the road condition.</li> <li>• Road is not wide enough and the riverbank is unstable on both sides which would be exacerbated with development traffic causing further subsidence.</li> <li>• Who will maintain the bridge going forward?</li> <li>• Fire Brigade recommends structures should have a full 26t capacity.</li> </ul> |

4. **Planning Applications: Members are asked to confirm a view on the following:**

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

APPLICATION: 22/0302/OUT

**PROPOSAL: Full: Erection of 5 No. dwelling houses (Access only).**

**AT:** Land to the West of Whitehough Grange Barley New Road **FOR:** Mr N Stevenson

**The Chairman** opened by informing that the site lies within the AONB and adjacent to the Conservation Area and reminded members that there was previously an application for 15No houses in 2021 for this location, which is a field to the East of the Whitehough settlement, not to the west as stated in the application. He added that there were a significant number of objections raised in 2021 and that the application had been withdrawn.

He reported that this is a scaled down application for 5No Houses and it was an outline planning application focusing on access but that it gives little detail regarding access arrangements. There is little mention of the steep access road in to Whitehough and its junction with Barley New Road. The bridge is referred to in the Design & Access Statement and is referred to as being deemed unsafe in 5.1, as being rebuilt in section 10.12 and only being repaired at Section 5.2 – there is no detail on any repair in the application.

The Chair added that there are a number of erroneous statements in the application related to the bridge, the visibility of the development and the reference to providing “affordable housing” in Sect.10.14 must be a cut and paste error. He said the reduction in the number of houses is a better application than 15No but it is unlikely 5No houses can fund a new bridge being built.

The Chair went on to say that the reduction in houses does not change the fundamental issues:

***The adverse impacts of this proposal are on the character and appearance of the countryside within the Forest of Bowland AONB.***

The development, whilst sitting in the valley bottom, is in open countryside and highly visible from numerous and adjacent well used footways and bridleways. These include the popular bridleway from Barley to Roughlee and the Whitehough access lane from Barley Road where the view will be directly on to the development. The location is one of the main tourist areas in Lancashire and the area is well frequented by residents and visitors because of the scenic beauty between the two villages.

He said he came to live in Barley because I enjoy the open countryside. *Over recent years there have been a number of houses built between Roughlee village and Thorneyholme settlement which have detracted from the openness of the countryside between the village and the settlement. The proposed development would further significantly reduce the open countryside between Whitehough and Thorneyholme and continue the creep of housing in this corner of the AONB.*

*Protection of the open countryside has to be a priority for Councils and Government as it provides many benefits (physical and mental) to the local and wider community, hence areas are designated as AONB's and National Parks.*

Character & Appearance

*The outline plans look like a residential development in terms of density of housing, layout and orientation, parking bays / drives and gardens. This would be in an unspoilt area of the AONB which complements the adjacent, and impressive, grade listed Whitehough Grange and the Whitehough hamlet. The development would change damage the appearance of Whitehough as well as increasing noise pollution and lighting intrusion within the area.*

PBC have offered advice on this application and can be found in Section 14 of the Design & Access Statement. The Case Officer states ***“It is an open area that is seen as an unspoilt area***

*of the AONB and open countryside by those using the lane. Building there, even with landscaping, would alter the character of the area and result in an urban form. It would significantly detract from the character of this part of the AONB. Whilst there are merits for developing housing as is well documented in appeal decisions, these would not outweigh the significant visual harm that a development here would have..... a development of that proposed would significantly harm the AONB and the designated heritage asset”.*

The Chairman said these views supported his own determination to protect the open countryside in our AONB and his view was that the development would be contrary to Policy ENV1 and ENV2 of the adopted PBC Local Plan and he would be moving in due course that the Council objects to this planning application.

