



## 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 on Tuesday 3 December 2024 at the Pavilion, Grindleton.**

Members present:	Parish Cllr Lorraine Halley (Chair) Parish Cllr Paul Atkinson Parish Cllr Tony Bramwell Parish Cllr Megan Haslam Parish Cllr Susan Walsh Borough Cllr Kevin Horkin MBE (RVBC)
Apologies for absence:	Parish Cllr Glenn Wheeler (Vice Chair) Parish Cllr Chris Brennan
Clerk present:	Andrew Glover
County Cllr present:	None
Members of the public present:	Ms Julie Skorupka
United Utilities representatives:	Dave Watson (Head of Planning) Matt Postlethwaite (Engagement Lead, HARP project)

1.	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Standing orders suspended</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">None</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) Standing orders resumed</p>	
2.	<p><b>Public Participation</b></p> <p>Ms Julie Skorupka (JS) wished to raise two matters relating to Shaw Terrace.</p> <p>Firstly, JS was concerned that the sign relating to the public right of way (numbered FP0321054) on Shaw Terrace had been removed. As a result, residents had been inconvenienced by the noise from walkers trying to follow the path in question, and who had sought her assistance when unsure of the footpath's route.</p>	

	<p>JS' attempts to secure the help of the County Council's Public Rights of Way team in replacing the sign had proved unsuccessful, and she now wondered if the Parish Council would be able to advise on next steps. The Chair confirmed that she had a suitable replacement sign in her possession, and – whilst she did not have authority to position the sign on private property, where it had originally been located - she would arrange for this to be placed on a post near to the access stile. JS appeared to consider this an acceptable way forward.</p> <p>Secondly, JS wished to query the accuracy of the Parish Council's published minutes relating to the meeting held on 6 August 2024. These minutes outlined members' consideration of planning application 3/2024/0149, with particular regard to parish councillors' decision in March 2024 not to oppose the application on the grounds that "no objections had been expressed". JS disputed this assertion as, to her knowledge, at least 3 objections to the application had been submitted to RVBC. The Chair confirmed that, in her view, the statement "no objections had been expressed" was in fact accurate as it related solely to the deliberations carried out by members in email correspondence prior to the March meeting. The Parish Council had no decision-making remit with regard to planning applications – it fell solely to the Borough Council as Local Planning Authority to determine whether planning approval should be granted. The Parish Council merely acted as a consultee, and the minutes of the August meeting simply reflected members' own internal dialogue; whether other parties had submitted responses to the Borough Council would presumably have been unknown to the Parish Council at that time.</p> <p>The Clerk undertook to write a letter to JS in formal response to her comments.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to pursue</b></p>	Clerk
3.	<p><b>Minutes / matters arising</b></p> <p>a) To resolve that the minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 1 October 2024 be signed as a correct record.</p> <p>Proposer – Cllr Haslam Seconder – Cllr Bramwell</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Members agreed that the minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 1 October 2024 should be signed as a correct record and published on the Parish Council website</b></p> <p>b) <u>Actions taken / matters arising since the last meeting (not covered elsewhere on the agenda):</u></p> <p>The Clerk had compiled a list of actions for members to note / update briefly on progress since the last meeting.</p>	Clerk

	<p>Subject to a guillotine of 30 minutes, members gave verbal updates on their respective actions. These were captured by Cllr Haslam on the list retained by the Clerk.</p>	
<p>4.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p> <p>c)</p> <p>d)</p>	<p><b>Overview of financial position</b></p> <p><u>Income and Expenditure – October 2024</u></p> <p>A statement of income and expenditure for the month of October 2024 was provided for members’ consideration.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Members approved this statement as an accurate record of transactions during October 2024</b></p> <p><u>Income and Expenditure – November 2024</u></p> <p>A statement of income and expenditure for the month of November 2024 was provided for members’ consideration.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Members approved this statement as an accurate record of transactions during November 2024</b></p> <p><u>Savings balance - United Trust Bank</u></p> <p>Members were pleased to learn that the Parish Council’s savings account with United Trust bank had been credited with £892.05 in interest, giving an overall balance of £21,581.41.</p> <p><u>Budget – increase to National Insurance Contributions (NICs)</u></p> <p>In her budget on 30 October, the Chancellor had announced that – from 6 April 2025 - the rate of employer contributions would rise from 13.8% to 15%. In addition, the threshold at which employers would start paying the tax on each employee’s salary was to be reduced from £9,100 per year to £5,000.</p> <p>The NHS and other public sector bodies were to be exempted from these changes. However, NALC had recently been informed that the Local Council (parish &amp; town councils) sector was not defined as a 'direct' public sector body and therefore would not benefit from the exemption.</p> <p>In 2023/24, the Clerk’s gross salary had been £5,500; this sum was above the £5,000 threshold and would therefore potentially become liable for payment of NICs. Given that a Clerk’s salary would rise with inflation, members noted that they may need to factor this into their future financial planning. (Informal discussions with LALC had indicated that a salary of c£5,500 would henceforth render the Parish Council liable to pay NICs of £75pa).</p>	

e)

Precept 2025/26

The Parish Council had been asked to officially confirm its requested precept for 2025/26 to RVBC by Tuesday 24 December 2024.

