



## Gringleton 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 Gringleton Parish Council held on **Tuesday 6 August 2024** at the Pavilion, Gringleton.

Members present:	Parish Cllr Lorraine Halley (Chair) Parish Cllr Paul Atkinson Parish Cllr Tony Bramwell Parish Cllr Megan Haslam Parish Cllr Susan Walsh
Apologies for absence:	Parish Cllr Glenn Wheeler (Vice Chair) Parish Cllr Chris Brennan Borough Cllr Kevin Horkin MBE (RVBC)
Clerk present:	Andrew Glover
Members of the public present:	None

1.	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>  a) Standing orders suspended  As a neighbour of Bowland High School, Cllr Walsh declared a Non-Registrable Interest with regard to agenda item 21c below.  b) Standing orders resumed	
2.	<b>Public Participation</b>  None	
3.	<b>Minutes / matters arising</b>  a) To resolve that the minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 4 June 2024 be signed as a correct record.  Proposer – Cllr Bramwell Seconder – Cllr Haslam cont	

	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed that the minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 4 June 2024 should be signed as a correct record and published on the Parish Council website</b></p> <p>b) To resolve that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council held on 8 July 2024 be signed as a correct record.</p> <p>Proposer – Cllr Walsh  Seconder – Cllr Atkinson</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council held on 8 July 2024 should be signed as a correct record and published on the Parish Council website</b></p> <p>c) <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> <p>Subject to a guillotine of 30 minutes, members gave verbal updates on their respective actions. These were captured on the list retained by the Clerk / Cllr Haslam.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
<p>4.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p>	<p><b>Overview of financial position</b></p> <p><u>Income and Expenditure – June 2024</u></p> <p>A statement of income and expenditure for the month of June 2024 was provided for members' consideration.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members approved this statement as an accurate record of transactions during June 2024</b></p> <p><u>Budget Monitoring Report – Q1 2024/25</u></p> <p>The Clerk had completed a budget monitoring exercise for Q1 2024/25. The main points arising were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• income was on track, with the precept and LCC grant funding amounting to £800 had been received;</li> <li>• expenditure on salary costs was slightly elevated (both the Clerk's salary and associated HMRC payments being some £50 above the quarterly target), but Q1 was the busiest quarter featuring both an internal / external audit as well as an AGM;</li> <li>• there were still issues to be resolved around the Lengthsman and a possible outstanding salary claim (invoice 4226) from 2023/24; and</li> </ul>	

- some unbudgeted expenditure had occurred, such as the £330 spent on repairs to the footpath (Peter Jaques) on Grindleton Brow.

**Resolved**

**Members approved the budget monitoring report for Q1 2024/25**

c) Income and Expenditure – July 2024

A statement of income and expenditure for the month of July 2024 was provided for members' consideration.

**Resolved**

**Members approved this statement as an accurate record of transactions during July 2024**

d) Lloyds Bank account – not covered by Financial Services Compensation Scheme (FSCS)?

At the June meeting, the Clerk had informed members that a letter had been received from Lloyds Bank, suggesting that the Parish Council's account would not be protected by the FSCS should Lloyds Bank fail at a future date. Having taken advice from Cllr Atkinson, the Clerk had submitted a complaint to the bank challenging this assertion. The Clerk had subsequently been telephoned by an operative from Lloyds who had agreed that – as the Parish Council's turnover was less than £500,000 pa – its account was indeed covered by the FSCS. The sum of £25 would be (and had been) paid into the Parish Council's account as compensation for the inconvenience suffered, and a letter confirming the outcome of the complaint would be sent. (Members noted that, at the time of the meeting, the letter still had not been received, but considered that payment of the compensation was sufficient acknowledgement of the Parish Council's status under the FSCS).

e) Funding bid to LCC - LCC PROW and biodiversity grants

Confirmation had been received from LCC that grant funding of £800 (£500 for PROWs and £300 for biodiversity) had been secured.

Members were asked to note that, as a result, they would be obliged to complete a return to LCC in 12 months' time detailing how the funding had been spent in 2024/25.

f) Concurrent Functions

RVBC had once again invited all parish councils to bid for funding under its Concurrent Functions Grant. As the deadline for submission had expired on 31 July, the Clerk had prepared a bid and asked the Chair to sign it without wider member approval, which would ordinarily have been sought.

