



## 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 on Tuesday 1 August 2023 at the Pavilion, Grindleton.**

Members present:	Parish Cllr L Halley (Chair) Parish Cllr Paul Atkinson Parish Cllr Tony Bramwell Parish Cllr Megan Haslam Parish Cllr Peter Raywood Parish Cllr Susan Walsh Borough Cllr K Horkin MBE (RVBC)
Apologies for absence:	Parish Cllr Glenn Wheeler (Vice Chair)
Clerk present:	Andrew Glover
Members of the public present:	David Ryall for minute item 4

1.	<p><b>Welcome</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all present to the meeting.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Standing orders suspended</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">Re minute item 17 below, Parish Cllr Walsh indicated that she had been made aware (in her capacity as a village resident) that email correspondence between Bowland High School and another local resident had recently taken place.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) Standing orders resumed</p>	
3.	<p><b>Public Participation</b></p> <p>None, other than minute item 4 below.</p>	

4.	<p><b>Presentation – B4RN</b></p> <p>Mr David Ryall, Project Development Manager for Broadband for the Rural North Ltd (B4RN), attended at the prior request of members to give a presentation on the role of his organisation. B4RN is a not-for-profit community benefit society which builds ultrafast broadband networks in rural areas. The government’s stated aim was to ensure nationwide access to high-speed, full-fibre broadband for all domestic and commercial properties, and grant funding had been made available in support of this. It was estimated that the cost of connecting all 526 Grindleton properties would be in the region of £730k, of which – dependent upon the level of local interest - up to £492k would come from government subsidy. Once initiated, the charging regime for B4RN customers would be £33pcm + VAT, with a one-off connection fee of £60. There would be a social tariff with discounts as appropriate.</p> <p>Mr Ryall had already received expressions of interest from some village residents, and was intending to host a local public meeting in the near future, with a view to establishing the wider level of potential interest in the B4RN initiative. He would appreciate the support of any parish councillors or local residents prepared to promote the scheme in the village (eg through the distribution of promotional literature). Any member who wished to become involved should email Mr Ryall directly.</p> <p>Members thanked Mr Ryall for his informative presentation.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>With regard to a public meeting, Clerk to email Mr Ryall with contact details for booking a room in the Pavilion</b></p>	Clerk
5.	<p><b>Minutes / matters arising</b></p> <p>a) <u>Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 4 July 2023</u></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2023 were signed by the Chair as a true and accurate record.</p> <p>Proposed by: Cllr Bramwell  Seconded by: Cllr Atkinson</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>The Chair was authorised to sign off the minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 4 July 2023, and it was agreed that the minutes of this meeting would be posted on the Parish Council website</b></p>	Clerk

b) Matters arising (not covered elsewhere on the agenda):

i) Speeding vehicles – East View – concern raised by Cllr Bramwell

Following a presentation by Mr Rennie Pinder at the July meeting, members had agreed in principle to the hiring of a single SID to be placed on East View. The SID would be positioned so as to capture the speed of traffic heading down the hill from Chatburn towards Grindleton (once it had crossed over Grindleton Bridge). However, before commissioning Mr Pinder to provide a SID, the Clerk had been asked to take a number of preparatory actions, including making contact with Paul Connell (Road Safety Officer with LCC's Highways and Transport Department) as the person responsible for ensuring that SIDs were hung in a safe and appropriate manner. Mr Connell had provided a written report on the relevant costs, timescales etc with regard to the erection of the SID on East View. The Clerk presented Mr Connell's report to members, with key points including:

- if located where proposed, the SID would record data from traffic as it left the 60mph zone. This was significant as it would invalidate any data in terms of securing police involvement at a future date. (Members noted that this concern had not been raised by Mr Pinder during his site meeting with the Clerk and Cllr Bramwell); and
- the following process / sequence would need to be followed:
  - a consultation event was to be carried out by GPC with residents living in the vicinity;
  - a licence application was to be submitted by GPC to LCC (£70 fee);
  - a structural survey would be required on the proposed lamppost from which the SID would be hung (free, with a 10 week wait);
  - GPC to provide LCC with evidence of its public liability cover (to a minimum of £10m), and to indemnify LCC against any future claims;
  - a mounting plate would need to be purchased (c£70) unless the existing plate from Main St were to be recycled. LCC would remove the existing back plate from Main St for an (unspecified) fee; and
  - fitting of the back plate to the lamppost would be undertaken by LCC (fee of £35-£70).

Members expressed concern at the costly and bureaucratic process to be followed, which ultimately would not then provide data which the police would consider acceptable in determining whether to commit resources to the problem of speeding on East View. As part of this discussion, members recalled the report which had been presented to a recent meeting of the Parish Council Liaison Committee (PCLC), at which the Chair had been present. Entitled "Working Against Speed in Parishes", the report had emphasised the potential value to rural villages of establishing zones with a 20mph speed limit, and had sought to gather support for this approach from as many parishes as possible across the County. The next meeting of WASP would take place on 16 August, with the Chair and Cllr Bramwell to attend.

