

Minutes of Oswaldkirk Parish Meeting 18th January 2023

1. Attendance / apologies

Apologies:

Alison Hampshire, Peter & Jill Stone, Peter O'Neill, Lisa Halmshaw

Attendees:

Chair: Shena Stewart (SS)

Treasurer: Mike Aherne (MA)

28 attendees

2. Minutes of last meeting

Minutes adopted. Proposer: Helen Goodman (HG). Seconder: ED (Eric Dunstone).

3. Next meeting scheduled for 14 March

4. Matters arising

a. Malt Shovel

ACV application accepted. Decision expected by 30.1.23.

b. Village Emergency Plan

David Nelson (DN) gave a detailed presentation. Slides attached in Appendix 1. Caroline O'Neill (CO) mentioned fire risk and offered to be involved. Jane Dexter-Smith (JDS) asked whether the Neighbourhood Watch scheme is still in place. ED confirmed it is.

DN requested people interested to be involved, including taking part a kick off meeting with Tim Townsend (Senior Resilience and Emergencies Officer NYCC) BC] on 17 February, to get in touch.

c. Extension of Millennium Path as far as Ampleforth

SS recapped that the key is to reach Ampleforth College where existing pathways can be accessed to reach Ampleforth Village. SS advised that a meeting had been held with Ampleforth

Abbey (Andy Slingsby) & Moors National Park (Gez Marshall and Ben Jackson) and that this was productive to map out potential routes and to receive confirmation that in concept the Abbey would allow a permissive access over their land. However, it is not possible to walk between Oswaldkirk and Ampleforth College by using the Abbey's land only – 4 potential routes were discussed which would require conversations and agreement from different landowners. A conversation between SS and a landowner has taken place which will rule out one of the routes so 3 remain open for further discussion. Discussions are ongoing and will report back further at the next meeting.

d. Road safety improvements at the corner of Oswaldkirk Bank

SS recapped that various proposals were put forth at the last meeting which have been put to NYCC Highways and their responses for all proposals, other than the new pavement alongside Ledbrooke House, are included in Appendix 1. Highways feedback sets out issues with each proposal and thus not expected to be viable.

In relation to a new pavement alongside Ledbrooke House, this is in concept feasible, but in practice there is no budget to do the work which Highways say would likely cost 'thousands'. Their initial feedback is that it would not meet the criteria to be funded through the County's Accessibility Fund. SS has requested that they cost this work so that further consideration of how this could be funded could be assessed. Highways will need to send out an engineer to undertake a further assessment of a possible new path.

In relation to Appendix 2:

- It was confirmed that a Community Speed Watch Group had not been set up. When this was last discussed it was suggested a conversation with Hovingham Parish would be useful to understand the process and what the required thresholds were to instigate action, for example, installation of chicanes. It was agreed that speeding issues are prevalent on exiting the village towards Gilling and this is a separate issue to road safety crossing from Main Street to The Terrace. SS agreed to reach out to Hovingham Parish and report back at the next meeting.
- Ambrose Gruenfeld (AG) asked what the Highways' feedback was on reducing the speed limit below 30mph. SS acknowledged that does not look to have been addressed specifically and will follow up.
- Highways flagged that an additional warning sign on the bank, as you approach the junction, should now have been installed. No such warning sign looks to have been installed – SS to follow up on timing.

The agreed yellow lines, discussed at previous meetings are likely to be installed in the Spring.

e. Moseys Certificate of Lawfulness (ref RDC 21/01658/CLEUD)

Still no decision reached. Hovingham have submitted a complaint against RDC to the ombudsman who did not uphold it. Bridget Hannigan (BH) had submitted a formal complaint to

RDC in August 2020 against Mosey lorries breaching their hours of movements restrictions and a request for enforcement action, however as of the time the CLEUD was applied for in September 2021 RDC's investigation was still open. BH noted that Mosey's response to RDC's investigation into this complaint was inconsistent with the information then provided in the CLEUD application, i.e. telling fibs to avoid enforcement action being taken against them and then having a different story to apply for the CLEUD. It was agreed that SS would ask for further information on how RDC are addressing this inconsistency and then BH to consider next steps, i.e. if should pursue a remedy with the ombudsman.

f. Electric cables on The Terrace

The contractors are in direct contact with the resident and it is expected, weather dependant, the final cables will be buried w/c 23 Jan.

g. St. Aidan's Chapel

A letter from the Abbey was distributed. SS gave an update. GS provided background and stated that the decision was made by the Abbot's Council. It appears that the chapel will now be sold.

