



WOODPLUMPTON PARISH COUNCIL
MEETING HELD IN
THE MAIN HALL OF ST ANNE'S PRIMARY
SCHOOL, WOODPLUMPTON ROAD, PRESTON
ON MONDAY 16th Jan 2023 at 7.00pm

PRESENT: Chairman Cllr M Greaves
Councillors: Cllr P Bamber Cllr P Entwistle Cllr M Entwistle.
Cllr B Dalglish Cllr M Stewart

City Cllr S Thompson, Mr S Morgan (co-option applicant), Mr B Hill (Parish Lengthsman)
14 members of the public as detailed on the attendance sheet.
Mrs J Buttle (Parish Clerk)

APOLOGIES

Apologies were recorded for Cllr B Probin and noted from the local police.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES of the Parish Council Meeting held on 21st Nov 2022.

MIN 22/112 It was **resolved** that the Minutes be signed as a true record.

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS / WRITTEN DISPENSATIONS

Members living in the Parish have a disclosable, pecuniary interest in setting the Precept and benefit from an exemption paragraph 10(5)(vi) of the Code of Conduct. Members disclosed their interest verbally as dispensation forms cover them to the May 2023 elections.

Cllr M Entwistle and Cllr P Entwistle declared a pecuniary interest in the donation to Catforth Village Hall as they are both members of the village hall management committee.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

MIN 22/113 It was **resolved** that the meeting be adjourned for public participation.

Prior to the meeting, Members were copied in to various emails regarding the traffic calming scheme and parking concerns at The Orchard. The agenda summarised the concerns and to avoid duplication and provide clarity to the Minutes, the points raised during public participation - and the decisions taken to resolve / progress the issues - have been added under the Minute headings.

In addition to the traffic concerns, a resident raised concerns regarding highway safety in connection with planning permission 06/2021/1190 for a nursery at Sandyforth Lane. The Clerk explained that the Parish Council had objected to the proposal on highway grounds and suggested that the resident look at the officer's report on the City Council website and raise any concerns with the highway officer who commented on the application.

CO-OPTION OF CATFORTH CLLR

Mr Morgan from Inskip presented reasons why he wished to be co-opted to the Catforth vacancy. Although Inskip lies within the 3 mile eligibility criteria, Members stated that they would prefer the applicant to live within the Parish and as Mr Morgan has previously represented the Council on Plumpton ward, Members questioned whether he would be committed to the Catforth area. Mr Morgan stated that when he was on the Council previously, he had tried to represent the Parish as a whole and if he was co-opted to Catforth, he would be equally passionate about the area.

A member of the public queried why the Council was co-opting someone to the role when the vacancy should be decided by the electorate – who had previously voted not to elect the applicant.

The Clerk explained that all vacancies have to be advertised and any applications need to be processed as the Council may feel it is desirable to operate at full strength until the next elections. The applicant has the option to apply for election in May and Members have the option not to co-opt at this time, providing they give the applicant an acceptable reason.

MIN 22/114 Following a unanimous vote - Members **resolved** not to proceed with the co-option as Members would prefer to see if an interested person came forward from within the Parish.

A) PARKING ISSUES RELATING TO LAND AT THE ORCHARD

Double Yellow lines

Residents expressed their annoyance that parking spaces on The Orchard were already limited and had been restricted further due to the addition of double yellow lines, to such a degree that residents could no longer park outside their houses. Residents stated that they had raised concerns during the traffic calming consultation but these had been ignored. It was also confirmed that parking on the yellow lines had been enforced and residents had been penalised.

The Chairman referred to an email dated 13th Sept 2019 which confirms that the Parish Council originally suggested that *the yellow lines should be 12m in length to allow wagons to turn into The Orchard without damaging the verge at the junction*. However, LCC had dismissed this and had issued the consultation stating that the lines should be 27m in length.

The Parish Council referred all the comments on the consultation to LCC and in an email dated 9th Feb 2022, LCC replied *there is scope to reduce the length of the lining which may ease the concerns of potential objectors*. The Parish Council replied on the same day, stating that the line reduction would be fine. Notwithstanding the above, LCC painted the lines 27m in length resulting in the exasperation expressed at the meeting.

