



# WOODPLUMPTON PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES OF THE REMOTE MEETING

HELD ON MONDAY 20<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2020

### PRESENT

Chairman: Cllr M Greaves  
Councillors: B Dalglish M Entwistle P Entwistle  
B Probin G Walker S Yates  
Public Mr Leeming Ambrose Hall Farm

### CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION, SOUND CHECK AND VOTING INFORMATION

The Chairman 'hosted' the meeting, welcomed the public and ensured that everyone could be seen and heard. It was confirmed that voting would be by show of hands.

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr M Stewart.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2020.

**MIN 20/26** Members **resolved** that the June Minutes were a true record.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS / WRITTEN DISPENSATIONS

Cllr M Greaves declared a prejudicial interest in the donation to the Community Fete as he is a member of the Action Group organising the event.

### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

**MIN 20/27** it was **resolved** that the meeting be adjourned for public participation. The Chairman welcomed Mr Leeming and Members **noted** that there were no other attendees. The Clerk explained that

- residents requested that the Clerk raise the Hope House concerns on their behalf
- the Redrow application **06/2019/1275** will not be reconsidered as it is in accordance with planning policy and residents can object directly to the City Council who will determine the application; the City Councillors are working with the residents regarding when the roads will be surfaced and adopted. The Clerk is checking the S106 Agreement to establish the timescale for the provision of a play area. Residents will be updated once this is established.
- The resident who raised concerns about Bartle Village was invited to observe the meeting but did not request a weblink.

A Councillor stated that the odour situation at Ambrose Hall Farm had not improved and in his opinion, it was worse than before. Mr Leeming replied that although there had been an increase in people walking in the area during lockdown, there was no significant increase in complaints. He stated that he had spent a lot of money on new ventilation at Catforth, Woodplumpton and Hillcrest where there had been more complaints, however the Environment Agency had been unable to verify them as site visits had been suspended due to Covid 19. He was aware that 5 complaints were recorded immediately prior to the Parish Council meeting and stated that *it was the same people making the same complaints* but as they coincided with a local farmer spreading manure on fields, there was nothing to confirm that the odours were from the farm.

Several views were exchanged on whether the odours could be easily identified and Mr Leeming stated that he had used an independent 'smell monitoring company' to do some tests. The tests confirmed that various odours were present - but they were not all related to a poultry odour. He had obtained the report at his own expense, and if the complaints continue, he was prepared to use the report in a court of law.

A Councillor expressed concern that Mr Leeming was implying that the complaints were malicious when they were very genuine. Another Councillor stated that it was disingenuous to state residents didn't know the difference between a poultry smell and manure being spread on the fields. Mr Leeming repeated that the Environment Agency could not defend the farm by confirming the origin of the odours due to Covid 19.

Members questioned if the analysis equipment could be used to 'identify' the source of the odour so that the information could be correlated with the complaints.

Mr Leeming replied that he had used an independent company but would have no objections if the Environment Agency wanted to install equipment at their own expense.

In response to a question, Mr Leeming explained the practices used to manage the chickens and reduce the odours. It was questioned whether the fans simply recirculated the odours or whether organic filters were used. It was also questioned if a different system could be used. Mr Leeming stated that a different system would cost £250,000 per unit and he would need 2 or 3 which is not cost effective in relation to the number of complaints. If people remain concerned, they should report the odours to him and he would happily meet residents on site when they consider the smell to be most offensive. The Clerk confirmed Mr Leeming's contact details are still on the website and he was thanked for attending.

### **AMBROSE HALL FARM**

Members reflected on the exchange itemised under public participation and considered that more facts were required regarding the monitoring and analysis of the odours as without factual information, it is difficult to prove that the odours come from the farm. Members also expressed concerns that Mr Leeming appeared to know who the complainants were and how often they had objected. **MIN 20/28** It was **resolved** that the Clerk contact the Environment Agency to find out if any odour monitoring equipment can be installed. The Clerk was also requested to establish what data was being exchanged regarding the complaints and whether it complies with GDPR. As the complaints need to be recorded, residents will be reminded to report their concerns directly to Mr Leeming and the Environment Agency via the next Newsletter

### **HOPE HOUSE, MOSS LANE, CATFORTH**

Prior to the meeting the Clerk circulated some concerns regarding Hope House Children's Home and Members noted that a PCSO had stated that it appeared to be a well-run house with minimal issues. Members reported that police cars were frequently seen at the home and expressed a concern that this substantiates the residents' concerns.

**MIN 20/29** It was **resolved** that the Clerk should draw the concerns to the attention of the Care Home and query what their procedures and policies are in relation to any complaints. In addition, it was **resolved** that the Clerk should write to the police to find out how many times a police car has been dispatched to the facility as this may not be reported to the local PCSO's. Depending on the replies, a letter may also be sent to Care 4 Children asking them to investigate the concerns.