DN asked if St Aidan's could be registered as an Asset of Community Value. Others questioned the value of doing that. CO raised concerns about the loss of the car park in front of St Aidan's. It was agreed that a further letter would be sent to the Abbey, asking if the car park could be carved out and protected as a separate space.

5. Financial update

MA presented the figures. Three new grants for horticulture and signage obtained.

6. Planning activity

- a. **St Oswalds Orchard. APPLICATION NO: 22/01079/HOUSE.** Erection of garden room following demolition of existing conservatory and rebuilding of the raised terrace with garden storage below. Planning agreed as per the previous meeting. Subsequently Approved.
- b. **St Gregory's Barn. APPLICATION NO: 22/01354/FUL.** Open - Deadline extended to 20th January for the Parish Meeting to comment.

Change of use, alterations and extension to outbuilding to form 1no. three-bedroom dwelling with parking and amenity area.

SS explained that this was the same application that had been granted in 2014, renewed in 2019 which had expired and thus needs to be renewed. Primary issue is car parking. There are two car park spaces included. SS had a conversation with the applicant who provided further clarification, specially i) that there are no significant changes to the plan since the previous approvals (other than certain dimensions added into the drawings and certain details on materials now included, which would otherwise need to have been dealt with via a condition); ii) that it was intended for cars to have space to turn around in the property so that they did not need to reverse into the property from Main Street and iii) that certain changes were planned to allow for space to park, i.e. the existing calor gas tank would be repositioned and the drive level resurfaced so there would be no drop. RW delivered an exhaustive history of his own planning research and stated that he and his wife have privately instructed an architect to challenge the turning circle dimensions in the plans. RW also stated that he was concerned about the new development overlooking his own property. Roger Dexter-Smith (RDS) raised concerns about visibility exiting the driveway, even when driving forwards, and questioned why NYCC approved the plans on this basis. Pauline Henley (PH) made the point that many people in the village who have driveways do not use them, so regardless of the development, cars will still park on Main Street.

SS explained that she can reply with the same comments as previously made for the 2014 and 2019 applications, which included a request to reject the plans, however it would likely not have a different outcome. It was agreed that SS would write to Ryedale Council to strongly state the village's unhappiness at our views not been considered and invite someone from Ryedale Council to explain how they see this plan working in practice. Proposer: David Lis (DL). Secoder: HG.

- c. **Spring Wood. APPLICATION NO: 22/01347/CLEUD.** Open - Deadline extended to 20th January for the Parish Meeting to comment.

Certificate of Lawfulness in respect of the use of a former Shooting Lodge and land adjoining as a single dwellinghouse and garden in excess of four years before the date of this application together with the building works for the erection of a lean-to extension, 3no. sheds and a polytunnel were substantially completed more than four years before the date of this application. This differs from a normal planning application in that it can only be considered on matters of evidence and law, and not on the planning merits of the application, such as the effects of the use in a residential area or highway safety etc.

SS noted that there was an open question she has requested clarification from the Case Officer in relation to whether the timeframe was 4 years (per the description) or 10 years, per the covering letter that she was following up on.

SS noted that the applicant states they have been living in the property since 2014 and asked if anyone had any information or knowledge inconsistent, i.e. that would challenge whether the applicant had in fact been permanently living in the lodge since 2014. No one highlighted any information that was contrary. The meeting expressed mixed views about the situation. One view was simply to acknowledge that the applicant had been living as of 2014 until present and to say no more in the comments back to RDC. The alternative view, whilst acceptance that the applicant had been living there throughout, had more concern about the precedent and process undertaken which needed to be highlighted. For example, to highlight that the applicant never sought planning permission for the lodge initially, that it was hidden from view (during the initial lodge build it was hidden by bales at certain points and known as Bale View Cottage and hedges have since been overgrown) and when retrospective planning was sought on the affirmation that it was non-residential, this was later questioned as to whether it had been true from the outset, i.e. whether the applicant had been living there as of the time it was represented for retrospective planning it was not being lived in.

