

**Minutes of the Meeting of Weaverthorpe Parish Council held remotely, at 7pm on Monday 22nd
March 2021**

Present: M Rowland, J Mason, G Downes, A Milner, S Taylor, G Perry, F Shellard (Chairman),
T Thomson, J House (Clerk)

1. **To receive apologies for Absence:** There were no apologies for absence.

2. **Matters to be raised by members of the public:** Two matters had been raised by email:
Gypsy Race: A resident has raised the subject of regular cleaning of the Gypsy Race bed. Emails were attached to the meeting pack. The resident was not present at the meeting. It had been suggested that the precept be increased to pay for an annual scraping of the bed of the Gypsy Race to ensure that in times of high rainfall the water still drains away through the village. Members of the PC that have long knowledge cannot remember when there has been a problem with the water not draining and although it had been mentioned that some householders allow the vegetation in the ditch to grow each year this does not inhibit the flow of the water.
The PC did have the bed of the Gypsy Race scraped in August 2013 and the cost then was £4500. Applying inflation to that figure for 8 years would give us a sum in excess of £6000. Our current precept is £4850, so adding £6000 to this would give a sum of £10850 which the Council decided was not justifiable.
Ownership of War memorial site: An email had been received from another Resident regarding ownership of the land as they want to prune a Rowan tree which is on that land. The Clerk has replied with the facts and promised to get back to the resident if there is anything else to note.
The only additional piece of information was that the land was gifted to the Parish in 1923 by the Cholmleys.
The Clerk was asked to reply to the resident saying the Parish Council had no objection to him carrying out pruning and thank him for contacting us and being responsible for the upkeep of the tree.

3. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 18th January 2021**
The minutes of the meeting were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

4. **Matters arising from the last minutes:** M Rowland has informed us that work on the play equipment started today will continue this week. The starting of the work has raised some interest from two residents who contacted the Clerk to enquire what was happening. One of the residents is interested in purchasing more equipment and asked if the PC has any funds to spare. The Council agreed that we could give them support with things as Community Grants from RDC, but no monies are available directly from the PC at present. The Chairman was originally involved in discussions about the play equipment a couple of years ago and he will contact the resident concerned to discuss the subject further.
The Clerk contacted our Community Officer at RDC about dog fouling but received no reply. In the last few days we have received news from RDC that the Community Team has been reorganised. The Clerk will circulate the details to the PC and the Warbler. Cllr Mason agreed to contact the Community Team to ask them for help with dog fouling.

5. **Governance and Finance:** There have been two payments made in this period.
YLCA Membership fee £132
HMRC £68.80
The Council agreed the above payments.
After these payments have been made, the balances at the bank are as follows:
Current Account: £6581.39 less outstanding cheque of £313.12 = £6268.27
Reserve Account: £1544.69

The year end paperwork will be commenced shortly. Members have the spreadsheet of accounts in their packs for perusal.

Yorkshire Internal Audit Services were adopted as our external auditor for 2020/ 2021.

6. Correspondence:

An email has been received from the Station Manager of Scarborough NYFRS regarding their priorities and a request to talk to us at a future meeting. It was decided that we would decline this at the moment because of the uncertainty over meetings due to Covid. We will get back to him in 2022.

The White Rose update from YLCA for 2nd February 2021 draws our attention to the fact that the temporary regulations regarding holding meetings remotely cease to have effect from 7 May 2021. It was noted that due to the current Covid guidelines we would not be compliant. Therefore we should be prepared to start face to face meetings again from May onwards, but will need to keep this under review. That will commence with our Annual Meeting on 17th May 2021 which will be preceded by the Parish Meeting on the same date. As all of the village organisations normally represented at the Parish Meeting will not have met at all, and those who have met will have done so, like ourselves, remotely, we should consider just a written summary from each organisation.

The Clerk will inform the Village Hall of bookings for the rest of the year.

We have been made aware of the consultation by HM Govt. Communities Secretary on the future of local government in North Yorkshire, which is due by 19th April 2021. The survey to be completed will not allow the contributor to move from page to page , until the current page has been completed. The Council decided that replying to the consultation was not possible by the PC and it would be left to individual members to respond.

An email from the RBLI regarding their promotion of Bring Tommy Home for VE day on 8th May 2021, will be publicised in the Warbler.