	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>In light of the information from LCC, the Parish Council’s previous decision in principle to support erection of a SID on East View would be reversed.</b>  <b>The WASP campaign to introduce 20mph zones in rural villages appeared to have merit, and would be further explored by GPC representatives at its August meeting – Chair / Cllr Bramwell to report back</b></p> <p>ii) <u>Welcome to Grindleton” signage</u></p> <p>Over recent months, the Clerk had – at members’ request – been seeking guidance from LCC as to the ownership of the wall at East View, just prior to Grindleton Bridge; the parapet wall had been identified as members’ preferred location of the proposed “Welcome to Grindleton” signage.</p> <p>As no response regarding ownership had been received at the July meeting, members had considered other potential sites on which signage could be located (eg land owned by Clitheroe Angling Club), as well as the scale and cost of possible designs. As requested, Cllr Bramwell had made an informal approach to a local resident connected with Clitheroe Angling Club as to whether the Club would support use of their land to display a sign. The resident was not opposed to the proposal (although any decision would need to be formally endorsed by the Angling Club beforehand), but pointed out that a sign located there could be washed away when the Ribble flooded.</p> <p>The Clerk reported that, immediately after the July meeting, LCC’s Asset Management Team had confirmed that – in its view – the parapet wall was indeed part of the Grindleton Bridge structure. Whilst LCC would not normally support the display of signs on bridges as they posed a distraction to drivers, the Highways Authority was prepared to consider a request from a parish council. There would be a number of criteria to be met before permission could be granted, including the proposed design of the sign meeting LCC’s approval; the willingness of the parish council to indemnify LCC against any claim; and GPC being willing to take on maintenance of the sign.</p> <p>A further option was affixing a sign to the flower box adjacent to the bench.</p> <p>Members discussed the various options at length, and concluded that any signage erected at the various entrances to the village would need to be consistent; it would be potentially divisive to have different signage used across the parish. The Chair presented the findings of her research into the types of signage available – some of this was extremely expensive (up to c£8500), whilst small / plain signs were available for around £300 each. It was agreed that further research should be carried out on the availability and design of smaller / cheaper signs, with the possibility of erecting a more high-profile sign in a prominent village location at a future (post HARP?) date.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to undertake further research on the smaller signs available</b></p>	<p>LH/TB</p> <p>LH</p>
--	--	------------------------

iii)	<p><u>Rum Fox – parking issues</u></p> <p>Following concerns expressed by a local resident at the July meeting, the Chair had researched the availability of small wall signs to remind drivers to park courteously. The Chair had identified small red signs (with a capital letter P crossed out) which may suffice at a cost of £20. She had also established that a local resident would be happy for such signs to be affixed to his wall in a suitable location.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to further investigate the purchase of suitable signage</b>  <b>Cllr Walsh to establish whether the manager of the Rum Fox had updated his online booking form so as to remind customers to park responsibly</b></p>	LH SW
6.	<p><b>Overview of financial position</b></p> <p>a) <u>Monthly accounts – July 2023</u></p> <p>The Clerk submitted details of income and expenditure for the month of July 2023 for approval by the Parish Council and signing-off by the Chair.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>That the record for July 2023 as presented would be signed off</b></p> <p>b) <u>United Trust (UT) Bank:</u></p> <p>i) <u>Removal of former councillor Keith Hutton from mandate / addition of Cllr Wheeler to mandate</u></p> <p>The Clerk reported that he had sent off the application form for the above. On 24 July, the Clerk had telephoned UT Bank for an update, and had been advised that the form had been received but not yet actioned due to a high volume of mandate work.</p> <p>ii) <u>Transfer of funds to the UT deposit account</u></p> <p>At the July meeting, members had agreed that, given the rising level of interest rates, it was appropriate to transfer £10,000 from the current account to the 100-day UT deposit account.</p> <p>This transfer had not yet been actioned as, due to its size, the Clerk felt that it was more appropriate for the transfer to be signed off by two members (and, as per minute item 6bi above, the Parish Council did not yet have two members listed as signatories in the mandate).</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed that the transfer of £10,000 should be authorised by two parish councillors, once the amendments to the mandate had been completed</b>  <b>Clerk to facilitate the transfer arrangements at that time</b></p>	Clerk

