



## *Committee Meeting, 18th August 2005*

### MINUTES

<b>Present:</b>	<b>Gillian Jones</b>	<b>(GJ)</b>	<b>Chairperson</b>
	<b>Heather Thomas-Smith</b>	<b>(HTS)</b>	<b>Vice Chairperson</b>
	<b>Andrew Walkden</b>	<b>(AW)</b>	<b>Treasurer</b>
	<b>Cllr David Heather</b>	<b>(DH)</b>	<b>NYCC</b>
	<b>Cllr Helen Firth</b>	<b>(HF)</b>	<b>District Councillor</b>
	<b>Keith Grimshaw</b>	<b>(KG)</b>	
	<b>Gavin Dewar</b>	<b>(GD)</b>	
	<b>John Finnigan</b>	<b>(JF)</b>	
	<b>Malcolm Beresford</b>	<b>(MB)</b>	
	<b>John Mathew</b>	<b>(JM)</b>	
	<b>John Rogers</b>	<b>(JR)</b>	
	<b>Chris Moorby</b>	<b>(CM)</b>	<b>Chair Parish Council</b>
	<b>Ian Evans</b>	<b>(IE)</b>	
	<b>Bob Cater</b>	<b>(BC)</b>	
	<b>Roy Newhouse</b>	<b>(RN)</b>	

---

#### **1.0 Apologies**

**Samantha Glossop**

#### **2.0 A65**

**JR** has circulated notes from the meeting in Northallerton with Nigel Smith (NYCC) and emails from Ann Farquar. The A65 committee will meet again in Northallerton with 1 or 2 LoPRA representatives, with Nigel Smith (at his request) to work on the combined opposition to the A65 bypass land purchase order revocations. Have proposed 9<sup>th</sup> September. Nigel Smith was extremely supportive of the A65 group and LoPRA.

In response to **GJ**'s question regarding NYCC's position of the bypass revocation, **DH** read directly from a prepared note. In summary, (i) the County Council will not be able to fund the building of any bypass, (ii) uncertainty over the best way to bypass the A65 makes it premature for the Highways Agency to revoke the present building line without a new plan, or any funding for such, and (iii) the Highways Agency have indicated that the enquiry will be held in February 2006.

**DH** mentioned that Elwynn Williams had given the report from which he'd just read, and that further to his report, Elwynn had said that the traffic situation has actually worsened since the need for a bypass was originally established.

According to **IE**, up until 1995, the Highways Agency used a (now defunct) model for traffic flow projection. Data based on the old model are now no longer accepted, and new data suggest that use in 2005 is the same as in 1995. This is certainly not a good case for a bypass. **DH** would have to take that back to the County Council. **BC** asked where **IE** had received that information from. **IE** replied that his source was Ann Farquar. **DH**'s musings that the Highways Agency could be taking traffic flow data at times to suit themselves were rebuffed by **BC** who informed the meeting that the timing of traffic surveys are government dictated.

**JF** suggested that the Highways Agency could nevertheless skew the data by sampling in Gargrave (collecting mostly local traffic, and avoiding the A682 -> motorways traffic). **BC** reiterated that the enquiry will focus *solely* on the revocation of the A65 plans, and that we mustn't concede that the current line is unwanted. Must only press that an alternative must exist before the present line can be revoked. **BC** also said that the Highways Agency will maintain that the reason for revoking the line is that it is government policy not to build bypasses, not that the bypass is not required. In revoking the line, they'll remove uncertainty (blight) which is viewed as a good thing.

**BC** reported that the NYCC has conducted a survey to propose a new 'minimal length' bypass scheme, essentially just bypassing Long Preston. They won't mention this in the enquiry, lest the Highways Agency use it against NYCC. He also was unable to comment on how much of the land for the original A65 bypass line, the Highways Agency is already in possession of. (**KG** pointed out that they had been within three weeks of starting the bypass, suggesting a high degree of ownership of land by the Highways Agency).