The Clerk now confirmed that the submitted bid had amounted to £2,650.30, solely consisting of costs incurred on the Lengthsman. RVBC would aim to reimburse 25% of eligible expenditure (subject to the total cost of claims

<p>g) <u>Lengthsman</u></p> <p>i) <u>Electronic invoices</u></p> <p>ii) <u>Salary claim</u></p>	<p>submitted by parishes not exceeding £33,200pa; in such an event, claims would be scaled back to the funds available) in September 2024.</p> <p>The Clerk reported that, with regard to the submission of electronic invoices / work sheets, a submission for July 2024 had now been received but that it appeared to be incomplete. The Chair indicated that she had had separately received timesheets for a number of prior months in 2024, but these were not always consistent with the salary claimed.</p> <p>Cllr Walsh commented that the software for the accounting system used by the Lengthsman was sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of both the Parish Council and the Lengthsman, and offered to work with him in tailoring the system for mutual benefit.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair and Cllr Walsh to meet with the Lengthsman and work with him to ensure that satisfactory timesheets and accounts were submitted in future</b></p> <p>A salary claim for the month of July, amounting to £352.50, had now been received. However, members remained reluctant to pay any invoices where there was either a lack of timesheet provided, or where the timesheet and salary claimed were inconsistent. Whilst the documentation submitted for April 2024 was satisfactory, no payments would be made until the meeting with the Lengthsman had taken place and the matter resolved to the members' satisfaction.</p> <p>(Members recalled that there remained a discrepancy with regard to the Lengthsman's invoice from November 2023, which - due to a clerical error – had been paid at an amount lower than that owed. It had previously been agreed that the shortfall of £2.50 would be added to payment of a subsequent claim submitted by the Lengthsman).</p>	<p>Chair / SW</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>i)</p>	<p><b>Improving PC effectiveness</b></p> <p><u>Shared document storage</u></p> <p><u>Microsoft 365</u></p> <p>Prior to the meeting, Cllr Atkinson had confirmed that - regarding Microsoft 365 – he remained in ongoing debate with the provider as to whether they would accept that the Parish Council was a 'not for profit' organisation and provide the facility for use free of charge. However, despite his best efforts, he had been unable to persuade Microsoft that this was the case.</p> <p>Should the Parish Council wish, as an alternative, to subscribe to a paid service from the company, the cost would be £2.50pcm per user (equating to £240 pa).</p>	

	<p>Furthermore, Microsoft was adamant that payment for the service would need to be through a payment card – a facility which the Parish Council currently lacked.</p> <p>After some discussion, it was agreed that the Clerk would contact Lloyds Bank and establish whether the Parish Council was entitled to possess an appropriate charge card. A decision on whether to commission a service from Microsoft, or revert to the less favoured DropBox system, could then be made at the October meeting.</p> <p>(Any adoption of a payment card may trigger the need for further amendment of the Parish Council’s Financial Regulations).</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to approach Lloyds Bank and establish whether a charge card could be made available to the Parish Council</b></p>	Clerk
6.	<p><b>Parish Plan 2024/25</b></p> <p>The regular May meeting had been devoted to a reconsideration of the Parish Plan 2023/24 (which had been developed some years previously and was now considered out of date). As a result of the May discussion, the Clerk had produced a draft Parish Plan 2024/25 for consideration. This had been presented to the June meeting of the Parish Council, where members had agreed that - given (i) its significance to the work of the Parish Council moving forward and (ii) the large number of apologies received at the June meeting – detailed discussion on the draft should be deferred until the August meeting.</p> <p>Members now considered the draft and agreed that it was an accurate representation of their aspirations for the parish.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed to formally adopt the draft Parish Plan 2024/25</b></p>	
7.	<p><b>External audit 2023/24</b></p> <p>a) <u>Update</u></p> <p>The Clerk confirmed the following:</p> <p>i) <u>Notification from external auditors</u></p> <p>The external auditors had confirmed that the Parish Council’s notification of exempt status for the year ended 31 March 2024 had been received and logged. Consequently, no review would be performed, and no auditor certificate / report would be issued for this reporting year.</p> <p>ii) <u>Parish Council’s compliance with obligations</u></p> <p>The Clerk reported that the requirement for all appropriate documentation to be:</p> <p>i) submitted to the external auditor; and/or</p> <p>ii) displayed on the GPC website</p>	