7. Planning

21/0013/FUL Erection of 1no. four bedroom replacement dwelling with associated parking and landscaping following demolition of existing bungalow – Rarey Bungalow

The documents are on the website, it states that the dwelling would be for a local family bit does not mention LNO conditions.

To support our stance on LNO it was decided that we should mention that we would object to the imposition of LNO conditions to prevent an empty property being replaced by another empty property.

With the exception of the above we will reply to RDC to say we have no objections.

21/00122/HOUSE Erection of part two story / part single storey extension following removal of existing extension at Paster Farm, Pasture Road

There is no design statement to describe what is proposed but it is a straight forward two and one storey extension in red brick and slate and is barely visible from the road.

No Objections were raised.

Vellco: there has been surveying activity on the Vellco land recently. One of the Vellco employees told a contractor working for the Clerk, adjacent to the land that they were starting groundworks in a few weeks. There have been no updates to the Construction Management Plan and the Site Management Plan, so the Clerk will write to RDC and ask for updates if this is the case. He will also appraise Kevin Holinrake MP as our last communication from him was that he was following this up with RDC.

8. Police matters none

9. Grass Cutting; Confirmation of the same amount for grass cutting for this year. Our contractor has agreed to proceed. Response required by 22nd March 2021, this was sent the following day.

10. VAS: For everyone concerned the Clerk thought it would be useful to give the history of the VAS. We had been talking about this for some time. The first conversation about finding the money to purchase a VAS was at the July meeting when North Yorkshire County Councillor Janet Sanderson attended our meeting. She was supportive in our efforts to raise the money and awarded us £1000 towards the cost on the basis was that we try and share it with another Parish. We talked about Luttons and Wharram at the time. The Clerk followed up with Wharram and Luttons, and JS got involved in some of those discussions, but both eventually declined. As the VAS is a temporary sign it has to be moved so we would need two locations at which to site it. This would not have been the case if another Parish had shared it as the one of the locations would have been in another village.

We applied to the Police Fire and Crime Commissioner's Road Safety fund and were successful in being awarded £1900 towards the cost.

In order to show that we complied with the NYCC Protocol we had to go through a process of getting them to approve the locations. We had a discussion at the September meeting about the location of the sites for the sign. There is no need under the NYCC rules for the sign to be sited at the extremities of the village, although this is the norm in the majority of cases. There is an example of this not happening in Old Malton where the sign is in the middle of the village / town on the main road. It has to be recognised that in many villages where the VAS is at the entrance to the village, it slows the traffic but then drivers speed up as they pass through the village.

Another consideration was the cost of the installation. Installing the VAS on one of our new lamp columns is the most economic option. The price for purchase of the sign includes for two fixing points on that type of column. Unfortunately, we only have three such columns, on East Bank, outside September Cottage and outside Sunday School Cottage. One obvious location was on East Bank where the lamp standard is 300 meters from the 30 mph Speed Limit sign. There is a requirement that a VAS is situated at a distance of more than 100 meters from the 30mph sign and inside the parish boundary. We then discussed September Cottage and Sunday School Cottage. We concluded that September Cottage was too close to East Bank and that we would use the lamp column outside of Sunday School Cottage as it would also have the advantage that when it is facing a westerly direction would have more of an effect over vehicles travelling through the centre of the village.

The next step was to get approval from NYCC for the positioning of the signs. As this process was undertaken in January, the NYCC was not able to visit site so asked me to send a map indicating the locations together with photographs of the sites. I sent the above information, the photographs being taken from both directions on the footway. In the email to the engineer we asked two questions

"I note in the protocol that we will need to contact adjacent properties, are there any distances from the sign regarding the properties and is there any information about how much light they emit? and A deployment schedule is also mentioned in the protocol, what does this consist of?"

The two sites were approved by the NYCC engineer and his reply was as follows:

Both columns are acceptable to me - both look like good locations for a VAS. In terms of your questions: "Out of courtesy more than anything, adjacent properties should be made aware of the VAS. The columns don't appear to be directly outside somebody's window so light intrusion from the sign shouldn't be an issue here. There isn't a distance as such and the light emitted from the LED's is minimal, but occasionally we do get complaints if people see regular activations from their living rooms etc. They can be a nuisance if you see activations all the time." and "A deployment schedule is just a couple of sentences in the legal agreement explaining how you will ensure the signs will remain temporary. So, you might want to rotate the signs between both columns every six weeks? Let me know which direction the sign will be facing and for how long - that will do."

