

Constable Burton and Finghall Parish Council

The extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 27th August 2025 at 7.00pm in The Reading Room, Constable Burton.

Present: Cllrs Smith, Dalton, Hale & Gelder, 29 residents

1. Welcome by the Chairman
2. Apologies and reasons for absence. Cllr Allinson (applicant of the planning application to be discussed)
3. To receive any declarations of interest. None
4. Planning Applications
 - Application to determine if prior approval is required for proposed conversion of existing barn to create 5 no. individual dwellings at Southwick Farm, Hargill Lane, Finghall. Cllr Smith asked residents to air their concerns. Many residents spoke: Should financial gain of some be to the detriment and disregard of their neighbours? The height of Glebe House, photos are passed to Cllrs, and residents felt that this was higher than agreed and was a retrospective planning application also. The location plan within this planning application has some dwellings missed off and the proposal will block accesses. A lack of privacy for neighbouring dwellings and gardens due to the first-floor balconies, another resident felt these were intrusive. Current problems with this holiday let and anti-social behaviour. The aesthetics of the proposal is not in keeping with the village and next to the conservation area. Concerns about increase of traffic and the impact on the nearby new development. The resident welcomes a visit from Cllrs to observe the potential impact first hand. Residents feel there is a lack of transparency with the planning process, and that the Planning Officer has only been out to put the notice up, and there is lack of time for the consultation. Residents state that there are many inaccuracies with the planning application: boundary incorrect and some land is owned by another, traffic/transport assessment is incorrect, the images of the area were taken prior to recent building of Juniper & Maple House and these aren't included within the application plan. Concerns about traffic on the track/bridleway, this is deteriorating rapidly and the public bridleway isn't suitable for either the building or access traffic, with no room to pass other vehicles. This is an unadopted road and the resident predicts that the traffic use will increase by 3600%, the noise and the vehicle lights are a worry for local residents. Maybe other solutions for the access could be sought. There is no amenity space and so unsuitable for young families, where will refuse and recycling bins be stored, limited parking spaces and concerns about where visitors will park. Lack of sewage capacity within the village and the amount of other planning applications, residents felt that the planning department need to bear in mind the other planning applications in Finghall. A resident reads a quote from a 2022 planning application in Finghall, the applicant objected to this proposal due to the problems with the Hargill/Blewhouse Lane and the track. This application was refused due to potential traffic issues. Residents feel that this application will be used for holiday lets, further anxiety about more anti-social behaviour and noise. Detailed discussion from residents about the planning system and lack of support from North Yorkshire Cllr Jones. Specifically, residents hadn't noticed the planning notice, as this was placed in a poor location. Clerk had chased this and planners responded that the notice had been placed on 13th August on Hargill/Blewhouse Lane. Cllr Gelder spoke with the planner about the poor location of the placement of the decision notice. Other issues were that neighbouring properties hadn't received the consultation letter; Cllr Smith asks how many people had received the consultation letter, only one household attending the meeting had. The lack of "joined up" thinking about all the applications in Finghall, why do planners not consider current live proposals in relation to new proposals? Generally, it was noted that residents felt little confidence in the planning system. Questions raised about Class Q applications, and changing agricultural buildings to residential. Cllrs resolved to formally complain about the planning process in relation to this application, and to request a site visit from the Planning Department, Highways and North Yorkshire Cllr Jones. Cllr Dalton suggests that residents should write to the planning department with their individual concerns. Concerns about the applicant being a Parish Councillor and this gives a lack of confidence in the Parish Council, and residents felt they couldn't discuss this with Cllr Allinson – all Cllrs state that they are available and would be happy to discuss any issues with residents. Query about when the next parish council election is:– May 2027. Resident thanks Cllr Gelder for attending site meetings and for arranging the PC meeting. Residents discuss further actions and may forward information to local press and/or protests. Cllr Hale speaks about the current political and planning policies and suggests

residents write to their MP, and that a precedent shouldn't be set with this application. Cllr Gelder felt that the current application needs the mistakes rectifying, also that she had recently resolved problems within Constable Burton in relation to the Broadband supply, and had sent MP an email, this issue is now resolved.

Cllrs discussed all the residents' concerns raised at this meeting and resolved to send the following response: Following our meeting on 27th August, councillors do not support this application; and feel this proposal shouldn't be granted using The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q which allows the change of agricultural buildings to dwelling houses. Councillors felt strongly that this proposal should be re submitted as a full planning application with the following concerns:

- Mistakes relating to this planning application. There are some buildings which have been missed off the plan (Juniper House, Maple House, Sundays Well & Finghall Manor). Residents have noted that some right of way accesses may be blocked should this application be granted. Additionally, the application boundary is incorrect, some of the land highlighted is not owned by the applicant. Residents report the Transport/Traffic assessment is inaccurate and misleading (further comments below).
- Access, Highways & Safety. Councillors felt this was a major concern, not only is the proposal accessed from Hargill Lane/Blewhouse Lane, which is a single lane road with lack of passing places and pavements with high hedges and limited visibility. Furthermore, the access lane from Hargill/Blewhouse Lane is a deteriorating, unadopted, single track with no room for vehicles to pass. Questions were raised about where visitors could park. This track is also a public bridleway, and councillors highlight that the safety of all road users, and especially pedestrians, would be adversely affected by this proposal, both on the track to the proposal and the public highway of Hargill/Blewhouse Lane.
- Lack of privacy and noise concerns. The first-floor balconies are a worry for residents who abut the proposal, both the internal dwellings and gardens would be overlooked. The balconies are shown to be the only external amenity space for this application and so councillors wanted to bring to your attention the possibility of noise disturbances. In addition, residents brought concerns about the large holiday let at Glebe House, adjacent to the proposal, and the associated anti-social behaviour; councillors would like to ensure that this development will be for residential use only should it be granted.
- Overdevelopment in a small, rural village. Finghall has limited infrastructure and as such concerns were raised about the present system coping with this additional proposal. The sewage system was observed as an area which could cause issues, in addition, Finghall has a very limited public transport service and no play parks.
- Aesthetics and Conservation Area. The proposal is almost completely surrounded by the Conservation area, please see map included within the Conservation Plan (attached). The modern, intrusive design of the building is unsympathetic to the historic architecture of Finghall (highlighted in the Conservation Area Plan) and should this design be granted there will likely be negative ramifications for both the built environment and community cohesion.
- Planning process. Councillors and residents feel the proper planning process has not been observed. The notice was in a poor location and so residents felt that they had limited time for consultation. At the Parish Council meeting 29 members of public attended, only 1 household had received a consultation letter, many neighbouring properties had not been formally consulted. Residents were unhappy that planners were not returning calls or emails, and would like to see more "joined up" thinking in relation to all the planning proposals in Finghall.

Please could we request a site meeting relating to this proposal, this would allow residents and councillors to inform the planners, Highways and North Yorkshire Cllr Jones about the actual site location and the potential impact of this proposed development.

5. To consider the following new correspondence received and decide action where necessary:

- North Yorkshire Council – Community Governance Review Team, proposed naming of civil parishes. Cllr Dalton felt that naming East & West Hauxwell, Barden & Garriston would not be the ideal, as Barden and Garriston, although near geographically, are distant via the road network. It was resolved to request the naming of this civil parish to be "Barden, Garriston & Hauxwell".

Meeting closed: 20.32