In order to encourage discussion, the Clerk had produced a document outlining a range of options for an increase to the 2025/26 precept. Members also took into account that, whilst less severe than in recent years, the rate of inflation (as calculated under the Consumer Price Index) had still risen by 2.6% in the 12 months to September 2024.

After lengthy deliberation, it was agreed that a rise in the precept of 5% for 2025/26 would be appropriate. (This increase was proposed by Cllr Atkinson and seconded by Cllr Bramwell; it was carried on a unanimous vote). This increase would raise the precept by £473, to £9,933, from its current level of £9,460. The amount payable by each of the parish's 356 households liable for Band D Council Tax would rise by £1.48, from the current £26.42 to £27.90.

In reaching this decision, members noted that – due to financial constraints imposed by the County Council - the cost of proposed works to improve highways safety in the village (as discussed as part of the WASP initiative) was likely to fall upon the Parish Council. The additional £473 generated through the precept for 2025/26 would therefore be dedicated solely to highway safety initiatives. Should this money not be spent on such works during 2025/26, members would seek to roll this sum forward and ideally not increase the precept in the following year.

**Resolved**

**Members agreed to:**

- **raise the precept for 2025/26 by 5%, from £9,460 to £9,933;**
- **authorise the Chair and Clerk to sign the documentation provided by RVBC accordingly; and**
- **ask the Clerk to forward the completed documentation to RVBC by the stated deadline of Tuesday 24 December 2024**

Members thanked Cllr Atkinson for his online research on levels of precept agreed by parishes across the County, which confirmed that Grindleton was largely in line with the rates levied. However, for future meetings it would be helpful if any documentation added to the agenda by members were to be captured in a separate folder set up by the Clerk on Google Drive

**Resolved**

**For future agenda, Clerk to establish a folder entitled "Members' Contributions in the relevant folder on Google Drive**

f)

VAT claim

Members noted that, in March 2024, the Clerk had submitted his usual claim on behalf of the Parish Council for a VAT refund. However, this had been rejected due to a combination of (i) the amount claimed being less than £100 and (ii) the period of claim covering less than 12 months.

cont

Chair /  
Clerk  
Clerk

The sum of £76.66 in VAT owed had now been recouped from HMRC.

g) Lengthsman

i) Salary claims / timesheets

Members agreed that the new system (in which the Lengthsman was required to submit electronic timesheets to accompany his salary claims) was working well. However, a number of historical discrepancies still remained, and members – after due consideration of the documentation available – reached the following conclusions:

- **Cllr Walsh** would draft a timesheet on behalf of the Lengthsman for his January 2024 claim, which could then be paid;
- **Cllr Walsh** would locate and upload onto the system the documentation for the June 2024 claim; and
- the claim for April 2024 could now be paid.

SW

SW

h) Changes to Lloyds Bank account

Lloyds Bank had indicated its intention, from 14 January 2025, to change the account used by the Parish Council from a “Treasurers Account” to a “Community Account (intended for use by not-for-profit organisations with an annual turnover of less than £250k pa). This would result in the following changes:

- a monthly maintenance fee of £4.25 would become payable; and
- charges for electronic and cash payments would be introduced. (However, the first 100 of such payments per month would remain free of charge).

Members noted the above changes but did not consider beneficial to seek an alternative banking provider at this time.

i) Backpay 2024/25

In late October, the Clerk had been advised that the National Joint Council for Local Government Services had reached agreement on rates of pay for all local government employees applicable from 1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025.

From 1 April 2024, the Clerk had been paid at SCP 19 (£15.48 per hour) and this amount had now risen to £16.10, an increase of £0.62 per hour.

From 1 April 2024, up until the date of his salary claim for Q2 (25 September 2024) the Clerk had worked the following hours:

April	26.93
May	13.45
June	19.13
July	17.80
August	17.14

September (1 -25)	3.25
-------------------	------

This gave an overall total of 97.70 hours, which at £0.62 per hour totalled £60.57 before tax.

The Clerk offered to leave the room while members considered this matter.

**Resolved**

**Members agreed to:**

- award the amount of £60.57 in gross back pay to the Clerk for the period from 1 April – 25 September 2024;
- agree that the Clerk should liaise with the Chair to arrange for payment of the net sum and PAYE due; and
- increase the Clerk’s ongoing hourly remuneration for SCP 19 to £16.10 from 25 September 2024, in accordance with the nationally-agreed pay settlement

Clerk/  
Chair

5. **Improving PC effectiveness**

a) Shared document storage

At the October meeting, Cllr Atkinson had presented a viable alternative to the previously considered Microsoft 365 system. He had set up an account with Google, using the email address:

[grindletonparishcouncil@gmail.com](mailto:grindletonparishcouncil@gmail.com)

Using a password, members were now able to access free document storage up to 15 gb (with additional storage available to purchase at a nominal rate). This facility could be populated with Parish Council documents, which could then be worked on / added to by the Clerk and other members.