<p>iii)</p>	<p>had been complied with prior to the deadline of 30 June.</p> <p><u>Public Rights / Publication Requirements</u></p> <p>The only outstanding element of the AGAR process for 2023/24 was the requirement to give notice of public rights. This process obliged the Parish Council to give access to its accounts to any resident who should require it between the relevant dates of 1 July and 9 August. No request to view the accounts had been received at the time of the meeting.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>New draft Financial Regulations</b></p> <p>The Clerk had been made aware by the Lancashire Association of Local Councils that its parent body (the National Association of Local Councils, NALC) had produced a new set of draft Financial Regulations for potential adoption by parish councils. A copy of the new draft Regulations was provided for members' information.</p> <p>This new publication would appear to suggest that some changes to the Parish Council's current procedures may be advisable. Currently, the Parish Council set out its financial controls across two separate documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Standing Orders; and</li> <li>• a brief statement of financial controls.</li> </ul> <p>The new version developed by NALC would override the Parish Council's present approach, with the compilation of wide-ranging and detailed controls into a single document.</p> <p>The revised regulations placed an enhanced emphasis on a number of issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• risk management;</li> <li>• ensuring that the Parish Council follows its obligations arising from the external audit process;</li> <li>• procedures for agreeing the budget etc;</li> <li>• tightened rules around procurement; and</li> <li>• administration of online banking.</li> </ul> <p>As the draft was intended to cover a range of local authorities (including ones with considerably larger budgets than Grindleton Parish Council), the Clerk had deleted some of the proposed clauses from the presented version, and amended others so as to tailor the document to the Parish Council's circumstances.</p> <p>One noteworthy change (para 4.8) related to unpaid Council Tax. Any member with unpaid Council Tax for a period of two months was obliged to (i) declare this at the start of the meeting when the budget or precept was discussed and (ii) not vote on these issues.</p>	

	<p>Members 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 was therefore agreed that the Clerk and Cllr Bramwell would meet in advance of the next meeting, in order to go through the proposed draft regulations and iron out any inconsistencies that may arise with the current Standing Orders.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk and Cllr Bramwell to meet and prepare a report for further consideration at the October meeting</b></p>	<b>Clerk / TB</b>
<p>9.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>i)</p> <p>ii)</p>	<p><b>Planning applications to be considered</b></p> <p><u>Applications on which the Parish Council is a consultee</u></p> <p>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</p> <p>Following circulation to members of details of these applications, it had been agreed that an extraordinary meeting would be held on 8 July 2024. As a result, and with members’ agreement, a letter outlining the Parish Council’s stance had been submitted to RVBC on 11 July 2024, prior to the deadline of 17 July. A copy of the letter was provided for members’ information.</p> <p>In addition, the Chair had written to RVBC’s Director of Planning and Economic Development to express her disappointment that – in relation to a building of real significance for the village - no notices advising residents of the proposed development had been displayed. The Borough Council had subsequently responded by erecting a notice at the Cherry Trees, confirming that “the 21 day consultation period automatically extends from the day the notice is erected.”</p> <p>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</p> <p>Details of this appeal had been circulated to members on 4 July. At their extraordinary meeting held on 8 July, members had considered this matter further, noting that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Parish Council had submitted comments regarding application 3/2023/0297, but not in relation to application 3/2023/0973. Both applications had been refused by RVBC;</li> </ul>	

- the Parish Council's comments relating to application 3/2023/0297 were relevant to the appeal, as application 3/2023/0973 was a resubmission of application 3/2023/0297;
- the deadline for the Parish Council to withdraw its comments was 4 weeks from the start of the appeal; and
- no other comments could be submitted at this stage.

It had been agreed that the Parish Council's previous comments would not be withdrawn, leaving them to be considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the appeals process. As requested, the Clerk had re-read the appeal letter and no further action would appear to be necessary on GPC's behalf.

iii)

Planning Application No: 3/2024/0132

Proposal: Demolition of conservatory (retrospective), and construction of replacement single storey extension to rear. Conversion of garage to living accommodation.

Location: Valley Cottage, Back Lane, Grindleton BB7 4RW

Details of this application had been circulated to members on 5 June 2024.