SS to write to RDC accordingly.

7. Royal celebrations

SS to send out an email inviting help. Anticipate a different external location to the Jubilee celebrations will be required.

8. Defibrillator lighting

It was agreed to install a light so that the Defibrillator can be seen and used in the dark. Proposer: RW. Secnder: HG. MA agreed to find the money (about £300 - £500) from existing funds or by new grant funding. MA would liaise with the Village Hall Trustee's for the installation and future maintenance requirements.

9. AOB

- a. Agreed to invite a speaker on 20's Plenty.

- b. Other Village plans - to be revisited at a future meeting.
- c. ED raised the issue of door-to-door salesman / ex-offenders who have been cold-calling in the village. Currently the Close is a No Cold Calling Zone and it was suggested that this could be extended, so that the whole village is a No Cold Calling Zone. ED asked if we could invite a member of Trading Standards to a future meeting so people could understand what was involved and the process. Agreed that SS would speak to Trading Standards accordingly.
- d. AGM booked in for 3rd May. SS announced that she will step down as Chair, as will Alison Hampshire as Secretary.

DRAFT

Oswaldkirk village emergency plan

Briefing for village meeting,
Wednesday 18 January 2023

Why are we looking at this?

- Existing emergency plan dates from 1988/89, and is out of date – contact numbers, people, etc., all changed....
- New unitary council (NYCC) looking for parishes to produce up to date emergency plans
- Change in the demographics of the village in 35 years.
- Change in balance of emergency risks (climate change risks UP, nuclear war DOWN)
- Change in local authority structure, reporting lines, support offered.

The Oswaldkirk Village Emergency Plan (OVEP): The building stage.....

- Agree area covered: just village, or parish boundaries? Define zones.*
- Build emergency committee with representatives from each zone.
- Review the old plan, the current plan template (from NYCC), and adapt/develop.
- Guidance from Tim Townsend, senior resilience and emergencies officer NYCC. (Meeting: Feb 17 @ Birch House 10.00 am.)
- Establish database that is GDPR-compliant, secure, but accessible in emergencies.
- Build trust between residents and committee members
- Identify available local assets (people, skills, equipment, fuel) and vulnerabilities (people, property). Identify any further assets necessary for various scenarios.
- Liaise with potential providers (e.g. Village Hall, Fairfax Arms, ?Golden Square)

*Parish boundary includes: Golden Square (farm and caravan park), Newton Grange, W. Newton Grange, Hall Farm, Hag Cottage and the Bridge Farm development at Gilling.

OVEP: the active stage

- Define and classify the range of foreseeable “emergency”. (e.g. flood, drought, animal health epidemic, human health epidemic, extreme weather and consequences thereof, civil disorder, breakdown of services*, civil commotion, war)
- Plan appropriate and proportional responses.
- Build a communication network.
 - Understand warning systems from central + local government.
 - Build communication pathways
 - Within the committee and the community (digital/internet and back-up non digital, e.g. “telephone tree”, or “knocker-uppers”)
 - Externally – neighbouring villages, emergency services, council, large entities.
- Record and log this information securely (GDPR compliant, refer to previous slide) in a way it can be accessed immediately.

*e.g. electricity, water, sewerage, waste disposal.

OVEP – putting it in place

- Rehearse, seek feedback, refine, record and update plans.
 - “Paper” rehearsals
 - Drills, including checks on equipment readiness.
 - Keep records up to date
 - “Mock activation”, at least annually. People and situations change.
 - Communicate regularly (?standing agenda item on village meeting?)
-

Finance

- No immediate requirement for finance
 - Little future requirement envisaged
 - Some equipment (e.g. sandbags) available free from NYCC
 - Time requirement from individuals, but lots of kudos and new friends and acquaintances, building a sense of community!
-

Questions?

- Now, or.....
- If you think of any later.....David Nelson 01439 788735, davidjnelson@btinternet.com

Appendix 2: Feedback from Highways re potential solutions to improve pedestrian crossing safety.