Since the meeting, Cllr Atkinson had moved a number of current GPC electronic records to the Google system, and had circulated instructions to members on accessing the website.

Members agreed that the new approach to document storage was a considerable step forward for the Parish Council, and thanked Cllr Atkinson for his efforts.

b) Village communications

The Parish Council had previously sought to engage with village residents (on issues such as local events, the Best Kept Village competition etc) by using an email distribution list compiled and retained by GRGC. However, this would no longer be viable as GRGC was contemplating a move to wider access via a multiple account and verification facility (Mail Chimp).

The Chair had been discussing with GRGC the financial implications of this new approach for the Parish Council. It had emerged that – in order to have full access to the GRGC system (along with the email addresses of all residents who had

	<p>signed up to the system) – a monthly cost of £15 would be payable to GRGC. Members acknowledged the benefits of such access, but considered that the proposed monthly sum would be excessive for their needs. It was therefore agreed that the Chair would go back to GRGC and ask whether that body would, once per year, provide the Parish Council with a download of participating residents’ email addresses. This would be subject to GRGC obtaining the consent of all participating residents as required under Data Protection legislation.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to enter into further dialogue with GRGC</b></p> <p>c) <u>Frequency of meetings</u></p> <p>At the AGM in May 2024, members had reflected on their preferred frequency of meeting and agreed to revert meetings being held on a bi-monthly basis. It had also been agreed that a further discussion on the success of this move would be held in December 2024.</p> <p>Members agreed to continue with bi-monthly meetings for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>d) <u>Government consultation - Enabling remote attendance and proxy voting at local authority meetings</u></p> <p>The government was consulting (for a period of 8 weeks from 24 October 2024) on its intention to introduce changes to public meetings (and which would directly impact the working of parish councils). The proposed changes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● to allow members to attend parish council meetings remotely rather than in person; and</li> <li>● to introduce proxy voting, thereby allowing members who may be temporarily unable to participate in meetings to do so even if remote attendance provisions were in place.</li> </ul> <p>Responses were sought from parish councils and/or individual parish councillors on this topic. Following discussion of this matter at the Parish Councils Liaison Committee, some members had already attempted to complete the consultation questionnaire but commented that it had been very user-unfriendly.</p>	<b>Chair</b>
6.	<p><b>New draft Financial Regulations</b></p> <p>At the August meeting, members had considered a draft of proposed new financial regulations (based upon a template produced by the National Association of Local Councils). Members had accepted the need to update their financial procedures, but also acknowledged the importance of ensuring that any new approach adopted was both relevant and appropriate. It had therefore been agreed that the Clerk and Cllr Bramwell would meet in order to (i) further examine the content of the proposed draft regulations and (ii) iron out any inconsistencies that may arise with the current Standing Orders.</p> <p>cont</p>	

This meeting had taken place on 24 October 2024, and as a result the Clerk had prepared a draft version of the Regulations for members to consider. The Clerk and Cllr Bramwell were keen to ensure that the proposed Regulations were neither excessively onerous nor disproportionate for a parish council of Grindleton's size. The following key points were drawn to members' attention:

<b>Para:</b>	<b>Issue:</b>
2.3	Any new activity costing £5,000 or more shall be risk assessed
2.6	Rather than ask a member to reconcile the accounts each quarter, the Clerk shall carry out a monthly reconciliation exercise on the Parish Council's current account. This shall be circulated electronically to all members for their consideration prior to the monthly meeting.
2.7	Each quarter, the Clerk / RFO will make back-up copies of the records on any council computer (or Google collective storage facility) to be stored either online or in a separate location from the computer.
4.2 / 4.3	At present, all budget headings – including salaries – are approved at the AGM in May. It is now proposed that a draft budget is presented to members at the first meeting of the financial year (April) rather than at the AGM in May.
4.8	Any member with council tax unpaid for more than two months is prohibited from voting on the budget or precept by Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and must and must disclose at the start of the meeting that Section 106 applies to them.
12.3	The Parish Council review on an annual basis any investments currently held
13.7	With regard to income from the allotments, the Clerk / RFO will seek to issue a receipt (by email if possible) for all monies received.

Members agreed to adopt the revised Financial Regulations with immediate effect and thanked the Clerk / Cllr Bramwell for their work on this.

**Resolved**

**Clerk to arrange for the revised Financial Regulations to be presented to each AGM for consideration / readoption**

**Clerk**

**8. Planning applications to be considered**

A) Applications on which the Parish Council is a consultee

- i) Planning Applications No: 3/2024/0439 and 3/2024/440  
 Proposal: Application for planning permission for change of use from public house with living accommodation to residential use. Demolition of side and rear extensions and construction of single-storey extension to side and detached garage. Alteration to vehicle access and creation of domestic curtilage  
 Location: Duke of York Inn, Grindleton Brow, Grindleton BB7 4QR

This application had been approved by RVBC on 15 October 2024; since that date, a number of developments had occurred. In particular, these included the need



for the Chair to report concerns around the erection of fencing around the building, which had resulted in the loss of use of parts of the pavement. This impacted pedestrians; schoolchildren waiting for school transport; and walkers seeking to access the adjacent Millennium Wood. The matter was compounded by the premises being on a blind bend and with no footpath on the opposite side of the road.

