



## Grindleton Parish Council

Clerk: Andrew Glover  
 24 Hillside Drive  
 West Bradford  
 Clitheroe  
 BB7 4TG

Tel: 01200 428547  
 Mobile: 07968 486729  
 Email: andy.glover24@hotmail.co.uk

**Minutes of the meeting of Grindleton Parish Council held at 7pm on Tuesday 7 March 2023 at the Pavilion, Grindleton.**

Members present:	Parish Cllr K Hutton (Chair) Parish Cllr L Halley (Vice Chair) Parish Cllr Tony Bramwell Parish Cllr Alan Fielding Parish Cllr Peter Raywood Parish Cllr Glenn Wheeler Borough Cllr K Horkin MBE (RVBC) County Cllr Sue Hind (for minute item 16) County Cllr Ged Mirfin (for minute item 12)
Apologies for absence:	Parish Cllr Steve Dobson
Clerk present:	Andrew Glover
Members of the public present:	Eileen Flatley (for minute item 16) Martin Flatley (for minute item 16)

1.	<b>Welcome</b>  The Chair welcomed all present to the meeting.	
2.	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>  <b>a) Standing orders suspended</b>  None  <b>b) Standing orders resumed</b>	
3.	<b>Public Participation</b>  See item 16	

<p>4.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>a)</p> <p>i)</p> <p>ii)</p>	<p><b>Minutes / matters arising</b></p> <p><u>Minutes of the meeting held on 3 January 2023</u></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 3 January 2023 were signed by the Chair as a true and accurate record.</p> <p>Proposed by: Cllr Bramwell Seconded by: Cllr Raywood</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>The Chair was authorised to sign off the minutes of the meetings held on 3 January, and it was agreed that the minutes of this meeting would be posted on the Parish Council website</b></p> <p><u>Matters arising (not covered elsewhere on the agenda):</u></p> <hr/> <p><u>Xmas tree</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley confirmed that an order for two extra strings of lights, a supporting ring and an extra splitter had now been placed with Nick Milward.</p> <hr/> <p>Cllr Fielding confirmed that he had received £20 in recompense for the money paid to Dianne via Graham for the cost of electricity to power the Xmas tree lights.</p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p> <p>c)</p>	<p><b>Overview of financial position</b></p> <p><u>Monthly accounts – December 2022</u></p> <p>The Clerk submitted details of income and expenditure for the month of December 2022 for approval by the Parish Council and signing-off by the Chair.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>That the record for December 2022 as presented would be signed off</b></p> <p><u>Monthly accounts – January 2023</u></p> <p>The Clerk submitted details of income and expenditure for the month of January 2023 for approval by the Parish Council and signing-off by the Chair.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>That the record for January 2023 as presented would be signed off</b></p> <p><u>Monthly records – February 2023</u></p> <p>The Clerk submitted details of income and expenditure for the month of February 2023 for approval by the Parish Council and signing-off by the Chair.</p>	

	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>That the record for February 2023 as presented would be signed off</b></p> <p>d) <u>Clerk's salary</u></p> <p>Members were asked to note that – in line with his contract of employment – the Clerk's salary would rise by one increment from 1 April 2023. It had been agreed at the January meeting that the Clerk's salary would commence at SCP 18 on the NALC scale (£14.17 per hour); this would rise accordingly to £14.44 at SCP 19, an hourly increase of 27p.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed to endorse the proposed rise to SCP 19 from 1 April 2023</b></p> <p>e) <u>Financial Services Compensation Scheme Eligibility</u></p> <p>The Parish Council had been asked by the United Trust Bank to confirm that it remained a “small local authority” (with turnover of less than £500,000) in order to preserve its eligibility for the above scheme.</p> <p>With the agreement of the Vice Chair, this confirmation had been given on 16 January 2023.</p> <p><b>Members noted and endorsed the above</b></p> <p>f) <u>Pensions Regulator</u></p> <p>The Parish Council remained under an obligation to (i) put certain staff into a workplace pension scheme, (ii) to contribute to that pension and (iii) submit a redeclaration of compliance. However, it was not obligatory for a member of staff to be entered into a pension scheme if that staff member earned less than £10,000pa, as was the case with the Clerk, who in addition confirmed that he did not wish to receive a pension from his employer.</p> <p>Irrespective of the Clerk's position, the Council was still obliged to complete and submit a re-declaration of compliance prior to 10 July 2023 (even if it only confirmed that no pension was required).</p> <p>It was understood that this process could be completed over the telephone if the employer's PAYE reference were quoted. However, in doing so the Clerk must be acting with the clear authority of the Parish Council.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members noted the Clerks' desire not to receive a workplace pension and that his income was less than £10k pa</b>  <b>Members authorised the Clerk to contact the Pensions Regulator and complete a re-declaration of compliance confirming the above</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p>
--	---	--------------