Members of the Parish Meeting may not be aware that the County Council carries out annual and in year assessments of collision data to identify specific collision sites and routes which have the poorest collision record in terms of number and severity. Those sites and routes are then subject to detailed analysis to identify any trends from which engineering schemes can be developed and implemented to reduce the potential for future and less severe collisions. Our funding for such improvements is limited and we have to target these resources at sites where we can make the biggest difference based on the evidence of a problem rather than the perception of an issue.

It is the case that this location does not meet the criteria for it to be considered a high risk site or route, therefore it is not a location identified as requiring a road safety intervention.

I will now deal with the various suggestions that members have raised.

- **Reduce Speed Signs** – we do not have any evidence that speeding is an issue on the bend and the bank itself acts as a speed reducing feature. Another fact to consider is that HGV's could slow down and as a result be unable to negotiate the bend and the bank. The traffic speed results for Oswaldkirk Bank do not show a speeding issue. The bank went through the Speed Management Protocol process back in July 2019 and the results were mean speeds of 23/22 mph and 85% speeds of 27/26 mph which show a good compliance of the posted 30 mph limit. The Road Safety Task Group categorise the site as a Cat 4 site (the category of least concern) and suggested that a Community Speed Watch Group be set up. Did this ever take place?
- **Chicanes** - there is not a location where these could be located safely due to the bend and adjacent side roads, also limiting the carriageway width could have a detrimental impact on the road space HGVs require to manoeuvre around the bend. Another thing to consider here is the environmental impact chicanes would have on local residents. There would be an increase in vehicle noise and emissions as they dealt with the chicanes.
- **Zebra Crossing** – there is not a location where zebra crossings could be located safely due to the bend and the adjacent side roads. There are no footpaths on the eastern side of the B1363 where a zebra crossing would lead pedestrian to so a new footpath link would have to be created as well. Before any site is considered a pedestrian survey has to be carried out to monitor the number of pedestrians crossing the road. Looking at the number of properties this crossing would serve the number of pedestrian movements would be too few to justify the installation of a zebra crossing.
- **Traffic mirrors** – I am afraid the area would not comply to the County Council's policy. Traffic mirrors can actually make a junction more dangerous as drivers rely on the image they see in the mirror rather than assessing the junction carefully and looking and listening for oncoming traffic.
- **Writing painted on the road** – all road signs / markings have to comply with the regulations specified by the Dpt for Transport in their Traffic Signs Manual. There are already carriageway edge markings, hazard centre lines and junction road markings. There are also bend and junction warning signs on the approach to the 'crossroads' from both directions. Additional road markings are again not considered and appropriate feature here as the bank reduces vehicle speeds.
- **Making the main road junction a crossroads / installing traffic signals.** – In my role I also cover Scarborough, Whitby and Filey. We recently installed a four way set of traffic signals at a junction in Seamer that had the worst collision record in Scarborough. These traffic signals replaced a mini roundabout that drivers were failing to negotiate safely. The cost of this scheme was in excess of £350,000 and was jointly funded by a housing developer under a Section 106 agreement as their development would increase the number of vehicles using the junction.

Not only is this suggestion not possible financially it is also inappropriate in this location. It is not appropriate to have stationary traffic on the bank. Vehicles would have to negotiate the bend and bank from a standing start. This would be difficult for the larger heavier vehicles. Again the environmental impact of such a scheme would see noise levels increase greatly for local residents and air quality would be reduced as vehicles slow down, stop, start off and change gear as the traffic signals change.

I am sorry that this all seems so negative but the area was recently visited by a highways engineer to check on the current level of signage, to make sure it was correct and in a suitable condition. My colleague did recommend an additional warning sign as you approach the junctions from Oswaldkirk Bank which should have been installed now.

With regards to speeding concerns I would strongly recommend the Parish Meeting investigate the possibilities of setting up a Community Speedwatch Group if they haven't done so yet. More information on how to do this can be obtained from the Traffic Bureau at North Yorkshire Police by emailing them on speedconcerns@northyorkshire.pnn.police.uk

I am sorry that I cannot be more positive but I hope the information I have provided is useful and you can appreciate our responses.

DRAFT