It was confirmed that the Parish Council has referred the matter to LCC and their initial reply dated the 13th January includes a recommendation to retain the lines as they are. Members have stated they are unhappy with the reply and further communication is expected which will be considered at the February meeting. Residents were also encouraged to raise the matter directly with LCC.

MIN 22/115 The Chairman explained that residents do not have a right to park outside their homes, however if LCC do not shorten the lines, it was **resolved** that enquiries would be made to see if residents can be granted a dispensation to park there. Enquiries will also be made to see who is enforcing the situation as other dangerous parking issues, such as parking on the zig-zags outside the school, have never been enforced.

Protection of the junction verge

As stated above, the yellow lines were intended to protect the verge at the bottom of The Orchard and allow pedestrians enough space to cross the road safely. However, as vehicles are still mounting the verge, it was suggested that a planter / boulder could be added - subject to approval from Gateway / LCC. A resident offered to assist with the provision of this.

MIN 22/116 It was **resolved** that further enquiries would be made regarding permissions and the type and size of the desired object.

Playing field parking

Residents stated that the damage at the top of The Orchard is not being caused by Dransfield's it is being caused by larger vehicles such as tractors, trailers and HGVs as the road is not wide enough. As the field frontage is not part of the highway, parking on the grass around the play area should be banned and enforced particularly when the grass is wet. It was also stated that photographs of inappropriately parked vehicles have previously been passed to the Chairman and it was questioned why nothing had been done.

The Clerk explained that problems associated with parking on the frontage date back to 2007 when the City Council advertised that the play area was a starting point for winter rambles. As both the City Council and Lancashire County Council strongly opposed any plans to provide parking spaces for residents, Community Gateway were approached to see if residents could utilise the grass verges outside their homes. This was agreed providing the cost was met by residents.

Problems flared again in 2011 and the City Council stated that improvements could be made to the frontage, provided the Parish Council funds the improvements, even though the land is a City Council asset. In 2013, the Parish Council received CIL monies and the issue was added to the CIL business plan, however, following a CIL consultation with residents via the Parish Council newsletter, priority was given to the traffic calming schemes.

In 2018, CIL monies had increased and the City Council were asked to quote for a parking scheme. Initially they quoted £34,000 but this increased to £55,000 which Members considered to be too expensive. Following LCC's proposal to add yellow lines on The Orchard the issue was progressed again and the latest quote is £44,460 - £51,000 which the Parish Council has accepted.

The cost includes technical drawings detailing the proposed layout, materials, and specifications which the City Council will issue to appropriate, competent contractors. The cost may increase further depending on the quotes.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that the Parish Council cannot use a different supplier as the land belongs to the City Council and they need to abide by national, legal standards in terms of procurement. The contractor must also meet the City Council's requirements in relation to relevant experience, competence, financial viability, Health & Safety Regulations, etc.

Residents expressed concerns that LCC had been allowed to churn up the frontage in connection with the traffic calming works and had planted grass seed instead of reinstating the frontage properly. The Clerk explained that the Parish Council had requested that the parking scheme be completed at the same time as LCC's works but the City Council had stated this was not possible. This is detailed under MIN 22/81 of the Oct meeting. As landowner, Preston City Council are required to determine if the reinstatement works are acceptable.

Residents were informed that the draft plans for the parking scheme have been provided and, as stated under MIN 22/99 of the November meeting, the Parish Council have offered to assist with the consultation of residents. If the consultation is successful, the City Council have stated that due to their governance processes, it will be September 2023 before the works take place.

A view was expressed that the new spaces would encourage motorists to access The Orchard and park there. An email has also been received stating that the spaces would encourage anti-social behaviour and litter. Consequently, it was questioned if there was an alternative proposal.

The Chairman explained that the frontage could simply be fenced off with a post and rail fence to deter parking, however, as this may result in cars parking on the access road rather than the field frontage, the City Council would have to establish ownership rights relating to the access road.

Members **noted** that residents felt the alternative option to add a knee-high post and rail fence along the frontage would cause problems for larger vehicles.

Although the consultation will give residents an opportunity to comment on the parking scheme, a show of hands by those present, indicated that there was support for the parking proposals. It was stressed that even if residents vote in favour of the scheme, the final decision to progress the scheme is dependent on approval by the City Council as landowner.