g)	<p><u>Backpay for employees who have left employment since 1 April 2022</u></p> <p>At the November meeting, members had agreed to pay to the outgoing Clerk back pay in line with the 2022/23 national pay award. However, the outgoing Clerk had since clearly indicated that he did not wish to take advantage of this payment.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members wished to respect the outgoing Clerk's view, and agreed that no further action should be taken</b></p>	
6.	<p><b>Clerks' Handover</b></p> <p>Since the January meeting, the Clerk had progressed a number of issues relating to his role. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• updating the mandate for the United Trust account (with the Chair, Vice Chair and Clerk now listed as signatories); and</li> <li>• successfully arranging for him to have View Only access to the online Lloyds bank account.</li> </ul> <p>However, further work to complete the handover of records stored on Government Gateway was still required.</p> <p><b>Members noted the above</b></p>	
7.	<p><b>Registering with the Office of the Information Commissioner (ICO) as a Data Controller</b></p> <p>Having perused documents posted on the ICO website, the Clerk advised that it may be necessary for the Parish Council to register with the ICO as a data controller. This would require payment of an annual fee (likely to be £40), as well as the adoption and publication of a Model Publication Scheme (which identifies the specific information the ICO expects to be published under each of seven classes of information). The Parish Council currently displayed a Model Publication Scheme on its website, but this document had not been reviewed since 2008.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members authorised the Clerk to approach the ICO and (i) ensure the Parish Council is registered with the ICO and (ii) check the level of / pay the relevant data protection fee if required</b>  <b>Members to authorise the Clerk to revisit the Model Publication Scheme if required, for potential adoption at the AGM</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
8.	<p><b>Preparation for Parish Council's AGM in May 2023</b></p> <p>a) <u>Proposed format of meeting</u></p> <p>For members' consideration, the Clerk put forward a detailed format for the forthcoming AGM. He suggested that the AGM would be held as a separate</p>	

meeting immediately prior to the routine meeting scheduled for May 2023. The AGM would consist of the following agenda items:

- election of Chair and Vice for following 12 months
- Chair to sign declaration of office
- Chair's annual report / general comments
- Review of representation on or work with committees / external bodies, and arrangements for reporting back
- Approval of:
  - Standing Orders / Financial Regs (*currently in hard copy only, not reviewed since March 2021*)
  - Statement of Financial Controls (*currently in hard copy only, not reviewed since March 2021*)
  - Code of Conduct (*currently members have agreed to follow RVBC code of conduct, but an individual document for annual adoption in the name of GPC could be drafted by the Clerk*)
  - Review of asset register (*drafted but in need of further member input*)
  - Data Retention Policy / privacy notice – residents / privacy notice – staff and councillors (*to be drafted*)
  - Model Publication Scheme (*see minute item 7 above*)
  - Draft budget proposed for 2023/24 (*to be drafted*)
- Insurance cover 2023/24
- Determining the time and place of ordinary meetings of the Parish Council over the forthcoming municipal year

**Resolved**

**Members agreed to adopt the format for the AGM as set out above**

**Members agreed to continue to adhere to the Code of Conduct as drafted by RVBC rather than adopt their own version**

b) Requirement to move date of the AGM / May meeting

Currently, the May meeting of the Parish Council was due to be held on 2 May. Cllr Halley had pointed out that this date was immediately prior to the Parish Council elections on 4 May, as well as preceding the counting day for elections (9 May).

The Clerk advised that it would be preferable to hold the AGM after the conclusion of the election process, a view which members supported.

**Resolved**

**Members asked the Clerk to move the date of the next meeting / AGM from 2 May to 23 May 2023**

Clerk

c) Casual vacancy arising where Parish Council is quorate after an election

At the January meeting, members had queried (in general terms) what would happen in the event of a parish councillor standing down at the forthcoming elections in May 2023. The Clerk had researched the issue and was able to give detailed advice on the procedure to be followed should such an eventuality arise.

9.	<p><b>Member training</b></p> <p>Members had attended a number of recent raining events and the following updates were given:</p> <p>a) <u>New Councillors and Clerks – a whistle stop tour of powers and responsibilities</u></p> <p><u>Cllrs Bramwell, Dobson and Wheeler</u> had attended this session by Zoom on 17 January 2023. The training had been found to be beneficial, with an engaging speaker who had provided useful information. Over 20 other delegates had attended, including at least one clerk and some experienced councillors.</p> <p>b) <u>Get parish councils prepared for the local elections in May</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley had attended this session on 1 February 2023, also via Zoom. She too had found it useful, and – after she had outlined the main elements covered on the course – members took a number of procedural decisions as set out below.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Cllr Halley offered to circulate the course notes by email</b>  <b>All members would complete their nomination packs and return them to the Clerk, who would deliver them collectively to RVBC prior to the deadline of 4 April</b>  <b>Whilst an advisory email from RVBC was still anticipated, this was unlikely to appear before 13 March. The Clerk was to circulate this on receipt</b>  <b>A formal notice was to be displayed on the village notice board (Chair to laminate and display), parish council website (Clerk to arrange) and also be published in social media (Chair or Vice Chair to arrange)</b></p>	<p>LH</p> <p>All</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>KH / Clerk</p>
10.	<p><b>Improving Parish Council effectiveness</b></p> <p>a) <u>Shared document storage</u></p> <p>Given members’ ongoing concerns about the ease of using Dropbox, it had been agreed at the January meeting that Cllr Wheeler would seek to identify an appropriate alternative solution. Cllr Wheeler reported that he was intending to trial a Google Cloud account, which would potentially serve the Parish Council’s purposes. (The system had a limit of 6 users but this could be expanded manually). However, in order to complete the trial he needed all members to confirm that they were happy for their email addresses to be used in this way.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>All members and the Clerk indicated that they were willing for their email addresses to be used</b></p> <p>It was agreed that the document on footpaths compiled by Cllr Bramwell would be used as part of the trial. Hopefully, the trial could then be completed within around a week.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Cllr Bramwell to re-send the document to Cllr Wheeler</b></p>	<p>All</p> <p>TB</p>