On the basis of the above information above on 7th February after getting approval for the wording, the Clerk delivered four letters to adjacent properties at each location. We received a very supportive email from a resident on East Bank on the same day. On 1st March we received a letter from a resident who lives in the village and is the owner, not occupier, of one of the properties saying that the sign would be 2m from the window of the property and that was “not very nice”. On 2nd March we received a letter from the occupier of another adjacent property to SSC saying he disagreed with the siting of the sign. Other letters have been received from the owner of the other property. These letters were followed up by other letters about our process and these have been answered. In all the correspondence the Clerk has pointed out that the subject will be the subject of an agenda item at this meeting and members of the public were welcome to attend.

Another letter suggesting that we had not consulted and he wanted to know the engineer's name and contact details was replied to, by saying that we could not release the engineer's details to comply with Data Protection. The reply is included in the meeting pack and the Clerk had already told him that we would discuss further correspondence at the meeting. He has been made fully aware of the agenda and how to access the meeting.

Just for information the Clerk has checked the measurements that were given with regard to the property in question, being 2 meters from the window. The VAS if mounted on that column would be 4.2 metres from the top corner of the window. The top of the window is 1.9 meters from the ground and the VAS would be mounted at 2.1 meters above the ground. The information on light emission from the manufacturer is “Our LEDs are designed to be directional so as to reduce impact on the area surrounding the sign. That said there will be an element of light pollution emitted. In terms of comparison to a lamp column the sign will emit less light but it hard to quantify this without knowing exactly where the individual with the objection is in relation to the sign. The majority of the light will of course be emitted towards motorists. The sign as supplied incorporates an ambient light meter (ALM) which controls the brightness of the sign in conjunction with the surrounding ambient light. To that end, the sign is therefore at its brightest through the day if direct sunshine is on the display face, but the brightness is faded considerably during hours of darkness to ensure that drivers are not dazzled by an activated display.”

The Chairman has had a discussion with the resident and he has said we have not complied with NYCC's protocol and that we knew he owned the property so why did we not contact him directly. The Chairman had explained that we write to residents and cannot be expected to communicate with all owners of rented accommodation. He has offered to contribute to any additional cost.

The Council discussed what would be necessary to resite the sign to another location in the village. Cllr Taylor and the Clerk have identified two possible locations, one outside 7 Waddale End and the other adjacent to the village notice board outside the Blue Bell Inn. Our original quote for supply and installation from NYCC's preferred supplier SWARCO, was for the sum of £3127 plus VAT. VAT is recoverable.

For the two proposed locations the additional costs would be:

Installation of a post by NYCC £500 plus VAT.

The increased cost for a hybrid sign is £3327 plus VAT

Plus the purchase of the battery which is £255 plus VAT. The life of the battery is 6 weeks and it would be charging for the subsequent six weeks when connected to the mains supply at East Bank.

Total additional cost is therefore £500 + £200 + £255 = £955

- 11. Phone box:** In between meetings we discussed and agreed a letter to the person who answered the complaint against the rejection of RDC for the PC adopting the box. The letter was sent on 8th February and a reply which was undated, was received on 26 February 2021.

The reply is in the pack sent to all Councillors. RDC are saying that they will not allow the adoption of the box until BT put it back to full working order and condition. It would seem that we have no prospect of adopting the phone box in the near future but in the reply it does say that individuals can complain to the Local Government Ombudsman. Is this a candid message to say get someone else rather than the PC to complain? With the permission of the Council the Clerk will contact the leader of the Community Group to see if they have an appetite to revisit this. That person can then appeal to the Local Government Ombudsman.

It was also agreed that although Kevin Holinrake was copied on RDC's reply, he did ask to be kept informed so we should ask for his support.

The Chairman also pointed out that there appears to be a direct way of contacting BT to adopt a phone box and that he would supply the link to the Clerk.

Recruitment of Clerk: As the recruitment of a replacement Clerk has had no success the Council had a discussion on how to make this happen. A revised remuneration package was agreed and the Clerk, who has a HR background will look at the process with a view to more success in identifying a successor.