Attempts to resolve these issues with RVBC and LCC had been unsuccessful. Given the concerns for public safety, it was agreed that the help of Cllr Horkin would be enlisted. The Clerk would write to Cllr Horkin with a summary of the problems encountered to date, with a view to Cllr Horkin raising these concerns with either (i) officers at RVBC and/or LCC (via County Cllr Mirfin) or (ii) the landowner.

**Resolved**

**Clerk to write to Cllr Horkin**

**Clerk**

- ii) Planning application No: 3/2023/0973  
Proposal: Retention of 14 solar panels on the South east facing roofslope.  
Resubmission of 3/2023/0297  
Location: Rushton House Lower Chapel Lane Grindleton BB7 4QT  
APPEAL REFERENCE: APP/T2350/D/24/3344365  
APPEAL STARTING DATE: 2nd July 2024

An appeal against the Borough Council's decision to refuse this application had been lodged, but had yet to be heard.

Members noted with some frustration that it was taking a considerable time for clarity to emerge around the issue of solar panels and when planning consent was required. It was agreed that, in an effort to better understand the timescales involved and when the Parish Council would be in a position to develop its own definitive policy, an approach should be made to RVBC.

**Resolved**

**Clerk to pursue and copy in Cllr Haslam**

**Clerk**

- B) Other applications on which the Parish Council was not considered a statutory consultee

Planning application No: 3/2024/0748  
Proposal: Prior approval under Class Q (a) and (b) for the proposed conversion of agricultural stone barn to one two-storey dwelling.  
Location: Laneside Barn, Grindleton Road, Grindleton BB7 4QH

Site history:

Members noted the following:

- the precedent for conversion from agricultural use to residential occupation had been established with the approval of applications 3/2019/0760 and 3/2021/0307;

- however, Clause 1 of application 21/0307 stated that "The development hereby permitted shall be completed before the expiration of three years of the date of this prior approval." As this had presumably not been the case, resubmission was required;
- application 3/2024/0380 had sought to gain the required consent, but had been refused on the grounds that it failed to provide the "definitive confirmation that significant reconstruction works would not be required to the application building in order to support the residential use proposed";
- the latest application (3/2024/0748) had also sought to remedy the above defect, but had again been **refused** on 6 November 2024 due to "the building operations proposed as part of the development would go beyond what is "reasonably necessary" to change the use of the building and would include the construction of new structural elements for the building."

LCC (in its role as Highways Authority) had not objected to the latest application, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions. Details of the LCC comments had been circulated to members for their information.

For reasons that remained unclear, the Parish Council had not been considered a statutory consultee on this latest application and had not been formally invited to comment. However, with the agreement of the Chair, the Clerk had drafted a letter (confirming the Parish Council's non-opposition to the application) and submitted this to RVBC on 8 October (the day before the consultation period may have ended). A copy of the Clerk's letter had been provided to members for their information.

Members accepted that this was a somewhat technical area of Planning legislation, and thanked Cllr Horkin for his attempts to explain the legal background as he understood it.

Since the refusal of application 3/2024/0748, the Chair had been contacted by the applicant, who sought the support of the Parish Council in his endeavours; he was conscious that if no application were to be approved prior to May 2025 then any consent to convert the premises to occupational use would lapse. Members considered the applicant's request, and asked the Clerk to write to the applicant and indicate the following:

- any decision to grant planning approval lay solely in the hands of the Borough Council as Local Planning Authority, the role of the Parish Council being solely that of consultee;
- should the applicant wish to resubmit prior to his May deadline, the Parish Council would consider the application once again (each individual application being treated solely on its merits); and
- it was possible that any future application could be "called in" by the ward councillor, thereby ensuring that it would be considered by members the full Planning and Development Committee rather than determined by