<p>b)</p> <p>c)</p> <p>d)</p>	<p><u>Email correspondence</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley pointed out that – when emails are circulated amongst members for the purposes of inter-meeting discussion – some responses are only sent to the sender (as opposed to all recipients). In order to ensure that any consensus is identified, it would be helpful if all members could respond using the “reply to all” button. This was of particular importance on Planning matters, when members needed to give a united stance before any consultation submission was sent to RVBC.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members noted the above</b>  <b>Clerk to place a header on future emails on Planning matters inviting members to “reply to all”</b></p> <p><u>List of ongoing member activities</u></p> <p>Members noted the updated version of the list capturing all ongoing member activities as presented by the Clerk.</p> <p><u>Lengthsman</u></p> <p>At the January meeting, it had been agreed that the Clerk would contact the Lengthsman and politely remind him that he was expected to submit completed timesheets when making a claim for payment. This has been done (although no further requests for payment had since been made). However, it was likely that a claim would be submitted imminently, and members reiterated their view that a timesheet was required.</p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>11.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><b>Planning applications to be considered</b></p> <p><u>Planning Application No: 3/2022/1181</u></p> <p>Proposal: Proposed demolition of a single storey rear lean-to extension, front porch and outbuilding. Construction of a two-storey side extension and associated external works.  Location: Cherry Hall, Main Street, Grindleton BB7 4QT</p> <p>The Clerk had sought and collated members’ views prior to submitting a written consultation response to RVBC on 26 January 2023. A copy of the final version of the response submitted had been provided for members’ perusal. Members confirmed that they were happy with the format and content of the submission.</p> <p>It was understood that determination of this application may have been delayed due to RVBC’s delay in displaying the required public notice; this should have been displayed by 7 January but had not been displayed until 27 January.</p>	

b)	<p><u>Planning Application No: 3/2023/0033</u></p> <p>Proposal: Proposed single storey garden room extension to rear. Location: Low Barn, Barret Hill Brow, Lane Ends, Bolton By Bowland BB7 4PH</p> <p>Details of this application had been circulated to members, but no adverse comments were received and therefore no consultation response had been submitted.</p>	
12. a)	<p><b>Haweswater Aqueduct Resilience Programme (HARP)</b></p> <p><u>Update from County Cllr Mirfin and Cllr Horkin</u></p> <p>Cllrs Mirfin and Horkin attended the meeting and updated members on a number of fast-moving developments which had occurred in the days immediately prior to the Parish Council meeting. Parish Councillors were already aware that United Utilities (UU) had recently submitted to RVBC a number of revised documents relating to HARP. Many of the detailed proposals they contained related to road improvements required in Waddington (specifically at the junction of West Bradford Rd and Slaidburn Rd at the Higher Buck) and as such they fell outside the remit of Grindleton Parish Council. However, the main document of relevance to members of Grindleton Parish Council was the draft Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), discussed in detail in minute item 12b below. At a special meeting of the Planning and Development Committee to be held on 9 March, the Borough Council was due to determine whether to grant outline planning permission to UU for the HARP application; this would include the CTMP which – if adopted - would have significant repercussions for the residents of Grindleton.</p> <p>However, LCC had subsequently submitted a letter to RVBC. The letter – sent in LCC’s capacity as Local Highways Authority - was critical of the draft CTMP and strongly recommended that further work was required to it before approval could be granted.</p> <p>As a result of LCC’s comments, the borough’s MP (Nigel Evans) had opted to exercise his statutory powers and “call in” the planning application, on the grounds that insufficient weight had been given to preserving the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, within which Grindleton fell. Under this revised process, the application would be determined by a Planning Inspector appointed on behalf of the Secretary of State (Michael Gove), and would involve a further local consultation exercise (to which Grindleton Parish Council could contribute).</p> <p>Despite the MP’s intervention, the special meeting was still due to proceed on 9 March, and it was strongly suggested that the Parish Council should continue with its previously stated intention to attend and address the meeting.</p> <p>Members thanked the councillors for their very helpful update, following which the following decisions were made.</p> <p>(cont)</p>	



**Resolved**

**Members unanimously agreed that the Chair should attend the special meeting of the Planning and Development Committee on 9 March, and advise members of the Committee of the Parish Council's concerns at the draft CTMP**

**Clerk to advise RVBC of the Chair's continued intention to attend and address the Planning and Development Committee**

**Clerk to draft a statement which the Chair would use in addressing the Committee**

Clerk

Clerk

b) United Utilities (UU) – latest proposals made available by RVBC

In light of the above discussion, members agreed to continue to identify their specific concerns with the mitigation proposed by UU and set out in the draft CTMP. It was agreed that the Clerk would then submit these in writing to RVBC prior to the special meeting on 9 March.

<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	<b>Member comment</b>
The use of time restrictions when heavy vehicles would not travel, thereby avoiding the "school run ", as well as restrictions on the number of convoys per day / week	Members welcomed the proposed introduction of time restrictions due to the severe congestion around Grindleton Bridge at school drop-off and collection times. However, they would wish to see robust enforcement in place to ensure that these are adhered to, and also seek reassurance that – during periods of school holidays – the restrictions would stay in place to ensure ease of traffic flow for commuters.
The use of rolling roadblocks (section 4.1) at key locations such as Grindleton Bridge	Members fully understood the difficulties that lorries will face when seeking to turn left from East View onto Grindleton Rd and head towards West Bradford; this is a tight junction which, even after the proposed road modifications are carried out, will pose problems for the larger vehicles. However, members feared that the use of rolling roadblocks in this vicinity would cause severe traffic congestion. Assuming that each phase of the roadblock will take around 10 minutes, then the potential traffic build-up in this time would be considerable and may well extend a significant distance in all directions, including up Grindleton Brow towards the village.  Members did not believe that the likely impact of rolling roadblocks had been fully investigated by UU, and would seek further reassurance that all steps to mitigate disruption here have been taken.