MIN 22/117 It was **resolved** that as the City Council have not responded to a request to approve the draft consultation, the Clerk will contact them again.

Tree planting.

Alterations to the junction at Whittle Hill will result in some trees being felled and LCC are duty bound to plant replacements in the village. The Clerk confirmed that whilst previous Minutes state the trees will be planted at The Orchard, the intention is to plant them at The Orchard playing field.

Resident verge parking

As explained above, parking concerns at The Orchard date back well before the traffic calming scheme, however the Parish Council does not have any statutory powers to provide residents with parking spaces. Notwithstanding this, the Parish Council has contacted Community Gateway and LCC to establish if they will consider requests from residents wishing to park on the grass verge. LCC have indicated applications to drop the kerb will be considered provided the design does not drop debris on to the highway. Community Gateway have confirmed that they have no objections to vehicles parking on the verges provided the verges are protected from vehicle damage.

MIN 22/118 It was **resolved** that the Clerk would forward the confirmation emails to interested residents and it was suggested that the residents submit a collective application.

B) ISSUES RELATING TO WOODPLUMPTON

Newsham Hall Lane

An email was received stating that the new speed limit is being ignored and vehicles no longer slow down when approaching Woodplumpton from Broughton.

Members **noted** that the matter had been referred to the Tac Ops team who would monitor the area during the Neighbourhood Week of Action event scheduled for the 23rd – 27th Jan.

Hump gradient

Under MIN 22/95 of the November meeting, it was resolved that LCC check the gradient of the speed humps throughout the village. Members have been forwarded a copy of their reply which states that the humps have been inspected and are in accordance with the Department for Transport standards, however they have offered to meet a Council representative to discuss further. Members considered the reply but felt that before a discussion takes place, the Parish Council should ask for technical details of the measurements and request that an independent company measure the gradients and comments on the scheme.

MIN 22/119 It was **resolved** that Cllr P Bamber would use her contacts to provide details of an independent company who can be approached to check the gradients.

Planter / Child safety signs

The bollards have been installed outside Woodplumpton school and the silhouette signs have been ordered. LCC have stated that 1800mm is the required width for a footway, however, the pavement width is narrower at Catforth and as the signs are portable, Members are of the opinion that a small planter can be placed on the build out.

MIN 22/120 Members **resolved** that Cllr P Bamber would use her contacts to provide some designs which will be brought back to the February meeting for consideration.

Inconsiderate parking

Under MIN 109 of the Oct 2017 meeting, Members resolved that the Parish Lengthsman may place a 'Polite Notice' on the windscreen of a parked vehicle to inform the driver that the car is considered to be parked inconsiderately. Photographs will be taken to assist with any disputes. The procedure was followed in Dec 2022, however, as a complaint has been received, Members were requested to review the 2017 decision.

MIN 22/121 Members **resolved** to continue the above process, stating that the area outside the school should not be targeted disproportionately. The Lengthsman was also requested to check Bartle Lane following reports that a white range rover was parking on the bend.

Double Yellow lines in the Village

An email was received which stated that the addition of double yellow lines on one side of the road up to Plumpton Field had transferred parking problems to the opposite side of the road and additional lines were requested on the opposite side.

MIN 22/122 Members considered the email and **resolved** that additional yellow lines were not required because parking was limited on the opposite side due to driveways etc.

MIN 22/123 In addition to the above points already listed on the agenda, it was **resolved** that during the discussions to check the hump gradients, (MIN 22/119) LCC should be asked to check the tarmac around the school bollards which is uneven and of a poor finish. In addition, following comments that the change of priority is unclear near the school, LCC will be asked to check if the sign should be erected on the opposite of the road.

It was also stated that cars should be prevented from parking on the bend outside the Church.

MIN 22/124 Members **resolved** not to take any action regarding this as it will make it difficult for weddings and funerals

C) ISSUES RELATING TO CATFORTH

Catforth Traffic Calming Scheme

Members were informed that LCC have resolved the pole and guywire issue on School Lane by widening the footway. With this modification, it would appear that the Catforth scheme has been finalised and updated costs have been requested. Assuming the costs are broadly in line with previous quotes, Members will be required to sign the Legal Agreement to allow the works to proceed.