	<p>officers. The applicant may therefore wish to keep his ward councillor informed of his intentions in that regard.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to draft a response to the applicant</b></p> <p>C) <u>Planning matter – confidential</u></p> <p>Members considered this matter <i>in camera</i>.</p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p>
<p>9.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><b>Haweswater Aqueduct Resilience Programme (HARP)</b></p> <p><u>Planning application 3/2021/0661 - update</u></p> <p>At the August meeting, members had considered details of a briefing provided by HARP representatives to West Bradford Parish Council. As a result, and following further email communication between the Clerk and United Utilities (UU), it had been agreed that the following representatives of UU would attend the December meeting and provide an update on the situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Dave Watson (Head of Planning)</li> <li>● Matt Postlethwaite (newly appointed engagement lead specifically for the HARP project)</li> </ul> <p>Iain Pilling (Area Engagement Lead – Lancashire) had been due to attend, but was unfortunately obliged to be present at another meeting and therefore tendered his apologies.</p> <p>Following introductions, and a welcome from the Chair, the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the next phases of the project could be set out as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>0-6 months</b> from now: the contract to undertake the groundworks would be awarded to one of the two candidate companies, and final planning consents for tunnelling etc would be secured (including the enforced change to the location of the Park and Ride scheme). Residents would not notice much activity during this period;</li> <li>- <b>6-12 months</b> from now: preliminary works to the highways (along with vegetation clearance) would be undertaken; and</li> <li>- <b>12-18 months</b> from now: construction of the compounds would begin, along with the main areas of work;</li> </ul> </li> <li>● it was not possible at this stage to give much further detail about issues of importance to residents, as much of this would fall to the contractor (when appointed) to determine. For instance, the precise order in which the tunnels would be completed was a matter for the contractor to dictate (although as the Bowland section was the longest length of tunnel at 17km, it was likely that this would be commenced first);</li> <li>● given the significant role of the contractor in many aspects of the process, the appointment (when made) would be widely publicised and a representative of the successful company would attend a future meeting of the Parish Council, probably 6-12 months from now;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the sum of £10,000 would be made available to Grindleton parish in the form of statutory “section 106” funding, although the mechanics of how this sum would be accessed were not yet clear. Other non-statutory “social value” benefits (employment opportunities and other enhancements) may also emerge through the contractor, once appointed;</li> <li>• in terms of future liaison, Matt Postlethwaite would take the lead for UU. The contractor would also appoint an officer with responsibilities for engagement, this person being required to be available whenever work was taking place. UU would also fund an officer to be based within LCC as a point of contact for works to the highways, and RVBC would also part-fund an officer who could be contacted if needed;</li> <li>• Cllr Bramwell sought assurances that surveys would be carried out on Grindleton properties to determine whether damage would be / had been caused by vehicular traffic. He was advised that the contractor would undertake this work wherever there was potential for damage to occur;</li> <li>• Cllr Bramwell also raised the issue of possible impact damage to vehicles parked on East View during the maximum period of 9 months when the temporary bridge would be constructed. In response, he was advised that limits on traffic movements were in place (a maximum of 7 vehicles per day, with an average of 2 vehicles per day) and the contractor would be expected to implement mitigation strategies where required;</li> <li>• Cllr Haslam enquired whether an Environmental Management Plan would be completed. She was advised that this would be a responsibility for the contractor, but that land had already been acquired for “biodiversity net gain” and work was underway to partner with the organisations such as National Landscape;</li> <li>• it was noted that RVBC was intending to commission an Economic Impact Assessment to explore the extent to which local businesses may suffer financial harm. UU representatives stated that they would work with RVBC should their input be required, and that any claims for loss of profit would be paid out if verified;</li> <li>• including reinstatement works, the anticipated length of the project remained at 7 years, with tunnelling taking up 3 of these; and</li> <li>• approval for dumping of waste in Waddington Fell Quarry had now been secured.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair thanked the UU representatives for taking the time to update members on the current situation.</p>	
<p>10.</p> <p>A)</p>	<p><b>Footpaths</b></p> <p><u>Log of footpath concerns</u></p> <p>It had previously been agreed that any member who walked a footpath and identified a problem with it should bring a report to the following meeting of the Parish Council. The Clerk would then capture this information and, as required, update the master copy of the spreadsheet kept to capture such matters. The Parish Council would then seek to pursue a solution to the issue with the landowner (whilst again acknowledging that it had no power to compel any action in this regard). Should no repair be forthcoming, the matter would then be referred to LCC PROW for officers to address.</p>	

	<p>The latest version of the log was presented for members’ information.</p> <p>Since the August meeting, the following referral has been made to LCC PROW officers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bridleway BW 0321038 – defective sign at Grindleton Forest / Fell Rd end</li> </ul> <p>B) <u>New concerns raised</u></p> <p>i) <u>Footpath – FP03444016</u></p> <p>At the October meeting, members had received a complaint from a resident of Grindleton, expressing concern that the footpath from West Clough to Heys Farm was impeded by a number of fallen trees and completely blocked at the top. As the footpath fell within West Bradford parish, it had been referred to WBPC for consideration. Members were pleased to note that the footpath had now been cleared.</p> <p>ii) <u>Footpath FP0321047</u></p> <p>At the request of the Chair, the Clerk had written to the tenant of the land on which a faulty stile was located. The stile was on Chapel Lane, at the junction of footpaths FP0321047 and FP0321046.</p> <p>The recipient of the letter had subsequently telephoned the Clerk and indicated that, as tenant, in his opinion the matter was – initially at least – a matter for the landowner. It had been agreed that the tenant would therefore pass the letter onto the landowner, so that an agreement on a way forward could be reached. It was reported that this matter had also now been addressed and no further action was required.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to update log</b></p> <p>The Chair confirmed that she had become aware of a problem with a stile on the footpath to the rear of the Pavilion. The landowner had been identified and further enquiries made.</p>	Clerk												
11.	<p><b>Other reports submitted to LCC and other bodies</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 1576 1283 1727"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>By</th> <th>To</th> <th>Ref No</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Issue</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>22.10.24</td> <td>LH</td> <td>UU</td> <td></td> <td>Between flower tub and Rum Fox</td> <td>Missing cover for stop tap replaced</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date	By	To	Ref No	Location	Issue	22.10.24	LH	UU		Between flower tub and Rum Fox	Missing cover for stop tap replaced	
Date	By	To	Ref No	Location	Issue									
22.10.24	LH	UU		Between flower tub and Rum Fox	Missing cover for stop tap replaced									
12.	<p><b>Lancashire Best Kept Village Competition 2024</b></p> <p>a) <u>Attendance at the presentation event</u></p> <p>The presentation event had been held on 14 October 2024, at Eaves Hall, West Bradford. The parish had been represented by the Chair and a local resident, Veronica Milward.</p>													