<p>Access to PROWS should not be restricted (section 5.3)</p>	<p>Members were keen to see access to all PROWs preserved, but wondered if the claim in the CTMP was a little disingenuous. For instance, there is a popular concessionary footpath linking the PROWs numbered FP0300115 and FP0300114. Access to this route currently required walkers to walk in the road for some distance along Ribble Lane (there being no footpath), as well as having to cross Ribble Lane to pass from one PROW to another. This was a road down which heavy traffic would pass, and at such times access to the footpath would indeed be impacted, especially if a rolling roadblock were to be in operation. At the very least, walkers would be required to exercise extreme care when joining either of these PROWs and it was not apparent that these concerns had been adequately recognised in the CTMP.</p> <p>There were other sections of the proposed temporary route where pedestrians would be directly put at risk. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the lack of footpath where residents seek to access East View from Grindleton Brow, directly crossing the difficult junction at Ribble Lane / Grindleton Rd; and</li> <li>• pedestrians walking from Green Lane to Grindleton Bridge (past the East View / Grindleton Rd junction) would be obliged to walk along Grindleton Road, where again there was no footpath to offer protection from oncoming vehicles.</li> </ul>
---	--

In addition, members identified a number of other concerns arising from the draft CTMP:

<b>Concern</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>Section 6.4 states that a precondition survey will be carried out (presumably to act as a baseline for vehicular impact), in 3 identified areas, none of which include the road</p>	<p>Members were clear in their view that a precondition survey of roads should also be undertaken in the village of Grindleton, particularly on Ribble Lane between Grindleton Bridge and Grindleton Rd. The residents of East View have long held concerns about the road surface here, and any further deterioration due to HARP would be simply unacceptable.</p>

from Grindleton Bridge past East View.	
The draft CTMP, at page 50, makes reference to considerations to access over Grindleton Bridge, parked vehicles and alteration at the junction of East View / Grindleton Road, but gives no detail	Members felt that the CTMP failed to pay adequate attention to the impact that HARP would have on the residents of East View. This was particularly true with regard to the parking of residents' vehicles, which would have to be left on Ribble Lane as large vehicles pass by in close proximity. This was not only inconvenient but also dangerous. Residents would ask that UU provide safe car parking for residents, eg by funding the provision of car parking on land owned by the business based at The Spinney.
Whilst it is good that a Highways Stakeholder Group (HSG) will be established to oversee the process, section 7.2.2 states that "Local community groups (e.g. Parish Councils, special interest groups) will be made aware of the HSG as a vehicle for collating and investigating enquires from the public".	Members remained unclear as to the role of the proposed HSG, and whether they – as local community representatives - would have any access to it (as opposed to being made aware of it).
There will also be a Community Engagement Group and a Travel Plan Co-ordinator (sections 7.2.2 – 7.2.4), both of whom seem to be leading on contact with residents etc.	Members saw the issue of communication as absolutely key to the successful delivery of the project. Given the length of the construction period it was inevitable that problems would arise, and parish councillors would bear the brunt of any community concerns. Members were insistent upon having a direct and open channel of communication by telephone to a dedicated Single Point of Contact (SPOC), either within LCC or UU, who would be at a senior level and with enough "clout" to be able to resolve issues as they arise.
9-month construction period – further assurances required	In the initial period of 9 months, when construction traffic would facilitate the building of the temporary river crossings, what assurances could be given that such traffic would only service the temporary crossings and not be used for any other purpose? Members would find it unacceptable if heavy vehicles passing through

	<p>the village were to be used for construction of the tunnel.</p> <p>In addition, it was striking that no consideration is offered to the protected species (such as otters) which live in the vicinity of Grindleton Bridge.</p>
--	--

**Resolved**

**Clerk to submit these comments in writing to RVBC prior to 9 March**

**Clerk**

c) LCC – response to above proposals previously put forward by UU

Members also agreed that they should comment in detail on the comments of the letter from LCC, which was itself critical of the draft CTMP. These comments (captured by the Clerk below) should also then be sent to RVBC prior to the special meeting on 9 March.

<b>Topic</b>	<b>LCC comment</b>	<b>GPC response</b>
Route 1b (during 9-month period to build the temporary river crossing)	P8 – a “strong signing strategy will be required at all pinch points”, including the East View Bridge and the East View / Grindleton Rd junction	This proposal would appear to be in addition to the specific use of rolling roadblocks set out in the CTMP. Members would support any proposal to keep residents informed of the timings when vehicle convoys may be expected etc and so could try to manage their journeys accordingly.
Route 1b (during 9-month period to build the temporary river crossing)	P17 – proposed restrictions on time and frequency of vehicle movements	As stated above, members were supportive of this approach (subject to an adequate enforcement regime).
Main Construction Route from 2023 – 2030	P11 – in enforcing vehicle movements, the use of SIDs and police mobile cameras is proposed (though little detail has been provided by UU)	Members supported this approach
General	P22 - Enforcement of the CTMP should be “protected by suitably worded planning condition”	Members supported this approach
General	P24 – the appointment of a dedicated member of	Members supported this approach