### **MAJOR DEVELOPMENT AT BARTLE HALL**

**06/2020/0566** Request for a screening and scoping opinion Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for a proposed development comprising the construction of a roundabout on the Preston Western Distribution Road (PWDR) and proposed residential development of up to 1,100 dwellings on land at Bartle Village.

Members were informed that the application is to establish if there are any known environmental factors which should be included in a future application to develop land at Bartle Hall. The site is not part of NW Preston and is not included in the Local Plan, however it is understood that the proposal is being submitted now, as it would be more cost effective to add a new roundabout to the PWDR whilst the road is being built, rather than add it at a later date.

**MIN 20/30** It was **resolved** that the Clerk reply to the application stating that whilst the need for an EIA is understood in respect of the new roundabout, the scoping work should only apply to the full application for the creation of the roundabout. To link the EIA to an outline application for 1,100 dwellings is wholly inappropriate as the land is not allocated for housing in the Development Plan. Once the roundabout has been created, currently inaccessible land will come forward in a prime location next to the M55 and PWDR which may provide an opportunity for developers to submit proposals for jobs, services and amenities more in keeping with Preston's aspirations to grow as a City – rather than simply creating a massive housing suburb.

In addition to the above, Members were notified of an on-line consultation to view the emerging plans for the development.

**MIN 20/31** It was **resolved** that the Clerk should reply to the consultation raising concerns that respondents did not receive an acknowledgement or summary of their comments. Furthermore, the consultation period is only 13 working days which is inadequate as residents may need longer to visit relatives and access the information online.

5,300 homes are already planned in NW Preston with a limited increase in schooling, healthcare or investment in the local road or drainage systems leading to concerns about the legitimacy of the proposal. The application is contrary to the current Local Plan and future land use has not been identified through the Development Plan process. This means that other developers have not been given an opportunity to put forward more ambitious proposals which take into account the site's prime location next to the M55 and PWDR. This is a very blinkered proposal which, if the developers listen to the local objections, should not proceed beyond the consultation stage.

### **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

Members considered a 'final version' of the Neighbourhood plan in September and some minor amendments were suggested. The consultant addressed these and Members confirmed that they were happy with the replies. The Clerk advised that the consultation version can now be published as we have already held a community engagement event. Following the 6-week consultation period, the plan may be amended to take into account any replies. A final draft version will then be sent to the independent examiner. If the draft version is approved, a referendum can be held with the May 2021 elections and if successful, the Plan can then be adopted.

**MIN 20/32** As there are still several steps to take before the referendum, Members **resolved** to commence the consultation process using the Newsletter and the website. Hard copies of the Plan will be printed for reference and these can be collected and returned to individual Councillors with a comment form.

### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS BEFORE COUNCIL**

**MIN 20/33** Members **resolved** to note the following representations under delegated authority.

**06/2020/0537** Permission in Principle for a dwelling at Barnfield Cottage, Rosemary Lane. Barnfield Cottage is located on Rosemary Lane to the right of the Priory near to Adamson's Farm. The location is in open countryside where development should typically be small scale and limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need. The site does not meet those requirements and **delegated representation is to oppose** the proposal. Attention has also been drawn to the appeal decision for a new dwelling on Rosemary Lane **06/2018/0514** which was recently dismissed.

**06/2020/0550** 2 stables and hard-standing at Chapel Farm Stables, Chapel Lane, Catforth. Although this is a retrospective application, the stables and hard-standing are to the rear of Chapel Farm and do not appear visible from Chapel Lane or Chapel Barn. **Delegated representation is to leave to planning.**

**06/2020/0554** Permission to vary condition 10 relating to surface water drainage for 8 dwellings and a new access at 3 Nog Tow Bank, Tabley Lane. Members opposed the original application which was approved with a condition stating that no surface water shall discharge to the public sewerage system either directly or indirectly. Drainage options for the site are limited but United Utilities have stated that they have no objections to the applicant using an existing private drainage system for the surface water. Concerns are expressed that the increased surface water from new developments is causing problems across the Parish and if problems are encountered on this site, it will be difficult to take any action as the drains will be private. If there is no feasible method to create a new surface water solution, rather than rely on an existing system, the application should be refused. **Delegated representation is to oppose the application.**

**06/2020/0577** Single storey side and rear extension at 20 Brook Meadow. The site is a corner plot with trees to the rear bounded by Tag Lane and Tom Benson Way. The property already benefits from a single storey rear extension and the proposal will extend this further towards the garden boundary with 19 Brook Meadow. **Delegated representation is to leave to planning.**

**06/2020/0593** Single storey rear extension at 4 Caspian Avenue, Preston.

**06/2020/0595** Single storey rear extension at 2 Caspian Avenue, Preston.

The applications are off Lightfoot Green Lane. The properties are semi-detached and propose a similar styled, flat roofed, rear extension. **Delegated representation is to leave to planning.**

As advised in May, the Clerk opposed **06/2019/1172** for a store and distribution centre at Lewth Farm. The initial proposal submitted in Oct 2019 stated the proposal was for the applicant's own use but an amended scheme appeared much bigger in scale.