Members noted that – as no adverse comments had been received from members - the Parish Council had not submitted a consultation response to RVBC.

iv)

Planning application: 3/2024/0149

Proposal: Proposed demolition of boundary wall and creation of new vehicular access and driveway.

Location: 4 Shaw Terrace, Main Street, Grindleton BB7 4RA

APPEAL REFERENCE: APP/T2350/D/24/3346711

APPEAL STARTING DATE: 1st August 2024

At their meeting on 5 September 2024, some months prior to submission of the above application, members had given initial consideration to an informal approach from the resident who later submitted application 3/2024/0149. Based on information then available, they had concluded at the time that the proposal for the creation of a new driveway was not one which they were minded to oppose. In March 2024, once the full application had been submitted to RVBC, members had considered it in detail via email, and – as no objections had been expressed – the Parish Council had not submitted a response to RVBC within the consultation period.

Although the applicant later addressed members in person at their April meeting, the Parish Council had again opted not to submit any comments to RVBC.

Application 3/2024/0149 was refused by RVBC on 19 April 2024, and an appeal subsequently lodged. Members noted that - as with minute item 9a) above – at this late stage it was not in their gift to submit any comments for consideration during the appeal process. They reflected on this position, which had come about as a result of their existing policy not to submit comments to RVBC unless the application in question was opposed. Members therefore agreed in principle that, in future, a supportive response would (where appropriate) be submitted to RVBC, thereby ensuring that - in the event of an appeal - the Parish Council's view would be made available to the Planning Inspector.



	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>When a future application was received, to which the Parish Council did not object, Clerk to check with the Chair whether submission of a positive response to RVBC was appropriate</b></p>	Clerk
b)	<p><u>Possible referral to Planning Enforcement</u></p> <p>At the June meeting, the Chair had undertaken to obtain photographs of solar panels, visible from the road, which had been erected on a local property. It was agreed that, before making any decision as to whether to refer this matter to RVBC, it would be better to await the outcome of the planning appeal referred to in minute item 9a<sup>ii</sup> above.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to diary this matter for further consideration at the October meeting, when the appeal in question would hopefully be known</b></p>	Clerk
c)	<p><u>Duke of York – referral to RVBC</u></p> <p>At the extraordinary meeting on 8 July, members had expressed their increasing concern at the poor condition of the fabric of the building. Since its acquisition by the current owner some years ago, it had been severely neglected; not only was the appearance of this prominent local building now unsightly, but there were also fears that it may be structurally unsound</p> <p>Given that the property was Grade II listed (as per entry number 1072148 on the list held by Historic England), it had been considered that section 48 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 may be of relevance. This statutory provision empowered local authorities, where they considered that a listed building was not being properly preserved, to serve a repairs notice on the owner. According to statutory guidance on the .gov.uk website, local authorities should consider use of this power where “protracted failure by an owner to keep a listed building in reasonable repair places the building at risk.”</p> <p>At the request of members, the Clerk had written to RVBC seeking agreement for an officer to inspect the premises and assess its current condition (with a view to establishing whether the threshold set out above had been met). Members noted that RVBC had since responded in writing, confirming that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an external examination of the property had been carried out at RVBC’s request by an officer from Growth Lancashire, establishing that – whilst the window frames were rotten – the roof itself appeared to be sound;</li> <li>• the only possible measure was to require the windows to be boarded up, but this would further undermine the appearance of the building and was therefore not proposed as a way forward; and</li> <li>• under the extant planning applications for the site, a structural survey was required. Should this raise any concerns about the building’s stability, then the case for a Section 48 notice could be revisited.</li> </ul>	

<p>10.</p> <p>a)</p>	<p><b>Haweswater Aqueduct Resilience Programme (HARP)</b></p> <p><u>Planning application 3/2021/0661 - update</u></p> <p>On 7 July, the Clerk had circulated to members details of a briefing provided by HARP representatives to West Bradford Parish Council. Members noted that a note of the meeting could be viewed on the WBPC website via the link below:</p> <p><a href="https://www.westbradford.org.uk/post/harp-update-for-residents">https://www.westbradford.org.uk/post/harp-update-for-residents</a></p> <p>With regard to the note of the meeting, members noted with interest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• United Utilities had recognised the need for pre-commencement surveys of affected properties to be carried out, and would either provide these for affected residents or (where appropriate) contribute to the cost of private surveys commissioned by residents themselves; and</li> <li>• a sum of money had been earmarked in “Section 106” monies as a payment to affected parishes. It was thought that this Section 106 money would be in addition to any other legacy payment still under consideration.</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that an approach should be made to United Utilities, pointing out that certain properties in Grindleton may require a pre-commencement survey just as much as those in other parishes. Furthermore, given the likely impact on East View in particular, the Parish Council would register its interest in accessing any Section 106 monies which may later become available.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to write to United Utilities and convey the above points</b></p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p>
<p>11.</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>The Chair reported a defective signpost at the Grindleton Forest / Fell Rd end of bridleway BW0321038.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to report to LCC PROW</b>  cont</p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p>