	<p>staff “for the duration of the project to address the requirement of ongoing collaborative work, required to ensure the best management of the CTMP”</p>	
	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to submit these comments in writing to RVBC prior to 9 March</b></p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p>
<p>d)</p>	<p><u>HARP-related issues raised by Cllr Bramwell</u></p> <p>Cllr Bramwell had asked for a number of HARP-related issues to be placed on the agenda:</p>	
<p>i)</p>	<p><u>Proposed car parking at The Spinney for residents of East View</u></p> <p>Given the pressures which HARP would place on the residents of East View to find safe and convenient parking whilst living on the proposed route for heavy vehicles, Cllr Bramwell suggested that UU should be asked to provide free parking for residents on the car park of the business located at The Spinney. Members agreed, the Chair emphasising the need for UU to provide and fund safe parking for the residents of East View.</p>	
	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members supported this idea, and asked the Clerk to include this in the written submission to RVBC</b></p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p>
<p>ii)</p>	<p><u>Bus passes for children attending Clitheroe Grammar School</u></p> <p>Cllr Bramwell reported that 2 pupils living in Lower Grindleton and attending Clitheroe Grammar School had been refused bus passes, a move which he felt was wrong given the increased transport pressures that HARP would bring.</p>	
	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed that this was more a matter for LCC and suggested that the parents contact County Cllr Mirfin for support</b></p>	
<p>iii)</p>	<p><u>Proposed one-way system</u></p> <p>In view of both HARP and the projected increase in numbers for Bowland High School, Cllr Bramwell suggested the introduction of a one-way system to the school (going in past East View and out through Sawley) for all school traffic during school hours.</p> <p>Members were supportive of the idea but considered that it would be difficult to police if introduced.</p>	

<p>13.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p>	<p><b>Duke of York</b></p> <p><u>Planning application</u></p> <p>Members noted that the planning application for the Duke of York (3/2022/0883) had not been discussed at the meetings of the Planning and Development Committee held on 12 January nor 16 February 2023. It was understood that this may be due to staff shortages at RVBC, and the matter should appear on the agenda for the meeting to be held on 16 March.</p> <p><u>Associated parking issues</u></p> <p>On 8 February, the Clerk had held a telephone conversation with a local resident who wished to make informal observations about the above planning application. In particular, the resident was concerned at the proposal to remove onsite parking spaces to accommodate the proposed extension at the Duke of York, believing that parking spaces were at such a premium in the village that any steps to reduce their number would be seen as retrogressive and undesirable.</p> <p><b>Members noted the above</b></p>	
<p>14.</p>	<p><b><u>Grant funding for replacement Xmas lights</u></b></p> <p>The Clerk had sought clarification from RVBC, which stated on its website that a small pot of money was available annually to help parishes provide Christmas lights in their village. The grants would be for up to 50% of cost incurred; must be for low energy / LED devices; and must be on public display for the good of the community. However, the text merely stated that the deadline for applications was “31 October”, and it was not clear if an application could now be submitted for 2023.</p> <p>Members noted that no response had yet been received.</p>	
<p>15.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><b>Lancashire Best Kept Village Competition 2023</b></p> <p><u>Entry for 2023 competition</u></p> <p>The Clerk and Cllr Halley had now received the entry forms for the 2023 competition, which were to be completed and returned (along with the £25 entry fee) by <b>30 April 2023</b>.</p> <p>Members agreed that Cllr Halley should once again lead on the village’s entry for the competition.</p> <p>An information event had been held by the event organisers on 1 March at Salmesbury Memorial Hall. Cllr Halley had attended. She reported the importance of ensuring that weeds (especially around grids or impeding drainage) had been cleared; failure to do so would result in removal of marks.</p>	

	<p>Cllr Wheeler suggested that members undertake a “group walk” around the village to take stock of actions needed prior to the competition. It was agreed that this would take place after Cllr Halley’s return from holidays.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>confirm their intention to enter the 2023 competition;</b></li> <li>• <b>authorise payment of the £25 fee;</b></li> <li>• <b>thank Cllr Halley for her efforts in moving this forward; and</b></li> <li>• <b>organise a “group walk” to assess any issues to be addressed</b></li> </ul> <p>b) <u>Review of 2022 competition</u></p> <p>At the November meeting, members had reflected on the feedback from the judges for the 2022 competition. Whilst the 2022 entry had in many ways been a considerable success, they identified a number of matters which could be revisited prior to the 2023 competition. These had included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the bench at the top of Grindleton Brow could be more regularly tidied and surrounding vegetation cut back;</li> <li>• the Lengthsman could be asked to pay more attention to all benches around the village – this could be included in his work plan;</li> <li>• a “clean up” of the wording on the Grindleton Stone, which had begun to look grubby (now completed by Cllr Fielding, for which members thanked him); and</li> <li>• more effort could be made to engage with residents at the foot of Grindleton Brow, who did not necessarily consider themselves to be fully included in village activities. As the route up Grindleton Brow was a main access point to the village, perhaps the installation of “Welcome to Grindleton” signage in this vicinity could be considered.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Above matters to be addressed on the “group walk” agreed in item 15a above</b></p> <p>It was also noted that a “volunteer litter picker” had been recruited and was already working to clean up the village.</p> <p>Cllr Halley conformed that a composite certificate reflecting the awards given to Mary Brown Cottages had now been completed.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to amend list of ongoing member activities accordingly</b></p>	<p>LH</p> <p>All</p> <p>Clerk</p>
16.	<p><b>Footpath off Eccles Terrace</b></p> <p>County Cllr Sue Hind attended the meeting in her capacity as Chair of the Public Rights of Way and Access Forum. Also in attendance were two local residents, Eileen and Martin Flatley, who rented the land through which the footpath ran.</p>	