<p>iii)</p> <p>c)</p> <p>i)</p> <p>ii)</p>	<p><u>Interest rate</u></p> <p>No further increases to the interest rate on the 100-day notice account (fixed at 3.75% on 30 May) had since occurred.</p> <p><u>RVBC funding:</u></p> <p><u>Concurrent Functions Grant 2022/23</u></p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that the required documentation had now been sent to RVBC by email on 9 July (well in advance of the deadline of 31 July).</p> <p><u>Proposed bid to Rural Prosperity Fund</u></p> <p>At the July meeting, Cllr Horkin had referred to the Rural Prosperity Fund (RPF), consisting of c£420k which RVBC had received from central government. The funding was intended to support projects in rural villages, and it was important to note that it would be returned to central government if not spent within the next 24 months. Bids from parish councils for between £25-50k would be welcomed within the next 3-6 months. Members had been invited to give thought to the subject of possible funding bids, and the following suggestions were now made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Haslam proposed a bid to support the connection of communities to natural spaces, eg by the use of public footpaths, biodiversity, re-wilding etc;</li> <li>• members had previously supported the creation of a permissive footpath from The Hey to Bowland High School; and</li> <li>• the need for increased car parking for residents (along with electric charging points) was again mentioned, but the difficulty in finding a suitable location remained.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion with Cllr Horkin confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Cllr Mirfin had explored the possibility of officer assistance to maximise the content of any funding bids submitted, but no offer of support had yet been made;</li> <li>• whilst there remained time for bids to be compiled, it was better to submit these as early as possible in order to increase the chance of success;</li> <li>• any grant funding awarded would need to be spent by the end of 2024;</li> <li>• the RPF was separate to and distinct from the Capital Project Fund, for which RVBC had also recently sought funding bids; and</li> <li>• it may be appropriate to invite County Cllr Mirfin to attend a future meeting to discuss funding streams.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>At the September meeting, a session of around 1 hour would be devoted to working up the subject matter of a possible bid for RPF funding – Clerk to diary</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p>
--	---	--------------

<p>d)</p>	<p><u>Payments to Lengthsman</u></p> <p>Members were advised that payments to the Lengthsman had increased considerably in 2023 when compared against the previous year. However, it was noted that the Lengthsman had been asked to undertake additional tasks (such as clearing an allotment plot and take rubbish to the tip), and it was important to be both clear and realistic in terms of what demands were placed upon him.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Lengthsman’s claim for June 2023 (£468) would now be paid, but Cllr Walsh would be asked undertake a comparison of the tasks undertaken / salaries claimed during 2022 and 2023, and report back to members with her observations.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Cllr Walsh to undertake the above exercise</b>  <b>Clerk to scan the appropriate claims / records and send them to Cllr Walsh Chair / Cllr Bramwell to arrange for payment of the June claim</b></p>	<p>SW  Clerk  LH/TB</p>
<p>e)</p>	<p><u>Salary claims submitted by Clerk</u></p> <p>In a similar vein, Members considered a report compiled by the Clerk which set out details of his salary claims since appointment in November 2022. It was noted that the Clerk was frequently working for 35 or more hours per month, resulting in considerably higher salary claims than had been submitted by his predecessors. Whilst this may have been due to exceptional circumstances (eg elections and the appointment of new members), these tasks had required more commitment from the Clerk than he had envisaged when accepting the post and may soon begin to impact upon his other employment responsibilities.</p> <p>The Clerk offered to leave the room while members considered his report, but this was not considered necessary.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Clerk would seek to identify the preferred number of hours which he would wish to devote the role each month, and aim to agree this figure with the Chair. Once his monthly workload approach this figure, the Clerk could then liaise with the Chair and see what steps could then be taken to mitigate his working hours at that time.</p> <p>Members also offered further practical support, such as assistance with letter writing (Cllr Haslam) and the introduction of the proposed document sharing facility, for which the Clerk was grateful.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to give some thought to his preferred working hours and liaise with the Chair</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p>

<p>7.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><b>Matters arising from pending resignation of Parish Cllr Raywood</b></p> <p><u>Update on process</u></p> <p>At the July meeting, Cllr Raywood had indicated his intention to stand down from the Parish Council (although he also expressed his desire to attend future parish council meetings as a member of the public, as well as his availability to assist on local projects as required).</p> <p>In order to comply with electoral requirements, the Clerk confirmed that the following procedure had been agreed with Cllr Raywood and the Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• as Cllr Raywood had now tendered his resignation in writing (effective from 2 August 2023), the Clerk had drafted a formal notice of vacancy. This would be displayed by the Chair on the Parish Council noticeboard for a period of 14 days from 2 August;</li> <li>• the Clerk would send a copy of the formal notice of vacancy to RVBC on 2 August; and</li> <li>• should no election be required, the Parish Council would seek to co-opt a replacement member at the September meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Members again thanked Cllr Raywood for his work over many years as a parish councillor, and confirmed that his contributions to village life would be greatly valued in future for years.</p> <p>b) <u>Potential successor to P Cllr Raywood – representative on GRGC</u></p> <p>This matter was deferred to a future meeting.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Members to consider at a future meeting</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Return of signed forms – Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>The Clerk advised members that the completed Declaration of Interest forms had now been scanned and returned to RVBC on 9 July. The forms were now displayed on the Borough Council’s website.</p>	
<p>9.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><b>Approval of governance documents</b></p> <p><u>Parish Plan</u></p> <p>At the July meeting, members had agreed a number of amendments to governance documentation. With regard to the Parish Plan, it had also been agreed that a further discussion on its content should be held at the next meeting.</p> <p>However, Cllr Atkinson had since proposed that a full debate on the Parish Plan – as the sole agenda item – should be held at the regular meeting to take place after the AGM each May. This proposal reflected the importance of the Parish Plan to the Parish Council’s objectives and priorities throughout the coming year, and the importance of keeping it topical and current.</p>	