<p>b)</p> <p>c)</p> <p>d)</p> <p>13.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><u>Results</u></p> <p>Members were delighted to note that Grindleton had fared particularly well in this year’s competition, as shown by the table below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 371 1283 887"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Placing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Champion Village</td> <td>Winner</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outstanding Features – Public Houses and Restaurants (22 entries)</td> <td>8<sup>th</sup> - The Rum Fox</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outstanding Features - Public Building (21 entries)</td> <td>Highly Commended (ie 3<sup>rd</sup>) – the Pavilion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outstanding Features - Community Notice Board (20 entries)</td> <td>2nd</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outstanding Features - Heritage Feature (15 entries)</td> <td>Winner – Commemorative Table</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outstanding Features - Public Playing Fields (16 entries)</td> <td>5<sup>th</sup>=</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outstanding Features - Children’s Play Area (16 entries)</td> <td>Highly Commended (3<sup>rd</sup>) - Playground</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Chair was willing to retain the trophy for the Champion Village (which she brought along for members to see), along with the certificates received, unless the Rum Fox would be willing to display it on their premises.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to approach owner of the Rum Fox</b></p> <p>The Chair thanked members for their support, and reported that she had sent a range of thank-you letters to persons who had assisted the Parish Council in its efforts around the village. The commemorative plaque had been installed by local residents, who had been reimbursed accordingly.</p> <p><u>Feedback</u></p> <p>Members noted the very positive feedback provided by the competition judges. The relevant report had been circulated to councillors and pertinent specifics had been sent to other groups (eg the church, GRGC and the Rum Fox).</p> <p><u>Learning points to be captured for 2025 competition</u></p> <p>Whilst Cllr Wheeler had circulated some suggestions for the 2025 competition, members felt that the biggest advantage possessed by the village was its community spirit and willingness of residents to participate. Attempts would be made to continue this during the 2025 competition.</p>	Category	Placing	Champion Village	Winner	Outstanding Features – Public Houses and Restaurants (22 entries)	8 <sup>th</sup> - The Rum Fox	Outstanding Features - Public Building (21 entries)	Highly Commended (ie 3 <sup>rd</sup> ) – the Pavilion	Outstanding Features - Community Notice Board (20 entries)	2nd	Outstanding Features - Heritage Feature (15 entries)	Winner – Commemorative Table	Outstanding Features - Public Playing Fields (16 entries)	5 <sup>th</sup> =	Outstanding Features - Children’s Play Area (16 entries)	Highly Commended (3 <sup>rd</sup> ) - Playground	<p>Chair</p>
Category	Placing																	
Champion Village	Winner																	
Outstanding Features – Public Houses and Restaurants (22 entries)	8 <sup>th</sup> - The Rum Fox																	
Outstanding Features - Public Building (21 entries)	Highly Commended (ie 3 <sup>rd</sup> ) – the Pavilion																	
Outstanding Features - Community Notice Board (20 entries)	2nd																	
Outstanding Features - Heritage Feature (15 entries)	Winner – Commemorative Table																	
Outstanding Features - Public Playing Fields (16 entries)	5 <sup>th</sup> =																	
Outstanding Features - Children’s Play Area (16 entries)	Highly Commended (3 <sup>rd</sup> ) - Playground																	
	<p><b>Events</b></p> <p><u>Celebration to mark the re-opening of footpaths in the Millennium Wood</u></p> <p>The Parish Council had been invited to participate in the celebratory event held to mark the completion of upgrade to the paths in the Millennium Wood. This free</p>																	