Cllr Halley updated County Cllr Hind on the current situation, which had not progressed a great deal since Cllr Hind (along with the PROW officer from LCC) had last attended a site visit. The essence of the problem remained the poor condition of the stepping stones, the location of which was shown below:



These stepping stones had largely washed away and were now a potential hazard to walkers, and at the site visit a number of possible ways forward had been discussed. However, subsequent discussions with Peak & Northern Footpaths Society had raised the prospect of funding becoming available to erect a footbridge, a solution which (if implemented) would greatly improve access to the area.

Cllr Hind had recently contacted the PROW officer for his views, but it would appear that his recall of what had been agreed at the site meeting seemed to differ from the recollection of those members who had been present. After some debate, it was agreed that – due to funding constraints – erection of a footbridge could be discounted and efforts should focus on (i) improvements to the path which gave access to the stepping stones and (ii) stabilising the stepping stones themselves. In an attempt to move things forward, it was agreed that, on members' behalf, Cllr Hind would now pose the following questions to the PROW officer:

- which person or body had overall responsibility for maintenance of the stepping stones?
- if the Parish Council were obliged to repair them, what basic actions were required to ensure the safety of walkers who used them?
- would LCC be willing to take action to stabilise the steps leading down to the stepping stones?

In addition, the Chair suggested an alternative approach featuring the possible establishment of a permissive footpath; this would link PROW reference 3-21-FP54 to the existing footbridge across the stream within the Millennium Wood, thereby providing a safe and accessible route for walkers. However, the establishment of a permissive path would require the consent of (i) the owner of the land situated to the rear of 4 Eccles Terrace (described as "Allotment Gardens" on the plan above)



	<p>and (ii) the Woodland Trust (who owned the small section of land between the footbridge and the land behind 4 Eccles Terrace).</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clr Hind to seek answers to the above from officers at LCC</b>  <b>Clerk to seek to establish the owner of the land to the rear of 4 Eccles Terrace, and enquire whether the owner would be prepared to discuss the establishment of a permissive footpath across this land</b></p>	<p><b>SH</b>  <b>Clerk</b></p>
<p>17.</p>	<p><b>Sustainability issues</b></p> <p>Members were reminded that Mr David Rawkins (member of Ribble Valley Climate Action Network) had attended the January meeting and given a presentation on climate change issues. The main theme of Mr Rawkins' presentation had been that climate change was already a threat to the natural environment, and he outlined some of the work carried out by RVCAN to combat this.</p> <p>Mr Rawkins had then challenged members to consider a number of areas in which greater support for the climate change agenda could be given locally. Possible activities included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sending a representative to attend future RVCAN meetings;</li> <li>• increasing efforts to support bio-diversity. Establishing the green space at the foot of Grindleton Brow had been a good start, but re-wilding activity could be widened out to include the local churchyard; residents' private gardens; or the planting of willow at the sewage works on Grindleton bend. Support could be given to the "No Mow May" campaign, or wider downloading of the Environment Agency app which allows immediate reporting of river pollution; and</li> <li>• within the community, communal growing of vegetables could be encouraged. Residents could be encouraged to support the "No Meat Monday" campaign, and to share cars when travelling to and from the village.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, Clr Halley had suggested the possible use of the unoccupied allotment plot no 6 for use as a community growing space, and/or the plot formerly maintained by the late John Groom (considered in minute item 20b below). However, neither of these were currently a viable way forward.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed to assess possible local contributions to the sustainability agenda when undertaking their "group walk" (minute item 15a above)</b></p>	<p><b>All</b></p>

18.	<p><b>Consultation on the proposed expansion of Bowland High School</b></p> <p>At the January meeting, members had debated at some length the proposed changes to the School Place Planning Delivery Programme 2023-25, as a result of which Bowland High School was listed for a permanent increase in its Published Admission Number from 110 to 140 places from September 2024. This would follow an agreed temporary expansion of 30 places from September 2023.</p> <p>As agreed, the Clerk had submitted a summary of the Parish Council’s discussion to LCC on 9 January, a copy of which had been provided for members’ information.</p> <p>The period of consultation had ended on 15 January 2023, with a final decision due to be taken by LCC’s Cabinet in February. No update on this decision had been received.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Members noted the above</b></p>	
19	<p><b>Complaint – unsolicited cold calling</b></p> <p>At the January meeting, the Clerk had outlined a conversation which – at the request of the Chair – he had held with a local resident who had been the victim of cold calling. Members had debated a number of next steps and, whilst there was support for the possible establishment of a No Cold Calling Area (NCCA) in the village, it was agreed that it would first be prudent to establish the level of demand. The Clerk had been tasked with arranging an informational talk to be given by a representative of Lancashire County Council’s Trading Standards Service, Julie Waddington. The talk had taken place on 24 February, in the main hall of the Pavilion, with residents alerted to the event by social media (courtesy of the Vice Chair).</p> <p>PS Day of Lancashire Police had been invited to attend but was unable to be present, in his absence, PCSO Mick Kearns-Turner kindly offered to come along.</p> <p>The session was introduced by the Vice-Chair, with other councillors (Bramwell and Raywood) also in attendance. A total of 10 members of the public came along on the day, and received welcome advice on how to respond to unwanted doorstep callers. The advice was clear – do not engage with such persons, and certainly do not buy anything from them. A range of guidance on how residents could protect themselves from scams was given, and information leaflets were made available for residents to take away.</p> <p>Members discussed whether to proceed with a request to LCC for a NCCA to be established, but after a vote (4 votes to 2) agreed not to go ahead with this approach. It was felt that the number of residents present at the meeting did not show an adequate level of demand to justify such an intervention.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to write to LCC Trading Standards and thank Julie for her talk, but advise her of the Parish Council’s decision not to apply for a NCCA</b></p>	Clerk

