



## *Committee Meeting, 9 March 2006*

### MINUTES

**Present:**

<b>Heather Thomas-Smith</b>	<b>(HTS)</b>	<b>Chairperson (outgoing)</b>
<b>Keith Grimshaw</b>	<b>(KG)</b>	<b>Chairperson (incoming)</b>
<b>Andrew Walkden</b>	<b>(AW)</b>	<b>Treasurer</b>
<b>John Finigan</b>	<b>(JF)</b>	
<b>Gavin Dewar</b>	<b>(GD)</b>	
<b>Gillian Jones</b>	<b>(GJ)</b>	
<b>John Mathew</b>	<b>(JM)</b>	
<b>John Rodgers</b>	<b>(JR)</b>	

---

### **1.0 Apologies**

Robert Cater

### **2.0 Hand over of Chairmanship and appointment of General Secretary**

2.1 All were in agreement that chairmanship could pass to **KG**, and that **HTS** could assume the role of secretary.

### **3.0 Matters Arising**

3.1 None.

### **4.0 Correspondence**

4.1 Ian Evans (**IE**) had received letters in support of our objection to the A65 bypass line revocation from 1) the School Governors, and 2) David Heather.

### **5.0 A65**

5.1 **GJ** reported that the Highways Agency (**HA**) claim that the A65 no longer meets the criteria for being considered a trunk road, therefore it cannot be bypassed, therefore there's no need for a bypass plan. **GD** had disputed this, but had been unable to get hold of the data with which the **HA** made their claim.

5.2 **GJ** added that a letter had been received from the **HA**, after the closing date of the enquiry, that presented the data with which they made their claim to the A65 not meeting trunk road criteria.

5.3 **JR** had noted that both advocates at the hearing belonged to the same chambers, and considered the possibility of a conflict of interests. **KG** thought this unlikely.

5.4 **GJ** pointed out that the **HA** evidence relating to the national average cost of (dual carriageway) bypasses wasn't valid, as the North Yorkshire County Council (**NYCC**) had proposed a lower

cost single carriageway alternative which comes out better in the cost/benefit analysis than the **HA** claim.

- 5.5 **JF** considered that the actual reasons for not building bypasses could be traced back to the Labour government pushing costs onto regional centres. **GD** added that **IE** had made a very eloquent point that governments change, as do policies, which is no reason to go revoking a bypass plan. **GJ** also mentioned that Michale Dean (Wigglesworth Parish Council) had spoken well against the bypass order revocation. **GD** commented that Gargrave Parish Council seemed split on the matter, with a small majority against the revocation of the bypass order.
- 5.6 **GJ** reported that the site visit went very well. They walked from the Alms Houses to the old people's bungalows, giving the inspector a perilous journey. It will be July before we hear back from the inspector.
- 5.7 **JF** stressed that we must point out that *every* elected body, and *every* administrative body has objected to the bypass order revocation, so anything but a finding in our favour will be very suspicious.
- 5.8 **KG** though the inspector should be told that the data from the Department of Transport (supposedly backing the **HA** claim to the A65 not meeting trunk road criteria) arrived too late (on 3<sup>rd</sup> March), but **GJ** said that no further evidence may be submitted to the inspector. Only the Ministry of Transport may receive any new evidence.

## 6.0 Newsletter

- 6.1 **HTS** reported that the Parish Council clerk had failed to provide an article for the newsletter.
- 6.2 **GD** said that Rachael is happy to let us print at the vicarage, and he suggested that we send the newsletter to lapsed members with a note asking them for the reason why they haven't rejoined.

## 7.0 Public Meeting

- 7.1 **HTS** noted that 23<sup>rd</sup> March is booked with the village hall, and wondered if **IE** would be able to come along and present what happened at the A65 bypass inquiry. **GJ** said she'd ask him, but that failing that, **GD** has all the information.
- 7.2 **JF** feared that we may get asked what we've done about the Neighbourhood Watch scheme, but **KG** pointed out that we merely facilitated this, and had no responsibility to action it. **HTS** commented that there had been no response to Neighbourhood Watch.
- 7.3 **GD** said we could distribute flyers for the public meeting this weekend, and **JM** added that we should also distribute at the village hall coffee morning on 18<sup>th</sup> March.
- 7.4 **KG** noted that we have the following speakers and topics for the public meeting :
- **IE** (possibly) Public Enquiry
  - **KG** Housing Needs Survey (HNS)
  - **GD** TRAMPS
  - **HTS** Neighbourhood Watch
- 7.5 **JR** reported that he was recently over at Malham trying to get hold of Gareth Evans and the display boards (for use at the May Day stand) but the office was shut. He'll try again.

## 8.0 Housing Needs Survey (HNS)

- 8.1 **KG** said that Peter Scott Smith has offered to perform an analysis of the new HNS. **HTS** cautioned of the scenario where **PSS** does find fault, then points out he was asked to perform the analysis by LoPRA. **KG** thought it best not to officially engage **PSS**, but for us each to analyze the report individually. **KG** also cautioned that new housing proposals would be long term (20+ yrs) so they will likely seem distasteful if not understood to relate to that timeframe.
- 8.2 **GD** commented that he thought the new survey to be quite reasonable.
- 8.3 **HTS** voiced a concern over any single developer becoming too powerful in their permission to develop, as it's harder to control a single developer on a small scale if he's the sole developer.
- 8.4 **KG** hypothesized that the true problem wasn't a lack of affordable housing in Craven, but the migration of city dwellers out into the country, and that Craven need to perform a full review of

the housing stock they have available. The report doesn't contain a lot of the raw data, but nevertheless seems pretty professional. Also, he wasn't sure whether being lumped in together with Hellifield was beneficial or detrimental to Long Preston, as there are issues regarding Craven vs. Parks planning.

## **9.0 TRAMPS**

- 9.1 **GD** reported that if TRAMPS do the show, then they're booked up for March, April, May already. If we wanted to put on the show, there's a slot at the end of March. If TRAMPS are to do the work, they only do 7:30pm screenings (i.e. no Matinees) and in order to engage them, we'd need to supply a list of possible dates, and it can turn out to be quite a lengthy business.
- 9.2 **Concensus** agreed to an Autumn showing, with LoPRA undertaking to do the work, and sell refreshments on a sale-or-return basis.

## **10.0 AOB**

- 10.1 **JF** wanted to know if **HTS** had followed up with Wilf Fenten over Townhead developments. In response, **HTS** said that she was preferring to approach general policy rather than Townhead in particular, and that she'd seen Hilary Fenten last night at the CPRE meeting.
- 10.2 **JF** remained concerned that Wilf Fenten might not feel he is getting sufficient support from LoPRA or the Parish Council.
- 10.3 **JR** circulated a news clipping advising of two training days being run by YDNP on traditional buildings and methods

## **11.0 Membership**

- 11.1 **AW** resolved to investigate the possibility of standing orders/direct debits being set up for membership subscriptions.
- 11.2 **JF** asserted that we should be accumulating a warchest for future need.
- 11.3 **KG** warned that we need not to be seen as a 'moneybags outfit' as we'll generate resentment that way.

Next meeting at 19:30 in the residents' lounge of the Maypole on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2006.