	<p>Members agreed with Cllr Atkinson’s suggestion and asked the Clerk to diary this accordingly.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed that the regular May meeting (held after the AGM) should be replaced with a discussion on the Parish Plan, this document then forming the basis of a work plan for the forthcoming 12 months</b>  <b>Clerk to diary</b></p> <p>b) <u>Asset Register</u></p> <p>At the July meeting, members had accepted that this document required further updating, in line with the suggestion made previously by the Internal Auditor. Accordingly, the Clerk had now produced an initial draft which he presented for members’ consideration (although he accepted that the content of the document required further input from an experienced member with extensive local knowledge).</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to work with the Chair to update the content of the revised draft</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p><b>Member training</b></p> <p>At the May meeting, members had considered future training needs and – given that there was both a new Chair and new members – had asked the Clerk to identify future LALC training courses as appropriate:</p> <p>a) <u>New Councillors and Clerks - a whistle stop tour of powers and responsibilities</u></p> <p>The Clerk reported that LALC had now published new dates for this course. It was agreed that members would attend on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuesday 26 September 2023 (7-9pm) – Cllrs Atkinson and Walsh; and;</li> <li>• Monday 23 October 2023 (7-9pm) – Cllr Haslam.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to book on behalf of members</b></p> <p>b) <u>Councillors: chairing meetings effectively</u></p> <p>The Chair and Vice Chair had attended this course by Zoom on 18 July 2023. Unfortunately, attendance had not proved as beneficial as hoped; Cllr Wheeler had not received his link to join the course at the appropriate time, and – in terms of content – it was considered that the emphasis been placed on town councils (where procedures tended to be more formal than in rural parishes).</p>	<p>Clerk</p>

11.	<p><b>Improving Parish Council effectiveness</b></p> <p>a) <u>Shared document storage</u></p> <p>In Cllr Wheeler’s absence, members again discussed the benefits and implications of establishing a shared facility. Cllr Walsh proposed that further consideration be given to Microsoft 365, which – subject to licensing issues – could allow shared access through Teams, SharePoint and One Drive. Cllr Walsh offered to work with Cllr Wheeler on this issue, and it was agreed that the Chair would approach Cllr Wheeler to ensure he was comfortable with the use of Microsoft as a potential storage facility.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to approach Cllr Wheeler</b>  <b>Subject to Cllr Wheeler’s agreement, Cllr Walsh to work with him on exploring the potential suitability of Microsoft</b></p>	LH SW
12.	<p><b>External Audit 2022/23</b></p> <p>a) <u>Certificate of Exemption</u></p> <p>The external auditors (PKF Littlejohn) had now confirmed to the Clerk that the Parish Council’s claim for exempt status had been received. Members noted that, as a result, no review would be performed, nor would an auditor certificate / report be issued.</p> <p>b) <u>Period of Public Rights</u></p> <p>Members noted that the period of public rights (during which residents of the parish are entitled to inspect the Parish Council’s accounts) was now underway, running from 3 July to 11 August 2023. An update on the outcome would be presented at the September meeting.</p> <p>c) <u>Additional dates for meetings</u></p> <p>Traditionally, the Parish Council had met every two months. However, due to the amount of business which now tended to build up over a two-month period (and the consequent length of meetings held), members had been consulted on whether to move to a monthly meeting schedule. It had been agreed that a move to monthly meetings would be beneficial, and as such the following meeting dates had now been arranged for the remainder of 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 September</li> <li>• 3 October</li> <li>• 7 November</li> <li>• 5 December</li> </ul> <p>The Clerk reported that, according to paragraph 3.2 of the Parish Council’s Standing Orders, an “agreed frequency of meetings will be decided at the annual meeting”. However, given such major recent change in the membership of the</p>	

	Parish Council, it was considered appropriate for the frequency of meetings to be changed now.	
13.	<p><b>Amendments to the Parish Council website</b></p> <p>Following an approach from the Clerk, the administrator of the Parish Council’s website had ensured that the following additional information was now displayed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the additional dates for meetings which had been agreed; and</li> <li>• the inclusion of a specimen agenda to inform members of the public of business to be concluded.</li> </ul>	
14.	<p><b>Planning applications to be considered</b></p> <p>a) <u>Planning Application No: 3/2023/0350</u></p> <p>Whilst this application had been approved with standard conditions by RVBC on 19 June, members had commented that - as had been the case with the 2022 application - no prior public notice had been displayed by RVBC. When Cllr Halley had challenged this with RVBC, she had been advised that certain applications (such as those for large housing developments or listed buildings) did indeed require the prior display of a public notice, in other cases the display was at the discretion of the Borough Council’s Director Planning. Members had generally understood that the display of a prior public notice in all instances was a legal requirement, a view shared by Cllr Horkin (who had offered to seek clarification on this matter directly from the Head of Planning).</p> <p>Cllr Horkin now reported that he had made enquiries with a number of parties at RVBC, and could confirm that the Parish Council’s understanding of the need for notices to be displayed was in fact incorrect. In legal terms, the requirement for the prior display of notices was at the sole discretion of the Director of Planning, the only exceptions being (i) if the building to which the application related was listed or (ii) if the development had real significance / importance to the public.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members noted the information, and thanked Cllr Horkin for his efforts</b></p> <p>b) Planning Application No: 3/2023/0274  Proposal: Proposed demolition of the existing agricultural building and erection of one new detached dwelling.  Location: Laneside Barn, Grindleton Road, Grindleton BB7 4QH</p> <p>At the request of members, the Clerk had submitted a consultation response to RVBC outlining their concerns with the application. Members noted the submitted comments (sent on 9 July), and the Clerk expressed his thanks to members for their contributions to the final version.</p> <p>Cllr Bramwell informed members of certain relevant information with which he had been provided prior to the meeting.</p>	