**HF** said that Craven would be unlikely to attend the hearing due to the financial cost, but that pressure could be put on Chris Iversen (head of Craven Council legal dept.). **DH** agreed that as only 8% of Craven councillors would be affected by the bypass, peoples cages would have to be rattled to generate interest at Craven Council.

**CM** said that the Parish Council had already objected as a statutory objector, and that there's nothing to stop LoPRA from appearing at the hearing on behalf of the PC. **HTS** reminded urged LoPRA to follow up on YDNP's objection to the revocation of the bypass order. In the spirit of collaboration, **JF** suggested that NYCC, CC, PC, etc. could club together and form a single statement of case, and hire a barrister between them. The idea was well received by **DH**, and **HF**. It was confirmed that by 20<sup>th</sup> September, the statement of case needs to have been made, but that this just amounts to a list of documents for presentation. The actual documents themselves need not exist at that time.

**DH** resolved to do the following :

- 1) pursue finding out the land ownership of the current A65 bypass line
- 2) speak with David Butterworth about the YDNP's objection
- 3) talk to other statutory objectors regarding collaboration on a case
- 4) approach a friend of his (Mike) in NYCC who's a press officer

**HF** resolved to talk to Carl Lis

**BC** is to follow up on the traffic census conducted in Gargrave

**JR** is to contact Hellifield and Gargrave groups regarding their actions in relation to objecting to the revocation of the A65 bypass line.

**BC** suggested changing the date of the next meeting with Nigel Smith at Northallerton to 12<sup>th</sup> September, in order that **GJ**, **IE**, **BC**, and **JR** may attend.

**GJ** proposed that LoPRA pursue a list of supporting signatures (against the revocation), and photographic evidence for the statement of case. **CM** pointed out that a lot of the heavy goods traffic starts at 4am, should LoPRA wish to include such evidence.

### **3.0 Planning Applications**

**GJ** reported that at the planning meeting, authority was given to the planning officers to grant full planning permission to the Gallaber developments. **GD** confirmed that the committee had been powerless to consider anything but the fine details of the proposal, as outline permission had already been granted. They would, however, defer the decision until a more detailed management plan was received for the wetland area.

**HF** responded that she couldn't comment on her view of the sustainability of the Gallaber proposals, but she did think it'd end up going for housing anyway. In Gallaber's defence, the Sheep Centre at Penrith is similar to what's been proposed at Gallaber, and is a success. Additionally, the sales capacity of the development would be strictly laid out in the permission granted, and readily enforceable.

**GJ** asked why the size of the enclosed area next to the lorry park had increased dramatically in size. **HF**, and **GD** said they were unaware that it had, and that the planning committee had stated that there was no alteration to the size of the planning area. **HF** added that the committee could not control the rate of development once permission was granted. A gatepost planted within five years of the detailed planning permission being granted means the development has started and may continue to completion (regardless of how long it takes).

**GJ** reported that retrospective planning permission had been granted for the stainless steel flue at Townhead. **JF** added that Pentmoor Developments have moved the Townhead Farm gateposts back some way from being in the way of a large access road, and have removed trees that were subject to protection orders. Retrospective planning applications have been received by YDNP in respect of the development of Townhead Farmhouse.

**GJ** has emailed Alison Leach (4<sup>th</sup> August) for information on the Housing Needs Survey. She claimed that a draft report was to be ready in September, with the full report being published in October. **HF** confirmed that the draft report would be presented to members on 12<sup>th</sup> September in a closed session, and that she didn't know if the Parish Council would get to see it before it is made public. **HF** was uncertain as to when LoPRA would be able to comment on the report, but resolved to investigate claims made by **GJ** that the HNS results could not constitute a report without then input of socio-economic data.

**HF** resolved to answer what is able to constitute the HNS report, find out if the report will be available on the Craven website, and when it will be made public.

*The next General Committee meeting is to take place on 8<sup>th</sup> September in the Maypole Lounge.*

*The Annual General Meeting is scheduled to take place on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2005.*