MIN 22/125 Members **resolved** to engage the Solicitors to oversee the signing of the Legal Agreement as occurred with the Woodplumpton Scheme.

Catforth Laybys.

Resurfacing of the Catforth laybys is not a requirement of the Catforth scheme and under MIN 21/59 of the 1st Sept 2021 meeting, Members resolved to seek quotes to resurface the laybys. A quote was received for £27,902 however, the work was put on hold due to the ongoing discussions regarding the width of the footpath between the School Lane layby and the school.

MIN 22/126 Now that a solution has been agreed, Members **resolved** that works on the laybys can commence subjected to an updated quote being obtained.

ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT AND RECEIPTS – 31st Dec 2022

Members **noted** a receipt of £1,000 from the Deputy Police Crime Commissioners for the speed silhouette signs to be placed outside Catforth & Woodplumpton schools.

MIN 22/127 Members **resolved** to note and approve the following accounts already paid in accordance with standing order 15 (b) xii

Catforth Carol refreshments	£25.89	BACs	Ref 75
Clerk's Dec Salary	£1259.87	BACs	Ref 76
HMRC PAYE	£105.74	BACs	Ref 77
Employer Nat Ins	£88.71	BACs	Ref 78
Parish Lengthsman weeks 33 - 36	£900.00	BACs	Ref 79
Shrubs for the War memorial (MIN 22/107)	£122.90	BACs	Ref 80

2022/23 FINANCIAL STATEMENT 1st April – 31st Dec 2022

The Chairman verified that the financial accounts and bank statements had been reconciled

REVIEW OF 3rd QUARTER ACCOUNTS 2022 / 2023

MIN 22/128 Members noted and **RESOLVED** to approve the 3rd quarter accounts.

CATFORTH VILLAGE HALL BIN DONATION

MIN 22/129 Members **resolved** to approve a donation of £105 to Catforth Village Hall towards the emptying of the green waste bins.

SLCC MEMBERSHIP

SLCC Membership is based on the Clerk's combined salary for both Whittingham and Woodplumpton which equates to £118 each. If the Clerk worked solely for Woodplumpton, the membership would be £187.

MIN 22/130 Members **resolved** to renew the Clerk's membership to the Society of Local Council Clerks jointly with Whittingham Parish Council.

COMMUNITY GARDEN ACCOUNT - EDGING STONES

Under MIN 22/107 Members resolved to approve replacement edging stones around the notice board in the community garden at a cost of £72.35.

MIN 22/131 As the cost is a Community Garden expense, Members **resolved** to transfer £72.35 to the Community Garden account.

SPONSORSHIP OF NEWSLETTER

Members were informed that Newton Bluecoat CE Primary School had offered to make a donation of £25 to place a small advert in the Parish Council Newsletter. Members expressed concern that this could set a precedent for other similar adverts which could restrict the space for Parish Council news. It was suggested that sponsorship may be a better way forward.

MIN 22/132 Members **resolved** to consider the matter in more detail and requested that the Clerk put it on the February Agenda.

ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT AND RECEIPTS

MIN 22/133 Members **resolved** to approve the following accounts for payment.

Clerk's Jan Salary	£1259.87	BACs
HMRC PAYE	£105.74	BACs
Employer Nat Insurance	£88.71	BACs
Parish Lengthsman weeks 37- 40	£900.00	BACs

2023/24 BUDGET AND PRECEPT SUBMISSION

At the November meeting, Members considered a DRAFT budget totalling **£43,850** and under MIN 22/109 Members resolved to increase community donations to cover incidental requests such as assistance with the cost of emptying community bins.

A revised budget was presented to reflect the above along with proposals to

- increase the Community Garden transfer to £2,005 to cover increases to the maintenance contract, water bill and replacement plants;
- increase the inflationary element of the Clerk's salary from 1% to 4% to reflect possible changes to public sector salaries
- add £2,000 for a new asset not covered by CIL

MIN 22/134 Members **resolved** to approve the above changes and requested that the Clerk investigate an online account for the community Garden rather than cheque payments.

