21/03/2022 To receive Apologies:

Parish Councillors: Kevin Marshall, Gareth Rees

Ward Councillor: Pauline Greenwood

Lockington Parish Council

Confirmed Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting Held on

Monday 21 st March 2022

Councillors present were:

John Rowson (Acting Chair), Andrew How (Acting Clerk), James Warburton, Jeremy Mason, Graham Chapman, Cynthia Hamlin, Mary Munro Hill, Adrian Cookes

Ward Councillor Kevin Beaumont

Visitors;

There was 6 Parishioners present at the meeting.

 03/22/062 The Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 21st February 2022 had been previously circulated to all Parish Councillors for review and subsequent approval. Parish Councillors present at the meeting agreed it was a true and correct record of the meeting and duly approved the minutes with no amendments.

Proposal: Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Parish Council on February 21st 2022 be accepted.

Proposer: Parish Councillor James Warburton

Seconder: Parish Councillor John Rowson

A vote was taken and the resolution was carried unanimously.

Resolved: Meeting minutes approved.

The Chairman then signed the minutes as a true and proper record on behalf of the Parish Council.

Name…………………………………Signature………………………………………………………….Date………………………

03/22/063  To receive any ‘Declaration of Interest’ as detailed in the Governance documents itemised below:

To record any Declarations of Interest and the nature of the interest (Pecuniary or Non-Pecuniary), by any member of the Parish Council in respect to the agenda items listed below.

The Declaration of Interest should be made at the commencement of the meeting.

There were none recorded

03/22/064 To review and resolve any East Riding of Yorkshire (ERYC) Council Business:

Ward Councillor Kevin Beaumont raised his concern over the completion of works of the trod. He would follow this up but also suggested that it be pursued at the Street Scene Walkabout on April 22nd as, although strictly outside the village boundary, responsibility lay with the same official. He also agreed to follow up on the signs for the Passing places and the white lines on the road.

There followed discussion on responsibility to ensure the Hunt does not destroy the trod by inappropriate parking. It was agreed that this was not an ERYC responsibility but a matter for the police if the path was being destroyed or obstructed by in appropriate behaviour.

The Chairman requested that the issue of whether the ERYC would empty new “Litter bins” in the event that the LPC purchased more directly be followed up as no response had been received to date. KB agreed to do this.

Councillor Beaumont left the meeting at this point

Action: Clerk to place on the April Agenda to allow review of progress.

The Chairman then raised the following item in view of the Number of Parishioners in attendance 67.1- 22/00724/PLF Northfield House 84A Front Street Lockington. Construction of Vehicular Access.

The Chairman informed the meeting that whilst he was aware of potential disputes between neighbours that might influence Councillors approach. However this was not the concern of the meeting , there will be new owners and new tenants of the properties concerned in the future and that the proposal must be considered only on the relevant planning issues, particularly the impact on the Street scene in the light of the village designation within a Conservation Area.

The discussion took place around the following issues:

* Whether the removal of 4 metres of the original front wall to allow for a new gate as proposed should be approved. A previous proposal had been turned down by ERYC. The Conservation Area appraisal of 2009 gave importance to the maintenance of the wall for the village street scene, and this had been upheld in the approval for the planning approval for the property and insistence on the shared drive in the original approval and subsequent proposal. The LPC should be insisting on the ERYC upholding these principles in the light of the Village designation as a Conservation area as to do otherwise was to undermine the purpose of the designation. The LPC is constantly urging the ERYC to stand by the principles involved and for the LPC to now recommend they be waived in this instance would provide a poor precedent that could be used by ERYC or interested parties to justify further detrimental requests to the street scene in the future.
* Further points raised including that parking on the road was already in short supply and that the purchasers of the property were aware of the conditions of access when they purchased the property were not considered critical to the decision now required.
* The contrary argument revolved around the unsatisfactory situation of the shared drive approved in the original application. This would remain an issue for present and future owners and tenants of the properties concerned and the proposal was a reasonable attempt to resolve the issue once and for all. While the loss of a portion of the front wall was regretted, the proposed gate would be in keeping with the existing street scene.
* There was further discussion on the proposed wall to be erected as a physical barrier between the properties including whether it was too high and could affect light to number 84. It was concluded that if approved these factors and the materials used were sympathetic to the overall scene and could be amended to comply with existing regulations

Two Parishioners spoke to the subject.

Action:

The motion was put to the meeting that the Application be rejected. Proposed Mary Munro Hill. Seconded by Adrian Cookes

The motion was carried by Four votes for, three against, one abstention.

The Clerk to inform the ERYC to this effect

Deadline 31st March 2022

65.1 Noted. No action

65.2 More information required. Discussion deferred. No action required

65.3 After discussion TPO to be applied for. Proposed by JW, seconded by GC.

Action: Clerk to write to ERYC. Requesting TPO.

65.4 Dog bins supplied by ERYC would cost £400 each. Could be bought directly much cheaper. As raised earlier response required form ERYC on whether they would empty them or the £400 includes in effect the cost of emptying in perpetuity. Discussion held as to where they might be put but no decision required. James W produced a number of “dog waste” notices and these were to be distributed to agreed positions.

Action: To be raised during April 22nd walkabout

65.5 Noted

03/22/66 Correspondence Clerk

66.1

66.2

66.3

66.4

66.5

66.6

66.7

66.8

Above items noted: No further action required.

03/22/067

To review & submit observations to the following Planning Applications/ Approvals

67.1- 22/00724/PLF See above

Planning Consultation for 22/00922/TCA The Poplars 51A Church Lane Lockington

There was a further application not included in the minutes for the felling of two ash trees in the above property.

JR and ARH had visited the property that afternoon. There observation was that the southern tree had lost a large part in gales last year and had not been appropriately pruned. It appeared to be suffering from disease. The larger tree nearer the house however looked to be in good health but could be made safer by a lightening up the main trunks with the judicial removal of some branches which would also conserve its shape. Although two tree surgeons had said that Ash Die back was present, No specialist advice had been received by the householder on whether the trees were suffering from Ash Die back or to what extent. It was proposed by ARH, seconded by JW that the Clerk write to ERYC requesting:

Action:

* That a decision be deferred until the trees are in leaf and the full extent of possible disease be established by a specialist from ERYC
* That if the southern tree is affected than the LPC would NOT object to its felling
* That the northernmost tree NOT be felled unless sufficient disease confirmed, but permission granted to remove some of the larger branches extending from the main trunks to both lighten the load on them, improve the shape and reduce the risk of any branches falling in high winds.

Response to be submitted by April 6th

This was carried unanimously

03/22/068 Finances – Clerk

68.1 Stationary Approved

AOB: The condition of the fence on the plot in Thorpe was raised.

 ACTION: it was agreed that The Clerk write to the estate asking for clarification as to their intentions as to development or rehedging of the entrance way.

The meeting closed at 2015

03/22/070 Dates for Next ordinary meeting

 Monday April 25th 2022 @ 7 pm