Councillors discussed the issues the chairman had raised and concurred with them. It was **RESOLVED** to object to this application. **Action: Clerk.**

5. **Planning Applications: Members are asked to confirm a view on the following:**

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990**

**APPLICATION: 220310/FUL**

**PROPOSAL: Full: Change of use of agricultural land to domestic garden.**

**AT: Narrowgates House, Narrowgates, Barley**

**FOR: Mr Oliver Growling**

**The Chairman** reported that a previous application for this change of use had been made and the Council had agreed to remain neutral but the applicant had then withdrawn the application. The owner, Mr Gowling, had purchased a parcel of land to convert into a garden. The land is in the AONB and in the open countryside. It is 0.05 hectare.

The Council considered the PBC “Special Planning Guidance – Development in the Open Countryside” noting that the application was within the criteria set out in the SPG and a landscaping plan had been submitted as part of the application.

**Cllr. Heap** said although the property is not directly linked to other properties in Narrowgates it is still overlooked by a popular bridleway and visual and noise impact should therefore be a consideration. He proposed that the Council remained neutral allowing planning officers to make an informed decision but, should approval be granted, the Council request conditions be added that would prevent any future erection of any type of structure on this land, including hardstands beyond the patio limits shown on the landscape plan. The Council could also request that any external lighting needs the approval of the Planning Authority before installation (positioning and luminance details) in order to protect the dark skies in the AONB valley and thereafter is maintained as such in perpetuity.

**Cllr. Cartmell** said all the work this resident had done on the property had been carried out to a very high standard and Narrowgate residents supported this application.

**Cllr. Dewhurst** said he had no objection to this application but Council must always bear in mind that they are protecting a property not an owner. If the property were sold a future owner may not be so respectful and safeguards must be put in place.

It was **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application but to ask PBC to add conditions, if the application is approved, as set out above. **Action: - Clerk to write to PBC.**

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| <p>6.</p> | <p><b>Members to Consider and Approve arrangements to start applying Parking Charges on the Turning Area</b></p> <p>The chairman had circulated a draft “Vehicle Parking Policy on the Village Turning Area” to members for their consideration prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Councillors confirmed they were familiar with the procedures the Council had followed to get to the position where parking charges could be introduced in June as set out in the policy. The members focused their discussions and agreed on the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All members of the Parish Council, and any other designated persons, are authorised to use the computer tablet to record breaches of parking conditions and send to PwE,</li> <li>• Loading and unloading is permitted on the Turning Area provided it is evident that persons are in attendance of the vehicle. Councillors recording breaches are under no obligation to spend time looking for owners of vehicles that are not attended.</li> <li>• No parking tickets are being issued on to vehicles by the Council.</li> <li>• There are no concessions for any vehicles including blue badge holders – parking concessions are limited to street parking and do not apply on private land.</li> <li>• Temporary parking concessions can be granted by the Council at the Council’s sole discretion on request, in advance, to the Council Chairman, Vice Chair or the Clerk,</li> <li>• Once the parking breach has been recorded and downloaded to Park with Ease it will solely be a matter for PwE to issue parking charges and to take such enforcement as the Company deems necessary,</li> <li>• The Parish Council have given an obligation to PwE not to enter into discussions with the recipient of any parking charge nor to interfere with the collection and enforcement of such charge,</li> <li>• The Computer Tablet will be held at a location agreed by the Council – For the first few months Cllr Goldsbrough agreed to storing the tablet at his property</li> <li>• The parking charge is £60.</li> </ul> <p>All Councillors unanimously agreed to adopting the policy.</p> <p>It was <b>RESOLVED</b> to adopt the policy and progress to notifying residents and businesses of the Councils intentions to introduce parking charges.</p> |
| <p>7.</p> | <p><b>Reports from Chairman, Councillors &amp; Clerk</b></p> <p>The Chairman reported that the new ‘Wallgate’ hand driers had been installed in the toilets but the contractors had not given notification of attending, had made a mess during installation and had taken the old dryers away when they had been instructed to leave them so they could be used for spare parts. <b>Action: - Cllr. Heap</b> to contact Wallgate for an explanation.</p>   |
| <p>8</p>  | <p>Date of the next meeting: 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022, (agenda items by 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2022).</p>  |