

permanent, and not temporary as was being claimed in the application. The meeting was reminded that the PCU had a shelf life of 70 years, and was guaranteed for 25 years. The land on which the PCU was to be situated was presently green belt, but would risk losing this green belt status if this use were approved.

The question of pupil numbers was now addressed. The Parish Council had been assured that whereas the PCU could accommodate 30 children, the school only intended to make use of half its capacity; the school had an excellent reputation, which accounted for children attending from as far away as Acomb and York; the objectors felt that were the extra costly accommodation to be made available it would quickly be used to capacity even if only to justify its cost, and numbers would continue to increase; far better to limit the intake of children.

The public were keen to put questions to the 3 school governors present, but they insisted they were in attendance at the meeting in their capacity as parents or residents only. Inasmuch as they had all three demonstrated that they were in favour of the PCU, they were then asked why, as residents and parents, they were supporting development within the green belt and bringing more traffic into the village. Their answer was more space for their children, which again caused uproar and cries of "conflict!" and "self-interest!" In particular, it was felt that the governors had mis-managed the question of pupil numbers very badly. One member of the public advised the meeting that she had attended the school's open evening, where she had specifically asked the North Yorkshire County Council representative in attendance whether the school would fill the new classroom – 30 extra places, taking the pupil numbers up to 102. The representative had confirmed that they would, over the coming year or two. The three school governors were then specifically asked why they were supporting this application, given that the extra space they had mentioned earlier would be effectively diminished within two years of its acquisition. All refused to answer.

Finally, with regard to this part of the meeting, it should be noted that whilst the reportage is representative of the opinions expressed, it has not been possible to record every single objection in detail.

Matters Arising from the Minutes

Traffic calming – Cllr. Ms Barrowman was now in attendance, and protested the decision taken by the other five Council members to return the £5000 contribution made by the school towards the cost of the speed platform, insisting that she should have been consulted. The Chairman explained at considerable length that although the speed platform had been agreed in principle by the Parish Council, it was now clearly referenced in correspondence received from school governors Glyn Goddard and Karl Shields such that this application and the one for the prefabricated classroom unit were now viewed by the public as quite definitely linked. The Parish Council had objected strongly to the proposal for the PCU, and the feeling was that it should suspend further involvement in the installation of the speed platform pending a planning decision. It was for this reason that the £5000 had been returned, and because of the perceived connection between the two applications Cllr. Ms Barrowman had been excluded from this decision, as is proper when an interest has been declared. The Chairman reminded the meeting that the statutory consultation letters with regard to the platform had not yet been sent.

Finance

The Treasurer presented the financial report as follows:-

High Interest Account	28783.37
Current Account	3137.72

Payments had been made as follows:-

H. Readman	93.48
DCG Tree Surgery	110.00