	<p>event had taken place on Saturday 12 October 2024. Although the weather had been very wet, the event (featuring a walk around the wood followed by excellent refreshments provided by the Rum Fox) had gone very well.</p> <p>b) <u>Switch-on of Xmas lights</u></p> <p>This event had been held on Thursday 28 November 2024, and again was considered a success.</p> <p>The Chair presented the risk assessment which she had put together for the event. One problem which had arisen related to the need to hire a cherry picker for use in dressing the tree. The hire fee had amounted to £203.16 inc VAT, and a similar sum would need to be spent in taking the lights down. Members considered a number of options to mitigate this cost (such as using a smaller tree, or leaving the lights in situ all year) but on balance considered the fee acceptable given the benefits conveyed.</p> <p>c) <u>Remembrance Day 2024</u></p> <p>Thanks went to Cllr Haslam for her efforts in acquiring the silhouettes displayed at the cherry trees, as well as to her and her partner for their erection. Cllr Haslam would safely retain the silhouette in her garage until next year.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to amend the Asset Register accordingly</b></p> <p>Cllr Bramwell had also lain a wreath on behalf of the Parish Council at the Remembrance Day church service.</p>	Clerk
14.	<p><b>Allotments</b></p> <p>a) <u>General issues</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p>b) <u>1981 lease agreement / possible areas of conflict with tenancy agreement to be explored</u></p> <p>Members had previously agreed that the Clerk should write to RVBC and ask officers to address two issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) whether the wording of Clause 2(8) of the existing 1981 lease could be revisited so as to allow the Parish Council to recoup its reasonable costs incurred in providing the allotments; and</li> <li>ii) whether – at the same time – RVBC would consider changes to Clause 2(9) of the lease, which stated that “one greenhouse and one implement shed only shall be erected on each allotment”, and that each shed or greenhouse should be “subject to a maximum gross area of One hundred square feet”.</li> </ul>	

RVBC had initially indicated its support for the above proposals. However, since the October meeting of the Parish Council, RVBC appeared to have changed its stance after a further approach from the Clerk, who had been advised that:

- in general terms, wholesale changes to the rental agreement were not practical as the wording of the agreement was standard and largely in line with that imposed upon other parishes; but
- there was however some room for manoeuvre in that the maximum area of one shed and greenhouse per plot could potentially be reduced to 50 square feet.

There was a general assumption that amending the lease would result in an increase to the £10 annual site currently paid by the Parish Council to RVBC. However, the wording of Clause 2(8) of the 1981 lease would then assume greater significance, as it suggested that the Parish Council could not generate any income through rent charged to tenants than it pays to the Borough Council.

(8) That where the premises or part thereof are underlet or assigned for allotment purposes the rent charged by the Parish Council for such underlettings or assignments shall not exceed in total the rent reserved by this Deed \_\_\_\_\_

The Clerk had subsequently received an assurance that RVBC was looking to remove Clause 2(8) from the revised agreement.

c) Complaint – unauthorised pruning of tree

Members were reminded that the Parish Council had received a complaint that a tree on the allotment site had been impacting upon tenants. The tree had been pruned by tenants, without the requisite agreement of the Borough Council as landowner or Parish Council as tenant.

Details of the unauthorised tree pruning had been forwarded to RVBC as landowner in July 2024. The Clerk understood that the views of the Borough Council's Arboricultural Officer had now been sought, and it had been agreed that the matter could be dealt with by education as opposed to sanction, and that some informative written material would be forwarded to the Clerk in the post. This, however, had not been received.

d) Request for shed

The tenants of Plot 6 had approached the Parish Council seeking agreement to erect shed on their plot. Any decision on this matter had been deferred up to now pending clarification of RVBC's stance on proposed amendments to the terms of its 1981 lease.

Whilst members could not see any real objection to this request, it was agreed that no definitive decision could be made pending clarification from RVBC on the proposed lease amendments.



e)	<p><u>Tenants' meeting</u></p> <p>Members were keen to note that tenants had previously been advised that a meeting would be held at the end of the season. However, given the lack of progress with lease amendments (which in turn dictated the Parish Council's stance on matter such as shed erection), it was impractical to hold a meeting at this time. Instead, it was agreed that a letter / email would be sent to all tenants, advising them of the situation and the reasons for the delay.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to draft for initial consideration by Cllr Bramwell prior to circulation</b></p>	Clerk
15.	<p><b>Rural Prosperity Fund</b></p> <p>a) <u>Permissive footpath</u></p> <p>No update</p>	
16.	<p><b>Update from Ward Councillor present</b></p> <p>Cllr Horkin commented briefly (and in outline) on (i) the HARP initiative and (ii) ongoing developments in terms of a devolved combined authority for Lancashire, the latter provoking a general debate on its merits. He went on to discuss the thoughts of the RVBC Conservative Group on how to reduce the £18.5m held in the authority's reserve funding. Possible measures included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● giving a grant to every parish council for them to spend locally;</li> <li>● giving a rebate to every Council Tax payer over the next 2 years; and</li> <li>● the introduction of free parking in local town centres.</li> </ul> <p>Cllr Atkinson sought Cllr Horkin's views on the proposed relocation of the borough's waste recycling facility (currently on Henthorn Rd) and whether this matter should be revisited at the Parish Councils Liaison Committee. Cllr Horkin shared some of his thinking on this matter, outlining the possible risks to retention of the site in the borough. However, members agreed that – on such an important issue - a constructive dialogue between the Borough Council and parish councils was important, and agreed that Cllr Atkinson should write to the Chair of the PCLC and ask for a discussion to be held at the next meeting of that body.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Cllr Atkinson to pursue</b></p>	PA
17.	<p><b>Other meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>GGRC</b> – the solar panels had now been in operation for several weeks.</li> <li>● <b>Parish Councils' Liaison Committee</b> – Cllr Atkinson had attended this meeting, held on 7 November 2024, with much of the content covered elsewhere in these minutes.</li> <li>● <b>WASP</b> – no date had yet been fixed for the next meeting.</li> </ul>	