<p>c)</p> <p>d)</p> <p>i)</p> <p>ii)</p>	<p>Planning Application No: 3/2023/0395          Proposal: Proposed works to surface and resurface existing pedestrian footpath routes through the woodland.          Location: Greendale Wood, Grindleton</p> <p>Details of this application had been circulated to members on 11 July, with a deadline for any consultation response of 1 August. As no concerns had been raised by members, no official submission had been made by the Parish Council to RVBC.</p> <p><u>Miscellaneous</u></p> <p>The Chair also pointed out that other applications had been submitted to RVBC but had apparently not been circulated to members by RVBC. These included:</p> <p>Planning Application No: 3/2023/0297          Proposal: Proposed addition of 16 x 395kw solar panels on the south east facing roofslope          Location: Rushton House, Lower Chapel Lane, Grindleton BB7 4QT          (This application was currently recorded as invalid on the RVBC website)</p> <p>In relation to this matter, Cllr Horkin sought the general opinion of members with regard to the installation of solar panels at properties within the Parish. The consensus was broadly supportive, although members were keen to balance the aesthetic impact of such installations against their environmental benefits.</p> <p>Planning Application No: 3/2023/0565          Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for proposed single storey extension to rear and conversion of garage to a bedroom.          Location: Valley Cottage, Back Lane, Grindleton BB7 4RW          (Members are not consulted upon applications for a Certificate of Lawfulness.)</p> <p>Members noted the above applications.</p>	
<p>15.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><b>Haweswater Aqueduct Resilience Programme (HARP)</b></p> <p><u>Update – planning application 3/2021/0661</u></p> <p>Prior to the meeting of RVBC’s Planning and Development Committee on 16 March 2023, the borough’s MP (Nigel Evans) had exercised his statutory powers to seek to call in any decision to approve the planning application. At its meeting on 16 March, the Planning and Development Committee of RVBC had gone on to approve the application by a majority of 8 to 1.</p> <p>After a delay of around 4 months, confirmation had now been received from the Secretary of State that the application to call in the decision of RVBC had been unsuccessful. In terms of next steps, Cllr Horkin was able to update members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it now fell to RVBC to issue a full planning notice to United Utilities (UU). This would oblige UU to comply with the 56 planning conditions already</li> </ul>	

	<p>laid down by the Local Planning Authority. RVBC would be carefully monitoring UU to ensure that all conditions were fully adhered to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it had been suggested that RVBC should, at its own expense, now carry out a full Economic Impact Assessment of the application. However, no decision on this had yet been taken; and</li> <li>• UU had been asked to fund a full-time post of Liaison Officer. Whilst UU had agreed to provide one officer to cover the whole project from Cumbria to Bury, it was hoped that RVBC would insist upon the provision of a Liaison Officer dedicated solely to working within the Ribble Valley.</li> </ul> <p>Members again expressed concern for local businesses likely to be impacted by the project, and noted that a number of other issues (such as the proposed legacy payment) remained as yet unresolved.</p> <p>Cllr Bramwell suggested that several new residents had recently moved onto East View, and he feared they may be unaware of the likely impact the project would have upon their residential amenity. Although members felt that they had gone to great lengths in the past to warn local residents of this, it was agreed that some further warning publicity would be appropriate. However, in order to convey the scale of the issue, it was necessary to first ascertain the likely vehicle movements over Grindleton Bridge during the construction phase (this information having been removed from the UU website). Accordingly, the Clerk was asked to compile a question on this topic for discussion at the next Parish Council Liaison Committee, to be held on 14 September.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members thanked Cllr Horkin for his input</b>  <b>Clerk to draft a question for discussion at the forthcoming PCLC</b>  <b>Members to then consider further correspondence to update residents of East View on the situation</b></p>	Clerk
16.	<p><b>Lancashire Best Kept Village Competition 2023</b></p> <p>a) <u>Entry for 2023 competition</u></p> <p>Cllr Halley was pleased to report that the Parish Council had progressed to the second round of judging in the Small Village category of the competition, due to take place from 5 – 14 August. As the village was now competing against two others only, this was in effect the semi-final of the competition. The Chair thanked all members for their considerable efforts over the weekend just gone, when everyone had participated in a number of tasks to tidy the village prior to the second round of judging; this was greatly appreciated.</p> <p>With regard to planting the flower tubs, the Chair asked members if anyone had access to expert gardening advice, so that the most appropriate flowers could be planted. Cllr Raywood offered to provide the name of someone who may be able to advise the Chair, and Cllr Atkinson offered to assist with the planting.</p> <p>The Chair informed the Clerk that he could expect submission of a bill from Cllr Wheeler, seeking reimbursement for the cost of cement recently purchased.</p>	