The application was refused and an appeal has been submitted to the Planning Inspector. The application has prompted various complaints from the applicant and local residents with LCC, the police and the Environment Agency all involved but some of the matters do not relate to the planning application. **MIN 20/34** Members **resolved** that the Clerk should resubmit the Parish Council comments to the Planning Inspector via the appeals website.

### **ADOPTION OF NEW STANDING ORDERS**

Standing Orders are the 'rules' explaining how a Parish Council should be run. NALC has produced a new 'model version' which can be adapted to suit a Parish Council's needs. Members noted that the Clerk has cross referenced the paragraphs in the current Standing Orders with the new version and has 'struck through' paragraphs not considered relevant to a smaller Council.

**MIN 20/35** Members **resolved** to approve the amended NALC version which restricts public participation to **30mins (3f)** and allows the Chairman to direct that a written response may be given to questions raised which are not on the Agenda. **(3h)** Members also determined that meetings should not exceed **3hrs** in length **(3x)**. A copy of the newly adopted version will be emailed to Members and added to the website.

### **CODE OF CONDUCT CONSULTATION**

In 2012, the Parish Council adopted the City Council's Code of Conduct although a shorter version was produced by NALC. NALC have now issued a consultation which asks Councillors for their opinion on how the NALC Code is applied to Councillor behaviour, whether aspects of the Code should be made clearer, whether it should apply to social media and whether Councillor Interests should be extended to other family members. **MIN 20/36** Members **resolved** to reply individually to the NALC consultation by the 17th August.

Members noted that a complaint had been received regarding a Councillor's conduct whilst acting in a personal capacity. The complainant has been advised to refer the matter to the City Council monitoring officer to assess if the Code has been breached.

### **ZERO TOLERANCE POLICY**

**MIN 20/37** Whilst the Code of Conduct details how Councillors should conduct themselves in public, Members **resolved** to adopt an anti-bullying / harassment policy which details how the Clerk, Councillors and contractors will respond to nuisance, aggressive or intimidating telephone calls, correspondence or encounters with the public. The Policy will be based on SLCC and NALC model examples and will be drafted by the Clerk and Cllr Yates before being presented to Council for approval.

### **DOG CONTROL ORDERS**

Members noted that there are 4 Dog Control Orders in Preston which the City Council is required to review. Whilst no changes are proposed to the existing Orders, Members expressed concerns that there is very little signage confirming the occasions when dogs should be kept on a lead or excluded from areas. **MIN 20/38** Members **resolved** to respond to the consultation requesting more signs, enforcement and publicity relating to the number of fixed penalty notices issued.

### **FLY TIPPING**

Even though the recycling centre is now open to cars without booking in advance, vans are only able to access the centre once a month which means fly-tipping is still a problem in the Parish and the Lengthsman is struggling to remove it. **MIN 20/39** Members **resolved** that the Clerk write to the City Council requesting support in an appeal to LCC to remove the temporary arrangements. Cllr Yates thanked Cllr Hill for continuing to maintain the grassed area around the Village hall.

### **STOCKS AND MOUNTING BLOCK**

Further to the site meeting and emails exchanged at the beginning of the month, Members discussed the location of the stocks and mounting stone. Members agreed that in addition to a plan or drawing showing the location of the assets - and any additions such as bollards, lighting and an information plaque – Members need to speak to a specialist with regards to moving and renovating the assets. **MIN 20/40** It was **resolved** that Cllr Yates, Cllr Greaves and Cllr Walker would work on the above.

Members also discussed the provision of Parish Information Signs to be displayed in Catforth and Woodplumpton identifying notable features of the villages. Cllr P Entwistle has approached several sign companies for an idea of the signs and in principle, Members agreed to the designs by Shelly.

**MIN 20/41** As the final cost will be dependent on the material and artwork required, it was **resolved** that Cllr P Entwistle progress the artwork and script for Catforth which he will share with Cllr Walker so a similar script can be drawn up for Woodplumpton. Both scripts, the locations and costings of the sign will be added to the Agenda of the next meeting.

### FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Copies of the accounts and bank statements had been emailed and Members confirmed they had been reconciled.

### REVIEW OF 1st QUARTER ACCOUNTS

Members considered the expenditure against budgeted items following the completion of the 1st Quarter – April to June. Members noted that several invoices have not been received as expected presumably as organisations fall behind due to Coronavirus. **MIN 20/42** Members **resolved** that no virements were needed.