	The Chair confirmed that she would be referring a further 2 complaints to the Clerk in the near future, with Cllr Haslam also to refer an additional matter.	
12.	<b>Other reports submitted to LCC and other bodies</b>  None	
13.	<p><b>Ribble Valley Local Plan - Review of Settlement Boundaries and Revision of Facilities/Services Data Within Settlements</b></p> <p>With regard to the above, the Borough Council was undergoing an exercise to gather data and supporting evidence. As part of this process, the Borough Council was consulting with parishes and had sent out a range of documentation for members to consider. The deadline for response was 20 August.</p> <p>Members were aware of the significance of this request and gave the matter all due consideration. In essence, the Parish Council was invited to undertake two tasks:</p> <p>a) <u>by reference to the maps and Settlement Policy provided, revisit the current "Settlement Boundary and Open Space Review"</u></p> <p>Despite their best efforts, members were unable to conclusively identify the parish boundaries from the maps provided. It was therefore simply not possible for the Parish Council to make a definitive judgement on this matter.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Chair to complete the required form, and endorse it with a comment along the above lines</b> <b>Chair to submit the completed form to RVBC prior to the deadline</b></p> <p>b) <u>revisit the "Services and Facilities" form provided</u></p> <p>Members identified a number of areas where the services and facilities identified for the village appeared to be missing.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Chair to amend the form with the missing information identified at the meeting</b> <b>Chair to submit the completed form to RVBC prior to the deadline</b></p>	<p>Chair</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Chair</p>
14.	<p><b>Lancashire Best Kept Village Competition 2024</b></p> <p>a) <u>Update</u></p> <p>The Chair was pleased to report that the village had successfully progressed to the second round of judging (the results of which would become known on 15 August, with the final round of judging to be held on 20 and 21 August).</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that she had purchased some flowers to replace the ones that had died in the tubs at Greendale View, at a cost of £9.</p> <p>cont</p>	



<p>c)</p>	<p><u>VE Day 80 – 8 May 2025 – “A Shared Moment of Celebration”</u></p> <p>Communities across the country had been invited to participate in events to commemorate the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of VE Day. These events were to take place on 8 May 2025, and would feature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reading of the VE Day Proclamation at 8am;</li> <li>• raising of flags;</li> <li>• church bells to be rung; and</li> <li>• over one thousand Beacons and several hundred Lamp Lights of Peace will be lit at 9.30pm across the United Kingdom.</li> </ul> <p>Members agreed in principle to support the event, which – for Grindleton - would probably follow a similar format to that adopted in June 2024 to mark the commemoration of the D-Day landings.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to diary a further discussion on this event in the New Year</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>d)</p>	<p><u>Remembrance Day 2024</u></p> <p>Cllr Haslam outlined the steps she had taken to raise the profile of Remembrance Day in 2024. She set out a number of options relating to the purchase of display items for use around the village, and how residents could be more easily informed about the military record of local soldiers who had served in historic conflicts. After some discussion, the following was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Haslam would order 2 x silhouettes from the website of the Royal British Legion (one of a soldier and one relating to women at war). These were to be inscribed with “Grindleton Parish Council” around the base, and would cost c£200 per item; and</li> <li>• Cllr Haslam would also order 2 x waterproof, plastic A3 signs, of her own design, from a supplier in Chatburn. These would contain a QR code which would direct residents to online information about the contribution made by local soldiers, and would cost c£180 each.</li> </ul> <p>Members thanked Cllr Haslam for her efforts to date, which – when implemented – would have a positive impact on the village’s remembrance activities.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Cllr Haslam to pursue</b></p>	<p>MH</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p><b>Allotments</b></p>	
<p>a)</p>	<p><u>General issues</u></p> <p>None, other than those itemised below.</p>	