	<p>Cllr Walsh pointed out that the metal post at the footpath stile opposite the Hydro Lodge had become rusty, and the sharp edges were a potential hazard for walkers seeking to cross the stile. It was agreed that Cllr Walsh would provide the Clerk with photos, which could be sent on to LCC.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Cllr Walsh to provide photos of the rusty metal post</b>  <b>Clerk to then bring the matter to the attention of LCC</b></p>	<p><b>SW</b>  <b>Clerk</b></p>
<p>17.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p>	<p><b>Bowland High School</b></p> <p><u>Consultation on the proposed expansion of Bowland High School</u></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 had been 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. The period of consultation had ended on 15 January 2023, with a final decision expected to be taken by LCC’s Cabinet in February. No update on this decision had been received, and as a result members had agreed at their July meeting that the matter should be no longer placed on their agenda.</p> <p>However, on 6 July a letter had recently been sent to the Clerk by County Cllr Ged Mirfin. This letter indicated that LCC had in fact now approved the increased intake of 30 pupils per year to Bowland High School, and had found capital finance to support the resulting strain on the school’s infrastructure (although final approval for the increase in numbers was yet to be given by regional DofE officials).</p> <p>On the same day, 6 July, the Clerk had been copied into an email sent by a local resident, who sought to challenge the decision to expand the school roll. The resident felt that the decision to expand was not supported by the responses to the consultation exercise, with the school’s assertion that the exercise had revealed “no significant opposition” being flawed.</p> <p>Members noted the concerns raised by the resident.</p> <p><u>Signage</u></p> <p>On 28 July, the Chair had approached a local resident and pointed out that the warning signage for drivers approaching Bowland High School was being obscured by branches growing from his garden. The resident had been requested to trim back the foliage; members acknowledged that this would be potentially an onerous task, and noted that the Chair had offered help from the Parish Council if necessary.</p>	

18.	<b>Public Rights of Way (PROWs)</b>	
a)	<u>Footpath off Eccles Terrace</u>	
i)	<u>Email correspondence – LCC</u>	
	<p>As requested, the Clerk had corresponded with Geoff Leneveson (PROW officer at LCC) on this issue. In essence, Geoff had sought more time to consider the implications of the proposed permissive footpath, as well as the issues raised with the Parish Council by a local resident through whose land the proposed path would run. Geoff was also still pushing for repair of the stepping stones as a possible way forward. (In order to speed up the process, the Clerk had subsequently written to Geoff’s manager, Steve Williams, and asked if he would be able to discuss the matter with Geoff in the near future. However, no response had yet been received).</p> <p>The local resident had also recently held a telephone conversation with the Chair, in which he had pointed out that the Woodland Trust (WT) had recently submitted a planning application relating to new footpaths in the Millennium Wood; if WT was undertaking this work, could this body not carry out repairs to the stepping stones at the same time? The resident had put these comments in writing to RVBC, and members agreed to continue to monitor the situation.</p>	
ii)	<u>Further correspondence - landowner</u>	
	<p>At the July meeting, members had noted that Colin Riley (Woodland Trust) had confirmed that his organisation would have no objection to the installation of the permissive path, and were prepared to strim the strip of land over which it passed the requisite 3 times per year. However, the Parish Council would be expected to install a gate (providing access to the permissive path) at the point where it entered the Millennium Wood from the site owned by the adjacent landowner. This had begged the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• would the landowner agree to the installation of a gate by the Parish Council?; and</li> <li>• who would be responsible for maintenance of the gate?</li> </ul> <p>As requested, the Clerk had since held a telephone conversation with the local landowner to explore the above issues. In the absence of any deal with LCC regarding his counter-proposal, the landowner had clearly indicated his unwillingness to proceed with his previously-expressed support for the permissive footpath. As a result, repair of the stepping stones by LCC was perhaps the only open currently-remaining option to resolve the issue.</p>	
iii)	<u>Proposed information board at the entrance to the woodland at Buck Street</u>	
	<p>At the July meeting, members had agreed in principle to make a financial contribution to the cost of the information board, and had asked the Clerk to write a supportive letter to the Woodland Trust in support of that body’s grant request.</p>	

With input from the Chair, this had been done on 12 July. Mr Riley of the Woodland Trust had later responded, offering to keep the Parish Council abreast of developments.

b) Complaint 1 – Bolton by Bowland Parish Council – blocked footpath

At the July meeting, members had considered the complaint received from a parish councillor in Bolton by Bowland that a stile had been blocked off on an access route to Beacon Hill, near Holden. The Parish Council had raised the matter with the landowner, who had maintained that he had been advised by the HSE to close the footpath to protect his cows from dogs. Being aware of the particular circumstances surrounding this landowner (when a walker had tragically been trampled to death by cows on his land in September 2022), members had accepted his explanation and chosen to take no further action.