To achieve a balanced budget, expected income of **£4,580**, less the budget expenditure of **£46,920** would require a Precept of **£42,340**. The Clerk explained that based on the end of year estimates, the Council is likely to have reserves of **£35,878** which should be assessed annually as part of the Audit regime.

The Practitioner's Guide states the smaller the authority, the closer the figure may be to 12months expenditure. Members noted that cost of living increases may be affecting residents, however as the number of households contributing to the Precept has increased, each household will pay less.

MIN 22/135 Members **resolved** to set the precept at **£47,340**, which will increase the reserves by £5,000 to cover unforeseen costs in line with the Practitioner's Guidance.

LCC BUDGET CONSULTATION

Members considered LCC budget proposals and stated that as they receive the winter bulletin, they are aware of the amount of salt (and cost) required to grit the network. However, rural areas are more open and exposed compared to towns and cities and as such, adverse weather affects them more severely. In addition, as rural areas are seldom on a bus route, roads are not gritted. Members requested that when LCC reviews the service, they should consider the topography of the area and provide grit bins near to the canal bridges and other steep inclines. Members also stated that they are aware that LCC are considering changes to the public realm agreements. If this goes ahead, Members wish to express an interest in working in partnership with LCC to provide / fill the grit bins.

MIN 22/136 Members **resolved** that the Clerk respond to the consultation with the above points.

LCC SCHOOL CONSULTATION

Members were forwarded details of LCC's consultations for a new secondary school at the former Tulketh High School site and a new primary school at Cottam Hall. Members were also informed that the proposals are in addition to a proposal to expand Cottam primary school.

MIN 22/137 Members **resolved** to strongly object to the new schools on the grounds that planning permission has been granted in NW Preston on the understanding that primary and secondary schools will be provided **locally** to serve the new estates. Not only will this be beneficial in reducing the carbon footprint - it is necessary to give the estates a stronger sense of identity, purpose and community.

In addition, developers were required to contribute to the East West link to ensure that the new estates were served by a purpose-built road running through the heart of the estates providing access to the schools and community facilities. Moving the schools to the south, will put unbearable pressure on local roads such as Sandy Lane, Tabley Lane and Tag Lane and will also create problems within the estates, as all the highway modelling assessments are based on the use of the East West link - not trips south of Hoyles Lane to Cottam and Ingol.

Members concluded that it is nonsensical to go back to the drawing board and submit proposals in locations which have previously been dismissed and do not benefit from the improved infrastructure currently being constructed.

LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

Members were informed that a drop in consultation is scheduled at Preston Grasshoppers on Weds 18th Jan between 4.00 & 7.00pm.

MIN 22/138 As the consultation closes on the 24th February, and as there were several big issues on the January agenda, Members **resolved** to defer the item to the February agenda to give Members an opportunity to consider any additional information gained from the consultation event.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS BEFORE COUNCIL

MIN 22/139 Members **resolved** to note and approve the delegated planning comments for Nov & Dec. With respect to application 06/2022/1453 relating to the side extension to The Church on Moorside Lane, Members objected to the application due to para 55 of the Rural Development SPD which states *Proposals for extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt and the Area of Other Open Countryside, which have an increase of over 50% of the volume of the original building that stood in 1948, will be considered inappropriate.*

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Members were forwarded email exchanges regarding the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan in which the City Council requested assistance from the Parish Council to carry out a Regulation 16 consultation based on a cost and resource perspective. As MIN 22/37 confirms that Members would be strongly opposed to carrying out another consultation, the Clerk suggested that a meeting should be held between PCC, the consultant and the Parish Council.

The City Council felt the email was 'aggressive' but when asked if they wish to submit a complaint, they declined to do so, and stated that they will carry out the consultation and cover the costs.

It was **noted** that the consultation will commence 'no later than the beginning of February' and no further action was proposed.

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Members are requested to note the next meeting is currently planned for **Monday 20th February 2023** in St Anne's Primary School, Woodplumpton.

The Chairman informed Members that the Deputy Police Crime Commission had invited him to speak at a Road Safety Partnership meeting to present the traffic calming as a flagship scheme. Members agreed that the Chairman should attend with the presentation focusing on how we went about it, what we wanted to achieve and the problems encountered - in the hope that these can be rectified.