### WOODPLUMPTON FETE

Cllr Greaves stated that there was an interest in the Woodplumpton Fete still going ahead in September. It is accepted that any decision needs to comply with government advice, but as the decision needs to be taken in August, discussions were taking place to change it to a Christmas Fete. Members expressed concern that September was too soon as many events have already been cancelled and whilst there was some agreement that a Christmas fete might work in a marquee, concerns were expressed that it was too early to make a decision on that too. The Clerk stated that as the event was independent of the Parish Council in terms of risk assessments and insurance, the only decision required was whether or not to release the funding.

**MIN 20/43** Members **resolved** to defer the matter to the October Agenda.

In accordance with Standing Order 13C, Cllr Greaves added to the discussion on when the fete should be held, but did not participate on the vote to defer the matter to October.

### NEWSLETTER

Members were reminded that the Parish Council usually issues a Newsletter in June after the May Annual Council meeting, however, this did not occur as the meeting did not go ahead, an Annual Report was not produced and updates on other ongoing schemes, such as the traffic calming, are on hold due to Coronavirus. Whilst Members have agreed to promote the Neighbourhood Plan consultation in the next Newsletter, it would be advisable to wait until the copies are printed and the consultation process has been confirmed. **Min 20/44** It was **resolved** that the Newsletter should be drafted in August for release in September once progress on other matters are clearer.

### ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT

Members NOTED the following invoice already paid in accordance with Standing Order 17b.

Lengthsman invoice wks 9-12 and postcrete	£754.75	BACS
---	---------	------

**MIN 20/44** Members **resolved** to approve the following accounts for payment

DETAILS	PAYEE	AMOUNT
Apr – June Expenses & Land Reg fee	Mrs J Buttle	£39.55
July salary	Mrs J Buttle	£1134.58
PAYE	HMRC	£92.60
Employer N Ins	HMRC	£72.45

### UPDATE ON TRAFFIC CALMING

The Agenda reminded Members that LCC have stated *staff are currently redeployed to our COVID-19 Lancashire Safer Travel Restart taskforce and involvement in all 'business as usual' projects has been paused. Once we are able to return to our normal duties, we'll pick up your comments and review the plans accordingly.*

The Agenda also confirmed that emails had been received opposing the parking restrictions outside Catforth School. All of the emails have been acknowledged and the wider context of the scheme has been explained. Attention was also drawn to a letter from the headteacher of Catforth school which questioned the scheme and reiterated some of the concerns previously expressed. It was acknowledged that there is a degree of tension regarding the traffic calming measures outside Catforth School and it was felt that the views were becoming polarised instead of being considered in the wider context.

Members discussed holding a joint meeting between the Parish Council, Catforth School and LCC Officers who are responsible for the overall safety of the scheme.

Although commitment to both traffic calming schemes was confirmed under **MIN 19/109** of the extra-ordinary meeting in January 2020, Cllr Probin declared that he felt uncomfortable participating in a meeting specifically focussing on Catforth School, as he is also a School Governor. The Clerk confirmed that whilst he may comment on the wider aspects of the scheme, he would have a conflict of interests in relation to the measures outside the School and should probably withdraw from any further discussions in that regard.

**MIN 20/45** Members **resolved** to arrange a joint meeting with selected Parish Councillors, the Catforth School headteacher, governors and officers from LCC. The format and date of the meeting will be subject to agreement and confirmation by LCC officers.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

Members noted the following items of correspondence / actions taken

A HGV driver ignored the 'no HGV signs' on Cinder Lane and New Hall Bridge was damaged during the recovery attempts. Photographs were submitted to LCC who were requested to provide more signs and recover the repair costs from the company concerned.

Members were kept up to date regarding a flooding incident at Bartle Lane and were copied in to a reply from LCC's Chief Executive. It is understood that LCC are carrying out additional inspections and repairs to prevent the road flooding again. LCC have also been asked to investigate additional flooding at Rapley Lane since new drains were put in.

Members were informed that following the cancellation of the NW Rally, the organisers have applied to host it in May 2021. The Clerk was requested to resubmit the Parish Council's concerns.

There has been an increase in nitrous oxide canisters being discarded on Catforth Road. The matter has been reported to the police. Updated crime reports were requested for the meeting but they were not received.

### **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**MIN 20/46** Members **resolved** that the next meeting of the Parish Council will be on the 21<sup>st</sup> September at 7.00pm. The Clerk will continue to monitor NALC and SLCC advice and will start to work on the risk assessments required before face to face meetings can be resumed.

In addition, the Clerk will continue to progress matters under delegated authority, consulting with Councillors where appropriate and will use August to progress the proposed Policies on Communications, Zero Tolerance and Website Accessibility, commence the review of the new website and update the GDPR templates and model Financial Regulations.