<p>20.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><b>Allotments</b></p> <p><u>Renewal of tenancies</u></p> <p>At the January meeting, members had discussed the financial position relating to the provision of allotments in the village. It had been noted that – once administrative costs were factored in – the allotment facility was in all likelihood running at a loss, a situation which was unsustainable in the longer term. It had therefore been agreed that the rental income would be raised by c£50, to be distributed across all tenants on a pro rata basis.</p> <p>To reach the £50 target, a rent increase of 25% for individual tenant had been required. Members were provided with a copy of the costings sheet setting out the rent increases for and current rents payable by each individual tenant.</p> <p>In response to a question from Cllr Wheeler, the Clerk confirmed that no objections to the price increases had been received.</p> <p>The Clerk reported that he had spent a considerable number of hours dealing with the allotments, and it was likely that the increased tenancy fees had already been spent on administrative costs.</p> <p>The Clerk updated members on the current position regarding tenancy uptake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plot 1 – VACANT - now confirmed tenant has quit</li> <li>• Plot 2 – paid / returned contract</li> <li>• Plot 3 – paid / returned contract</li> <li>• Plot 4 – paid / returned contract</li> <li>• Plot 5 – paid / returned contract</li> <li>• Plot 6 – this plot had been subject to a misunderstanding, the Clerk having believed it to be vacant when this was not the case. Plot holder now renewed, has paid in full and returned the contract</li> <li>• Plot 7 – paid / returned contract</li> <li>• Plot 8 – former tenant withdrawn. Offered to next person on list, who has paid and returned contract</li> <li>• Plot 9 - paid / returned contract</li> </ul> <p>The only persons remaining on the waiting list have already been informally approached to see if they would wish to take on Plot 1 should it become vacant (as was now the case). They had stated that they were put off by its existing overgrown condition, and would be reluctant to take it on without some assistance from the Parish Council, eg some physical help to clear the site and/or provision of a skip. In addition, a separate complaint had been received about the condition of Plot 1.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair offered to restore Plot 1 to a reasonable condition by strimming it and clearing it</b>  <b>Clerk to discuss with potential tenants whether they would then be prepared to take on the tenancy</b></p>	<p><b>Chair</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p>
----------------------	--	---

<p>b)</p> <p>c)</p>	<p><u>Plot maintained by John Groom, Back Lane</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley reported that she had discussed the issue of maintaining this land with the widow of the late John Groom, who had indicated that she would want the plot to be maintained in his memory but would carry out this work herself.</p> <p><u>Wording of tenancy agreements</u></p> <p>Subsequent to the tenancy agreements being posted out for signing, the Clerk had understood from the outgoing Clerk that tenancy agreements had not traditionally been sent out for re-signing on an annual basis; instead, the agreements had been signed <u>only</u> when a tenant took on the tenancy of a plot. The Clerk had later received a letter from an allotment tenant commenting that the tenancy agreement for 2023/24 had varied from that which he had originally signed some years previously; the tenant also noted that – from a legal perspective - a number of amendments to the contract were advisable.</p> <p>The Clerk therefore sought agreement from members to re-visit the wording of the draft contract with a view to updating its content, before presenting a final version to members for signing off prior to renewal of tenancies 2024/25.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to redraft wording of allotment tenancies and bring back to members for endorsement in due course</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>23</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p> <p>c)</p>	<p><b>Miscellaneous matters</b></p> <p><u>Wildflower seeds (Carrs Billington)</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley conformed that the seeds had now been ordered at a cost of £52.</p> <p>Cllr Wheeler reported that the issue of “bus stop moles” had now been resolved, with the soil mounds being flattened.</p> <p><u>Flower tubs</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley reminded members that the flower tubs in the bus turning circle had unfortunately once again been hit by vehicles and needed repairing. After a debate on the best way forward, it was agreed that Cllr Wheeler would remove both the damaged tubs from the turning circle and dispose of the soil accordingly. Members could then re-evaluate whether to replace them in due course.</p> <p><u>SID</u></p> <p>At the request of the Chair, on 26 January 2023 the Clerk had reported to the Parish Council’s insurers that storm damage to the SID had occurred; high winds had caused the solar panel to blow off with resulting damage to the wiring, leaving the equipment without a power source. The solar panel had been discovered in a neighbouring garden on the morning of 13 January and retrieved by the Chair of the Parish Council later that day.</p>	

