

# MIDDLETON AND SMERRILL PARISH COUNCIL

## *Minutes of the Meeting of Middleton and Smerrill Parish Council held at the Village Hall, Middleton by Youlgrave on Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2017*

Present: Cllr Helen Brocklehurst, Cllr Henry Brocklehurst, Cllr David Mallaband (Chair), Cllr Staire Sutton and Cllr Jamie Wigley

In attendance: Matthew Lovell (Clerk) and 2 members of the Public

### Part 1 Non-confidential items

#### 642 To receive apologies for absence

Cllr Clare Sutton apologised for late arrival at item 648

#### 643 Variation of order of business and time constrained items

It was agreed that no variations were required.

#### 644 Declarations of Members Interests

Cllr Wigley declared a prejudicial interest as a tenant of Greencroft Farm.

#### 645 Public Speaking

Apologies were received from PCSO Anthony Boswell, the PDNPA representative, and County Councillor.

The District Councillor attended but had nothing to report.

A member of the public raised the issue of the deterioration of Bradford Dale and reported on the BRAG meeting he had attended last night in Youlgrave where it was apparent that there are no plans by the owners to do anything as they wish the Dale to revert to its pre-industrialised state. Council noted that it had unilaterally tried to reverse this policy when it became evident three years ago in our parish with no success so would be pleased to be part of a whole Dale effort to preserve our historical past.

#### 646 To confirm the Non-exempt minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED to confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017. The minutes were signed by the Chair.

#### 647 To determine which if any from Part 1 of the Agenda should be taken with the public excluded – none

#### 648 Planning decisions/applications received since last meeting & planning related matters

Decisions received: none

Applications returned/for discussion: NP/DDD/0117/0062 – Greencroft Farm – erection of a single agricultural workers' dwelling

It must be noted that in our opinion, this application is not just for a new dwelling but is effectively for a new farmstead.

Council understands the need of suitable living accommodation for the farm, but has major reservations about the scale and needs of this extremely important project and its eventual consequences for the future of our community.

The operation of a working farm in the heart of the village and general condition of Weadow Lane - cattle slurry, mud and general repair - have been on-going problems

for the village for many years and with the proposed movement of the farm from the centre of the village it gives the opportunity to significantly improve the situation. However, the proposal offers very little to alleviate these long outstanding problems. It is suggested that as a minimum the following areas should be more appropriately considered:-

#### 1. Misleading information

Given that over the last three years there have been significant changes to Middleton Estate properties and activities in the village, it is necessary to see all of this as one situation. Contrary to the comments in the Planning Statement, section 3.2 that 'The retention of an active and viable farm in the village is the main and most obvious economic benefit stemming from the proposal' it is evident that they do not comply with their own statement. To imply that they are supporting agriculture in the community is surprising when they have just closed down one of the largest working farms in the village (Castle Farm ceases operation at the end of March 2017) and we have no indication of what the future holds for this location. Additionally, they have received approval for the conversion of two stone barns into a residential property that were part of the same site that they are now requesting an additional new dwelling for! (Approval was granted in September 2014 and then were discussing a new dwelling only 15 months later on 19th January 2016.)

The fact that there is already an existing farmhouse must not be overlooked. The distance from the existing farmhouse to the proposed new farm is not excessive, such that when approval was given for the new buildings they were additional to existing buildings and the distance from the house was not an issue, also the distance is no greater than on any large agricultural holding, so justification for a new residential accommodation is not that apparent.

#### 2. A fully functioning range of buildings.

The proposed range of buildings provides a covered area of 968 sq. m. The planned stocking density requires a total of 844 sq.m. (See below) This leaves just 124 sq.m. to house machinery, equipment, workshop/tool store, fuel and oil store, bedding material, dry fodder and feedstuff, and this is providing the layout of cattle pens can make this space a practical area. All this is needed to create a sustainable working farm.

Type	Numbers	Weight Kg	Area required per animal sq.m	Total area required sq.m
Cows	80	500	5.85	468
Calves	80	200	3.00	240
Finishers	20	600	6.80	136
Total				844

#### 3. Adequate manure and slurry storage.

There is no apparent infrastructure in place to cater for this. With the prospect of this Parish once again being designated a NVZ status, adequate provision should be planned for regarding storage of up to 4 months so that spreading can take place during approved periods.

#### 4. Ensure the 'building line' is not crossed.

At the time the two existing buildings were approved (July 2013) it was recognised that the buildings were up to the 'building line' and that no further development should take place to the South of this line. With the proposal put forward it is necessary therefore to plan the layout of this new farm such that all future building requirements can be accommodated within this building line.

5. Adequate practices are put in place to keep roads clean. There are clear rules and guidelines regarding keeping highways clean and safe. Any future developments should recognise these needs and adequate measures put in place to prevent cattle slurry and mud being deposited on the highway.

