**Minutes for the Ordinary Meeting of the Great and Little Barugh Parish Council held at The Golden Lion, Great Barugh on Monday 1st July 2019 at 7.00pm**

1. To receive apologies for absence

Bob Ordidge,

1. Minutes and Matters arising
2. To approve the minutes of the Meeting 18.02.19

Approved

1. To consider any matters arising from the meeting on 18.02.19

Mrs Garrett informed Mr Swift that in answer to his previous question, there was no reason to have the public session in any particular order. Though the time is restricted to 3 minutes in order to ensure that meetings do not go on unnessarily long and to to keep some order.

1. Public Session – to allow members of the public to make representations, ask questions and give evidence in respect of any items of business.

Mrs Garrett said she had had an email from Mrs Gillies regarding the rights of way being overgrown. Mrs Garrett said that she had heard from NYCC and the matter was being investigate by them. It was also noted this was on the agenda for Item 8.

1. To report and update on Parish Liaison Meeting.

Notes attached.

1. To update on potential Telephone Box adoption for Great Barugh.

There have been further meetings by the local group regarding funding, the process is ongoing.

1. To formulate a response to NYCC Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Consultation.

Discussion was had over the request by the planning inspector, Elizabeth Ord whether the high court ruling should be taken into account regarding whether the Ministerial statement was lawful in not considering more up to date reports to have a more balanced approach. Mr Swift said he had read the documentation and he thought that energy security should be mentioned in our response. Mrs Garrett said that she thought that it was more about the governments failing to look at up to date reports and had not taken them into account which was agreed by Mrs Houlston. Discussion was had over what our response should be. Little weight should be given to the ministerial statement as they did not consider both angles fully, climate change and the buffer zone should be aspects in the response.

1. To formulate a response to planning applications as consultees from Third Energy:-

[NY/2018/0108/73A](https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=10577)

[NY/2018/0112/73A](https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=10581)

[NY/2018/0113/73A](https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=10581)

[NY/2018/0114/73A](https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=10583)

[NY/2018/0116/73A](https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=10585)

[NY/2018/0117/73A](https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=10586)

[NY/2018/0118/73A](https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=10587)

[NY/2019/0079/FUL](https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=10587)

Mrs Garrett outlined the aspects of these applications to be taken into account in formulating a response. These applications are for expansion of the existing conventional business though a number of points were raised and discussed. The question over why a 17 year extension was required considering the Governments commitment to achieve net zero by 2050 and these would take us to 2035. Any previous extensions granted have only been for ten years. The point was raised that 4 wells out of the six sites ( two being Great Habton) had not produced in some ten years so why would they wish to extend permission on wells that were inactive. The pipeline and Knapton generating station are reaching end of life and in order to meet the Industrial Emissions Directive by the end of 2021, the generating station needs substantial and inherently expensive work to bring up to the required standards. Question of whether NYCC take this into account when deciding.

The results of the Pickering site re-injection some 18 months on are still being analysed so it there viability?

It was questionable whether the extensions could lead to fracking in the future. It was also questioned why the depth had changed on the full permission at Kirby Misperton, being further down that the original application. A response was agreed detailing these points.

1. To discuss grass cutting on verges, also clearing of grown over rights of way.

Mrs Houlston to ask NYCC about verge cutting on corners. Mrs Garrett said that she had had discussions with Highways and some had been done already. She also said she had had conversations regarding the rights of way with Andrew Brown of NYCC and they were sending an inspector out to look. Apparently the issue with the stile had been looked at 2 years ago when first reported and despite being chased up had not been actioned but filed away. NYCC could not explain why it had been missed. Mrs Houlston was going to find out costs of Robert Snowball to mow Little Barugh lower green and for other required mowing of verges where necessary. It was noted that Richard Metcalfe kindly keeps Great Barugh areas tidy.

Mr Swift said he had walked a number of paths to find them overgrown and impassable in places, Mr Wagstaff was going to clear a section through the wood. A question was raised over the riverbank area to Barugh Bridge by Mrs Gillies. Mrs Houlston declared an interest and said she could not comment though that section of the bank has never been a public right of way. Mrs Gillies pressed the point that it had been used for a number of years and asked if it was possible to claim the right to walk it historically. Mrs Houlston said again she could not comment and Mrs Gillies would have to research it. Mr Swift offered to speak to Mr Stephen Houlston to discuss the right of way across the other side, a meeting to be arranged.

1. To agree changes to bank mandate.

Mr Swift agreed to act as a signatory on the bank account.

1. To review role of clerk for 2020/2021.

Mrs Garrett said that she had been ‘acting clerk’ as well as Councillor for the full term after the 2015 election. Initially it was for a short term to ascertain how much work was involved. Legally a Council has to have a paid clerk (or a Councillor who is unpaid can undertake the role). Unfortunately Mrs Garrett is going to have to step down from acting as Clerk from the New Year for personal reasons and other committments and wished to forewarn the Council of this so that steps can be taken to investigate the cost of clerk and implications to the Council.

1. To provide information to Councillors for ‘Standing Orders’ to be reviewed by next meeting.

Mrs Houlston said she had a copy of Amotherby PC’s standing orders and suggested it would be pertinent to read them and discuss at the next meeting. Copies to be distributed.

1. To set date for next meeting.

Date to be set for September.