<p>18.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p> <p>c)</p>	<p><b>Correspondence received</b></p> <p><u>Register of Electors 2024/25</u></p> <p>RVBC had written to the Clerk indicating that members were entitled to receive one copy of the full electoral register for the parish.</p> <p>On acquisition, the register was only to be used for certain specified purposes, such as the prevention / detection of crime or checking a person’s identity when they apply for credit. It was a criminal offence to pass information on the register to any other person, or to use the register for an unspecified purpose.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members did not consider it necessary to acquire a copy of the Register of Electors at this time</b></p> <p><u>Business Register and Employment Survey 2024</u></p> <p>In late October 2024, the Clerk had received a formal letter (originally sent to the wrong address) stating that the Parish Council had been expected to complete and return, by 4 October 2024, the Business and Employment Survey 2024; failure to meet this legal obligation may incur a penalty under Section 4 of the Statistics of Trade Act 1947. The Clerk had immediately telephoned the Survey Team and been advised that the form should be completed and returned by 21 November. Members noted that the completed form had in fact been sent back to the Survey Team (part of the Office for National Statistics) on 1 November.</p> <p><u>Little Green Bus</u></p> <p>Members were informed that a request for funding had been received from the CEO / Manager of the Little Green Bus Co, a service providing community transport to residents across the Ribble Valley. Members were willing to give a further donation to the cause, but recalled (perhaps incorrectly) that a donation had already been made this financial year.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to check whether a donation had been made this financial year and, if so, to potentially arrange for a further donation to be made in April 2025</b></p>	<p><b>Chair</b></p>
<p>19.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><u>B4RN</u></p> <p>Members were pleased to learn that adequate funding had now been raised for the project to proceed.</p> <p><u>Wildflower seeds</u></p> <p>Cllrs Walsh and Haslam had met with GRGC representatives and mapped out the proposed area for planting. Cllr Walsh would now gather prices relating to the next phase of the project.</p> <p>cont</p>	

	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Cllr Walsh to pursue</b></p>	<b>SW</b>
c)	<p><u>Bowland High School – traffic issues</u></p> <p>No update, other than Cllr Walsh reporting that the school warning signs remained inoperative.</p>	
	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to approach Bowland High School on this matter</b></p>	<b>Chair</b>
d)	<p><u>Institution of the Revd Grace Gaze as Rector of the Bowland Benefice</u></p> <p>On behalf of the Parish Council, Cllr Bramwell had attended this event at the Church of St Peter and St Paul in Bolton by Bowland on 7 November 2024.</p> <p>In addition, the Chair had welcomed, by a hand-delivered card, the Rev Gaze and her husband to the village, and had included an invitation to the Christmas lights switch-on.</p>	
e)	<p><u>Rotten post / handrail</u></p> <p>The Chair had expressed concern about the state of the handrail and its supporting posts leading to the permissive footpath at Brow Bottom. With members’ support, quotes from a local contractor had been obtained and the work now carried out. A final invoice was awaited from the contractor.</p>	
f)	<p><u>Dogs</u></p> <p>No update</p>	
g)	<p><u>Resignation of Clerk</u></p> <p>The Clerk had previously informed the Chair of his intention to resign from his post. This decision was due to personal circumstances, and in no way reflected on the workings of the Parish Council, a body which he had been proud to represent. He was willing to remain in post until the end of March 2025, by which time it was hoped that a replacement Clerk would be appointed (although members noted that there would also be vacancies in the neighbouring parishes of West Bradford, Waddington and Chatburn).</p> <p>Members thanked the Clerk for his efforts to date. It was agreed that, as no obvious local candidates for the role were known, an approach should be made to Chatburn Parish Council; it was understood that this body had successfully interviewed for a new Clerk in the previous week. Members surmised that the successful candidate may also be interested in a part-time clerking role with Grindleton Parish Council, and asked the Clerk to make enquiries to this effect with Chatburn’s outgoing Clerk.</p>	
	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to pursue</b></p>	<b>Clerk</b>

h)	<p><u>Traffic issues in the village</u></p> <p>The Chair had twice been approached by local residents expressing concern at inconsiderate parking problems in the vicinity of the Rum Fox. Members understood local frustration but were unclear as to what further measures could be taken, being (i) reluctant to ask for an increase in parking restrictions / yellow lines and (ii) conscious that the owner of the Rum Fox had already taken steps to ask clients to park courteously.</p>	
i)	<p><u>Slaidburn Rd – AONB signage</u></p> <p>In exchange for the provision of paint and brushes, a local resident had volunteered to re-paint the sign in question when the weather improved. All necessary equipment had now been provided to her.</p>	
<p><b>The next meeting of Grindleton Parish Council will take place at 7pm on Tuesday 4 February 2025 at Grindleton Pavilion.</b></p>		

The meeting closed at 10.07pm.

Signed by:		
	Date: 4.2.25	Cllr L Halley (Chair)