6. Is there sufficient land attached to the proposed dwelling to justify it. Most new agricultural dwellings approved under a Restricted Agricultural Occupancy have far more land 'attached' than is proposed in this application. This needs much more consideration with the possibility of attaching more land to the 106 agreement.

7. A clearer indication regarding the future development of the existing farmhouse and buildings.

Given all of the previous comments and the uncertainty that Castle Farm holds for the future, there must be a clear and uncompromising commitment to the future of this prime central location before any approval of additional dwellings.

Whilst there are advantages to Middleton Estates and the tenants of Greencroft farm, it cannot be said that Middleton Village gains equivalent advantages with the proposals put forward.

Considering the potential impact on the village, no one from Middleton Estates or their agents attended the Parish Council meeting when this development was discussed at length.

If any of this development is to take place then there must be clear advantages to the residents of Middleton village as well as the existing owners:-

More thought to the infrastructure of the proposed farmstead to ensure that there are sufficient facilities to support the level of livestock proposed and minimal impact on the residents and visitors to the village.

Careful and considerate development in that any changes to the existing Greencroft Farm house and buildings created in this major development and their use – private residential, enhances the community and can be looked at in conjunction with our own aspirations for a village owned community building that PDNPA officers are aware of.

A significant improvement to the general state and cleanliness of Weaddow Lane.

This current approach suggests 'change by stealth' in that the overall long term vision is still not apparent and that the Parish should be made very clear what these land owners have planned that can have an impact our village.

With all of the changes in progress, approved, applied for and in the planning stage, they all amount to a significant change to this small village and the residents and visitors deserve due consideration to this fact.

#### 649 Footpaths and Highways and related issues

DCC Footpaths – SBS 884465 – item 4 – Footpath 7 down The Dale – see below

Potholes: the heavy traffic movements have seen all the filled potholes reappear between the Rakes junction and Long Rake with mud and silage splatter filling them to make access hazardous.

DDDC road sweep: still non-existent with blocked drains, gullies and skidding on the Rakes made even more hazardous with the alternative bus route using this road currently.

Clerk to contact the Cabinet member for highways copying in our County Councillor regarding the potholes and road sweep. As DDDC is the subcontractor the clerk will also copy them in.

## 650 Report of the Clerk:

- i. Playground / Village Assets  
An outside tap is needed at the playground to provide a water supply. Clerk to investigate costs of installation.
- ii. Batemans Tomb  
Clerk has sent the spec to two further specialists with no response.
- iii. Website  
A news page has been added which currently shows all the road closures, DCC waste charges and a highlight summary of the last meeting.
- iv. Village Hall Management Committee Report  
Batemans Arms had a small attendance turn out. The loss of the plant stall at Wells weekend will see a major source of income vanish.
- v. Church Roof Repairs  
Repairs are still needed to the roof over the porch and chancel but fund income has slackened off.
- vi. Village Hall update  
The advice and bill for the solicitors has been received. If we are to consider the toilet block area permission from adjoining landowners will be necessary.

## 651 Access into the Dale for Well Dressing

The County Councillor has reported that a PROW officer agrees that works are needed is investigating costs and budgets and will keep chasing to ensure access is available by Wells board time.

## 652 Items for information and DALC (already circulated by email)

DALC Circulars 2-4, Clerks and Councils Direct, DCC recycling charges

## 653 Finance

### (a) Accounts for Payment

Cheque No	Payee	net	vat
Unity dd	3 months service charge	£18.00	
STO	HM Lovell (March salary)	£116.78	
Direct debit	NEST (March)	£8.64	
Unity dir	HM Lovell (4 months expenses)	£11.16	
300095	Taylor & Emmet	£500.00	100.00
300096	The Bugle	£25.00	
Unity dir	DALC	£63.90	
Unity dir	J Aston – 6 months website	£54.75	
STO set up	HM Lovell (monthly salary 17/18)	£117.94	
Direct debit	NEST (monthly)	£8.73	
	Total	£1024.90	

### (b) Income

Nat West interest £0.04

### (c) Budget Appraisal/Risk Assessment

Unity Account £5387.52

after above £4362.62

Nat West account Savings: £5007.98

£5008.02

The draft year end accounts were submitted and any surplus will be added to our village hall funds.

The internal audit will be carried out by Brian Wood following year end.

654 Date of next meeting - 17<sup>th</sup> May 2017 preceded by the Annual Parish Meeting at 8:15pm in the Village Hall. Remaining 2017: 19<sup>th</sup> July, 20<sup>th</sup> September, 15<sup>th</sup> November

PART II – CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION none

There being no further business the meeting closed at 10:05 pm