	<p>Zurich’s initial response to this approach was negative, maintaining that the SID fell outside the terms of the Parish Council’s cover. However, the Vice Chair observed that – if this were the case – why had the insurers paid out for a previous claim when the SID had been damaged in a traffic incident in December 2019? When this point had been put to them, Zurich repeated their assertion that cover did not apply, the previous claim having been paid “in error” and – whilst they had the right to recoup this settlement – they were “not minded” to do so.</p> <p>In view of this response, the Chair offered to establish whether the SID could be repaired by reattaching the damaged wiring.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Chair to assess SID</b></p> <p>d) <u>Brow Path - gate</u></p> <p>The gate at the foot of the Brow footpath had become unable to close properly, leaving the risk that sheep may escape. Cllr Wheeler had already carried out a temporary solution with string, but now offered to affect a more permanent repair by attaching a piece of hardwood to which the latch could then be fixed.</p> <p>e) <u>Young people / teenagers in Grindleton</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley informed members that, according to the 2021 census data, the village had a relatively large number of children / young people; there were 57 young people below the age of 9 and a further 76 aged between 10-19. It was noted that other parishes had sought to engage with these age groups in an attempt to better understand what support the Parish Council could give (eg Chatburn had held a pizza evening to encourage young people to attend).</p> <p>Members noted Cllr Halley’s comments and agreed that it was important they sought to represent all age groups within the parish, but felt that any engagement event needed further consideration in order to be successful.</p>	<p><b>Chair</b></p>
<p>f)</p> <p>i)</p> <p>ii)</p>	<p><u>Discussion items put forward by Cllr Bramwell</u></p> <p>Cllr Bramwell raised a number of points for consideration:</p> <p><u>The Spinney</u></p> <p>A local resident had requested that a "salt bin" could be provided for residents’ use on The Spinney.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to approach LCC</b></p> <p><u>Grindleton Village sign</u></p> <p>Members were reminded of their ongoing commitment to place a “Welcome to Grindleton” signage at Grindleton Bridge and at all other entrances to the village. It</p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p>

	<p>was agreed that a good starting point would be to obtain advice from LCC on what permissions would be needed etc.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to seek guidance from County Cllr Mirfin on way forward, possible funding etc</b></p>	<b>Clerk</b>
iii)	<p><u>Speeding traffic</u></p> <p>Cllr Bramwell commented on the often-excessive speeds at which vehicles travel from Grindleton Bridge to the junction at Brow Bottom, a problem exacerbated by the lack of pavement from 1 - 8 East View. It was agreed that a possible solution would be to hire one of the SIDs from RVBC, although there were complications regarding where the SID could be positioned, suitable lamp posts from which it could be hung etc.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to explore these issues with RVBC</b></p>	<b>Clerk</b>
iv)	<p><u>Footpath issue</u></p> <p>Cllr Bramwell noted that the steps on the concessionary footpath which ran adjacent to Ribble Lane and linked PROWs FP0311004 and FP0311005 were worn and could be dangerous in wet weather.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>As the steps were situated in the parish of Chatburn, Clerk to refer the matter to Chatburn Parish Council</b></p>	<b>Clerk</b>
24	<p><b>Update from Ward and County Councillors present</b></p> <p>Cllr Mirfin updated on the following matters:</p> <p>a) <u>Potholes</u></p> <p>LCC had agreed to add £30 million to its budget for pothole repairs. The Parish Council was advised to ensure that all potholes were therefore reported to LCC at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>b) <u>Funding opportunities</u></p> <p>Cllr Mirfin outlined a range of funding pots which may be of interest:</p> <p>i) <u>Members' Allowance Grant</u></p> <p>This was not available to parish councils, but could be accessed by associated good causes (such as the Pavilion). Cllr Mirfin still had £600 in his budget for 2022/23, for which bids needed to be submitted by 17 March. However, the budget did roll over into 2023/34 and further applications could be submitted after 1 April 2023. An application form was on the LCC website.</p>	

ii)	<p><u>Older People’s Champion</u></p> <p>LCC’s Older People’s Champion (County Councillor Joan Burrows) also had a pot of funding to which bids could be made. Alternatively, it may be worth her being invited to a future meeting to discuss what projects could be supported.</p>	
iii)	<p><u>Lancashire Environment Fund</u></p> <p>Arising from income generated by landfill taxes, bids could be made to this fund for environmental projects. An application from was on the LCC website.</p>	
iv)	<p><u>Lancashire Culture and Sport Fund</u></p> <p>Applications for up to £50k could be made to this fund, but they would need to be match-funded.</p> <p>Following a question from Cllr Halley, Cllr Horkin reported that the TAF (managed by RVBC) had not received any funding applications. Bids could be made by 31 March for any activity related to “active lifestyles”, and guidance on bids could be sought from Mark Beveridge at RVBC.</p>	
25	<p><b>Other meetings</b></p> <p>None discussed</p>	
26	<p><b>Correspondence received</b></p> <p>None</p>	
27	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>a) <u>Pending grant application – Women’s’ Institute (WI)</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley reported that a grant application was expected from the WI relating to the possible purchase of a tree guard. The Parish Council expected an application form to be completed before members could make a final decision, and it was agreed that the WI would contact the Clerk to discuss arrangements.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to arrange to receive application and then present it to members</b></p> <p>b) <u>Handrail needed for steps</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley suggested that a handrail be erected on the steps leading from Ribble Avenue to the River Ribble.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Cllr Halley to contact the Lengthsman and arrange</b></p>	LH
	<p><b>The next meeting of Grindleton Parish Council will take place at 7.30pm on Tuesday 2 May 2023* at Grindleton Pavilion</b></p>	

	<b>*NB – date subject to change</b>	
--	-------------------------------------	--

The meeting closed at 10.01pm.

Signed by:		
	Date: 16.5.23 (revised date)	Cllr L Halley Chair