However, on 6 July, a further complaint had been received from the original complainant, maintaining that:

“the signs blocking the original path have been re-erected. Other gates leading to the summit are marked “keep out””.

After consultation with the Chair, it had been agreed that – without any powers of enforcement - the Parish Council had tried its best to resolve the matter and the complainant should instead continue to raise his concerns with LCC as the enforcing body. The complainant had been formally advised of this stance, which he had appeared to accept.

On 9 July, in a telephone discussion with Geoff Leneveson, the Clerk had been informed that LCC (on receipt of a complaint made to them at the same time as the one made to the Parish Council) had visited the landowner to discuss the matter. It had appeared that Geoff had only recently learned of the 2022 trampling incident, and he was still in the process of determining the LCC stance with regard to the unauthorised diversion; this was likely to include a further site visit.

Members noted that the matter was therefore now fully in the hands of LCC, with no further role for the Parish Council.

c) Complaint 2 - footpath diverted without consent

At the July meeting, members had discussed a complaint from the Chair, who had noticed an unauthorised footpath diversion on Grindleton Fell behind Higher Asker House/Farm. As the landowner was not known, it had been agreed that the matter would be reported directly to LCC. A PROW officer from LCC had since confirmed that the landowner had been approached and advised that unauthorised diversion of a footpath (even during calving) was not allowed. It was, however, permissible for a notice to be displayed which (i) informed the public that cows and calves were present, and (ii) advised them that they may wish to use an alternative route.

Members noted the outcome, and considered their role in the matter closed.



<p>d)</p> <p>e)</p>	<p><u>Complaint 3 - rotted stile</u></p> <p>At the July meeting, members had noted the receipt of two complaints about a stile on FP0321047 (which ran from Chapel Lane to The Hey) and which had been found to be badly rotted.</p> <p>The stile was located along the boundary of two plots of land, each with a separate owner. A letter sent to one owner on 7 June had been responded to, although the issue of who was responsible for the stile had not been resolved. Accordingly, a second letter had been sent to the other landowner. Whilst not fully accepting responsibility to repair the stile, the second landowner (in an attempt to resolve the impasse) had agreed that installation of a kissing gate by LCC – at no cost to himself - would solve the problem, and he had asked that the agreement of the first landowner be sought. When approached by the Clerk, the first landowner had expressed support for the installation of a kissing gate, but had clearly indicated that he would prefer this to be installed by LCC free of charge. In light of this, the Clerk had contacted LCC for confirmation of the service they would provide here. However, no response from LCC had yet been received.</p> <p><u>Complaint 4 – rotted stile</u></p> <p>On 3 July, the Chair had advised the Clerk that she had encountered a rotten bottom step on a stile located on FP0321045. A letter had since been sent to the landowner, seeking his co-operation in making the stile fit for purpose. The Chair had since encountered the landowner, who had advised her that – while he had been too busy to repair the stile as yet – he had not forgotten about it.</p>	
<p>19.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p> <p>(cont)</p>	<p><b>Allotments</b></p> <p><u>Lead Member – allotments</u></p> <p>At the July meeting, the Clerk had been tasked with writing to all tenants and (i) asking them to provide an email address to improve ease of communication, and (ii) exploring whether they would want to have a formal meeting with the Clerk / Cllr Bramwell in order to discuss areas of concern / possible improvements.</p> <p>Members noted that only one tenant had replied to date, expressing general support for a tenants’ meeting to be held.</p> <p><u>Tenancy – Plot 1</u></p> <p>A further complaint had been received from the tenant of Plot 1, objecting to the ongoing presence of rubbish left by the previous tenant (even though she had first raised the issue several months ago).</p> <p>It had been agreed at the July meeting that the Lengthsman would obtain a permit for the LCC Household Waste site and complete the removal. After some delay, this has been obtained, and the final removal work was due to have been completed on Friday 28 July.</p>	

	<p>However, on 1 August, the Clerk had contacted the tenant for an update, and had been advised that – whilst the rubbish had been removed – a number of bins / tubs full of rubbish still remained. Cllr Bramwell was disappointed that the bins / tubs had not been removed, as he felt it was the Parish Council’s responsibility to ensure that this was done. It was agreed that Cllr Walsh would visit and inspect the remaining tubs, with a view to seeking their removal (with the assistance of other members) if possible.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Cllr Walsh to explore removal of the tubs / bins</b></p> <p>c) <u>Tenancy – Plot 8</u></p> <p>This plot had recently been taken on by a village resident. However, when the plot had been inspected, it had appeared that no more than 1/3 of the site had been cultivated, with the remainder left to grow wild.</p> <p>At the July meeting, members had agreed that – subject to the tenant’s future intentions with regard to plot usage - plot 8 could potentially be split in two, with one half being retained by the tenant and the other half rented out to another resident. However, the tenant had subsequently confirmed to the Clerk that he wished to retain the plot in its entirety, and would be digging it over in time for cultivation next Spring.</p> <p>Members were pleased to hear of his continued interest, and it was agreed that the Clerk and Cllr Bramwell would hold a site meeting with the tenant in due course in order to monitor progress and ensure that the tenant fully understood the boundaries of the plot for which he had assumed responsibility.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to arrange a site meeting with himself, Cllr Bramwell and the tenant</b></p>	<p>SW</p> <p>Clerk</p>
<p>20.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p>	<p><b>Miscellaneous matters</b></p> <p><u>Youth issues</u></p> <p>At the July meeting, members had discussed the possible attendance of LCC Youth Services in the parish with a view to supporting young people. Since then, the Chair had sought to finalise arrangements for a future visit. However, the staff responsible had now ceased to respond to her emails and it was therefore agreed to suspend further efforts for the time being.</p> <p><u>Drain</u></p> <p>Keith Hutton had contacted the Chair to suggest that the drain opposite the Chapel (at the Back Lane junction) was full and needed digging out. Cllr Wheeler had kindly undertaken this task, as well as digging out a second drain to the rear of Mandy Brennan’s property. Members thanked Cllr Wheeler for his efforts.</p> <p>It was also reported that a third drain (in the vicinity of the Friends’ Meeting House) was in need of clearing.</p>	