<p>b)</p>	<p><u>Tenants' meeting</u></p> <p>Members acknowledged the need to arrange another meeting at the end of the season. Issues to be addressed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• members' wish to reaffirm the ban on the use of fires (as confirmed at the June meeting);</li> <li>• the receipt of any feedback from plot 8 (on behalf of all tenants) regarding the composting of food waste; and</li> <li>• matters arising from the 1981 lease.</li> </ul> <p>However, as feedback was still awaited from RVBC on a number of relevant matters, it was agreed to defer discussion on a potential meeting to a later date.</p>	
<p>c)</p>	<p><u>Waiting list</u></p> <p>The Clerk reported that a third resident had asked to be added to the waiting list for an allotment vacancy.</p>	
<p>d)</p>	<p><u>1981 lease agreement / possible areas of conflict with tenancy agreement to be explored</u></p> <p>Following the June meeting, the Clerk had written to RVBC and asked officers to address two issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) whether the wording of Clause 2(8) of the 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 1981 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> <p>An initial response had been received from RVBC, indicating support in principle for the Parish Council's proposals. It had been agreed that RVBC Legal Services would draft an amended lease for members' consideration, which would be presented to RVBC Corporate Management for adoption. However, this may have been delayed by the July election, which clearly had an impact on a wide range of RVBC activity.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to approach RVBC for an update</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>e)</p>	<p><u>Complaint – unauthorised pruning of tree</u></p> <p>The Parish Council had received a complaint that a tree on the allotment site was impacting upon tenants. The tree had now been pruned by tenants, albeit without the prior agreement of the Borough Council as landowner or Parish Council as tenant.</p> <p>cont</p>	



	<p>the Henthorn Rd waste disposal century to a more accessible location (ideally along the lines of the modern facility at Farington).</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>Members agreed to support Cllr Atkinson in his request to RVBC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>WASP</b> – the next meeting would be held on Wednesday 14 August 2024, Chair and Cllr Bramwell to attend</li> </ul>	
20.	<p><b>Correspondence received</b></p> <p>a) <u>Open Day - Lane Ends School/Community Centre – 24 August 2024</u></p> <p>The Parish Council had been approached by the owner of the former Lane Ends School/Community Centre, who had purchased the property from Grindleton Consolidated Charity in 2014. Since then, the property had been extensively renovated, and the owner was now holding an open day from 1-4pm on 24 August 2024. All parish councillors were invited to attend.</p> <p>By email, the owner had sought the Parish Council’s guidance on whether there were “any requirements” that he ought to consider. After consultation with the Chair, the Clerk had advised that – whilst the advertisement of and arrangements for the event were a matter for himself – his invitation would be forwarded to all parish councillors.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>Members to note the date of the open day</b></p>	
21.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>a) <u>B4RN</u></p> <p>The Chair reported that all outlying areas of Sawley and Grindleton now had wayleaves in place. However, the situation remained more complicated in Grindleton village, due to the nature of the small unadopted roads off Main St. To resolve this, the project leader (David Ryall) had been meeting local residents in person, seeking consensus on the way forward.</p> <p>Good progress had been made on the financial front. A number of pledges, grants and government commitments had been received, although a shortfall of c£110,000 (against an overall target of c£803,000) still remained. Should this additional funding be raised, work to commence the project could begin from September 2024.</p> <p>b) <u>Wildflower seeds</u></p> <p>Members discussed the importance of returning to this project by the New Year, in order to ensure that the proposed location remained viable and other appropriate arrangements for planting could be made.</p>	



c)

Bowland High School – traffic issues

A resident had been conversing with the Parish Council regarding the problem of parents parking on the road around Hydro Lodge and general excess traffic at school times. The Chair had been made aware of correspondence on this problem between the residents and the County Council (in its role as Highways Authority) and had shared this with members prior to the meeting.

Whilst this complaint remained ongoing, the Parish Council had been made aware of a consultation exercise carried out by the County Council, which was considering whether to introduce a number of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) across the county. One of the proposed TROs related to the un-named road outside Bowland High School; if implemented, this would seek to introduce no waiting at any time along the un-named road (in addition to the current restricted waiting on Sawley Rd).