	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>CLlr Atkinson to inspect the drain / trough and assess the situation</b></p>	<p><b>PA</b></p>
21.	<p><b>Update from Ward Councillor present</b></p> <p>CLlr Horkin’s general comments had been made as appropriate throughout the meeting, with no further specific update at this point in the agenda.</p>	
22.	<p><b>Other meetings</b></p> <p><u>GRGC</u> – it was reported that discussions on the future use of the cricket field had been continuing. After a majority vote in favour, picnic benches (including one to be funded by the Parish Council) were to be installed, along with the development of a wild flower area. It was not proposed to utilise the site for residents’ car parking. A number of events were planned, including music nights and the “Gallopig Gourmet”. Chatburn FC had agreed to rent the football field for use during its home fixtures.</p> <p><u>Parish Councils’ Liaison Committee</u> – meeting to be held on 14 September 2023 (Chair and CLlr Atkinson to attend)</p> <p><u>LALC</u> – no update</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Feedback from LALC meetings was to be removed from future agendas and replaced with WASP</b></p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p>
23.	<p><b>Correspondence received</b></p> <p>a) <u>LCC – Safe Trader Scheme (deferred from the July meeting)</u></p> <p>The Parish Council had received an approach from officers at LCC, who were seeking to promote the Safe Trader scheme to local communities and had offered to visit any community groups who may be interested.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to forward the information to Anne Huson for her consideration</b></p> <p>b) <u>Community Payback / Instant Action</u></p> <p>The Parish Council had received a letter from central government outlining its stance on Community Payback etc.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>This item would be deferred until the next meeting</b></p> <p>c) <u>Registering local defibrillators (deferred from the July meeting)</u></p> <p>The Parish Council had received a letter from central government regarding possible registration of local defibrillators on a national database known as The Circuit. As a result, the Chair had contacted Georgie Hutton and confirmed that:</p>	<p><b>LH</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a defibrillator was located at the Pavilion, along with 3 others positioned around the village;</li> <li>• responsibility for the Pavilion defibrillator (and its registration with The Circuit) remained with Anne Huson;</li> <li>• Georgie would register the other 3 defibrillators with The Circuit over the coming week and would advise when this was completed; and</li> <li>• defibrillator pads are due for renewal every 2-3 years. Georgie was happy to continue to monitor this, and to replace the pads on the defibrillators (other than that at the Pavilion) as required. She would continue to undertake regular checks on the defibrillators to ensure battery life etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to advise Anne Huson of the expectation that the defibrillator at the Pavilion would be registered with The Circuit</b></p>	LH
d)	<p><u>Request to use Millennium Wood to support a Community Forest School</u></p> <p>The Parish Council had been contacted by leaders of a Community Forest School based in Accrington, who for educational purposes wished to access the Millenium Wood. Members noted that, with the agreement of the Chair, the request had been referred to the Woodland Trust (as the body responsible for managing the Millennium Wood), and Mr Riley had agreed to liaise with the Forest School accordingly.</p>	
e)	<p><u>Potholes – Sawley Rd</u></p> <p>Parish Cllr Walsh had raised with the Clerk the issue of two potholes on Sawley Rd, one near the junction with Bowland High School and the other near Foxley Bank Stables. Accordingly, the Clerk had raised this matter with LCC and had subsequently been advised that LCC would not undertake any repair in this instance as the defects reported were not in fact on the adopted highway.</p> <p>In view of the above, Cllr Walsh had initially suggested that it would be appropriate for the Parish Council to raise the issue of the potholes with Bowland School, given that the majority of one hole was on the road outside Foxley Bank Stables (and right on the junction of Sawley Road, opposite the school). However, at least one of the potholes had now been filled in, and members agreed to monitor the situation.</p>	
24.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>None</p>	
	<p><b>The next meeting of Grindleton Parish Council will take place at 7.30pm on Tuesday 5 September 2023 at Grindleton Pavilion</b></p>	

The meeting closed at 10pm.

Signed by:		
	Date: 5.9.23	Cllr G Wheeler Vice-Chair