Members felt that the complaint and the proposed TRO should be considered in tandem. It was acknowledged that the proposed TRO would have some benefits if implemented. For instance, it would make it easier for emergency vehicles and other traffic to access the businesses at Hill House Farm by allowing them to turn right at the end of the un-named road (whereas currently the presence of traffic would often prohibit this). However, members were strongly of the opinion that the disadvantages of the proposed TRO would far outweigh this benefit. If implemented, the TRO would not solve the wider issue of serious traffic congestion in the vicinity of the school at peak times – a problem which would only become more acute, given the expansion of the school roll from September 2024. Indeed, members strongly believed that introduction of the proposed TRO would merely exacerbate the already difficult situation by forcing the traffic which would otherwise park on the un-named road onto the main Sawley Rd. This highway was already at or beyond capacity as parents dropped off at, or collected their children from, the school.

After due consideration, and for the reasons set out above, the Parish Council was not able to support the LCC proposal.

**Resolved**

**Clerk to respond to the LCC TRO consultation and convey the above comments by the deadline of 16 August**

Clerk

There was a wide-ranging discussion about other possible measures to alleviate the traffic congestion. It was noted that, when school representatives had previously attended a meeting of the Parish Council, they had referred to the possible development of a “park and ride” type scheme, whereby children could access a minibus at the school premises and be transported to a remote location for collection. (One possible venue for this collection / drop off point was the Spread Eagle at Sawley). Members were keen to establish whether the school still saw this as a possible solution, and asked the Clerk to write to the school and explore this point. Should school representatives once again wish to attend in person a meeting of the Parish Council, to discuss this and any other issue, they would of course be made very welcome.

cont

**Resolved**

**Clerk to write to Bowland High School**

**Clerk**

d) Road traffic signage – “Slow Down, Save Lives”

The Chair had approached the County Council in an attempt to establish why prominent yellow signage warning drivers to “Slow Down, Save Lives” had been displayed without warning on Main St. In response, Council officers had confirmed that:

- the signage had been deployed as the location was considered “high speed”;
- the signage would ordinarily be removed after 3 months and then re-deployed for a further 3 months to re-enforce the safer driving message (initially from July – September 2024 and then again from January – March 2025); and
- the County Council now accepted that the sign had been placed close to a historic white sign, and officers indicated their willingness to re-locate the sign at an appropriate distance from this.

LCC officers had then escalated the matter to County Cllrs Mirfin and Swarbrick (the latter being the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport), prompting the Chair respond on the following grounds:

- the sign had been erected in a Conservation Area; and
- the methodology used to determine the location as “high speed” may be flawed (in that no on-site assessment has taken place).

Members discussed these events, concluding that:

- the nature of the signage displayed was indeed inappropriate for a conservation area;
- in general terms, it would not be possible for vehicles to travel through that location at the claimed average speed of 36.7mph. This was due to the volume of traffic, narrowness of the road and prevalence of parked vehicles; and
- the approach taken seemed to be in conflict with the stance on speeding generally taken by LCC. Correspondence between the County Council and the resident who had complained about traffic at Bowland High School stated that adherence to the speed limit was considered “good” when 85% of traffic did not exceed the enforcement threshold of – in this case – 35mph. With regard to the Main St signage, surely (if the average speed of traffic was 36.7mph) it was likely that 85% of passing traffic would be below 35mph?

This incident was considered particularly unfortunate given the Parish Council’s willingness to engage on speeding matters with WASP (an organisation in which the County Council was a senior partner). In an effort to resolve the situation, members suggested the following compromise. It would be acceptable for the signage to remain in its current vicinity for the coming 3 months, but members would ask that for the second period of 3 months (January – March 2025) it be

	relocated to East View in the village, this being an area where residents had genuine concern about speeding vehicles voiced over a long period.	
	<b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to contact LCC Highways (via County Cllr Mirfin) and formally propose the compromise solution identified above</b>	<b>Clerk</b>
e)	<u>Estate agent's board</u>  The Chair had complained to a local estate agent, seeking the removal of one of its advertising boards which appeared to have been abandoned. Despite receiving assurances that the board would be removed, this had not yet happened.	
	<b>The next meeting of Grindleton Parish Council will take place at 7pm on Tuesday 1 October 2024 at Grindleton Pavilion.</b>	

The meeting closed at 9.47pm.

Signed by:		
	Date: 1.10.24	Cllr L Halley (Chair)