

**West Bradford Parish Council**

Clerk:

Andrew Glover  
24 Hillside Drive  
Clitheroe  
Lancs  
BB7 4TG

Tel: 01200 428547

Mobile: 07968 486729

Email: andy.glover24@hotmail.co.uk

**Minutes of the meeting of West Bradford Parish Council held on Wednesday 22 February 2023 at West Bradford Village Hall**

Members present:	Parish Cllr A Bristol (Chair) Parish Cllr H Best Parish Cllr M Wood Cllr K Horkin MBE (RVBC)
Apologies:	Parish Cllr R Chew (Vice Chair) Parish Cllr M Fox
County Cllr present:	County Cllr Ged Mirfin
Members of the public present:	None

1.	<b>Declarations of Pecuniary, Other Registrable and Non-Registrable Interests</b>  None	
2.	<b>Minutes of the Last Meeting (25 January 2023):</b>  The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2023 were signed by the Chair as a true and accurate record.  Proposed by: Cllr Wood Seconded by: Cllr Best  <b>Resolved</b> <b>It was agreed that the minutes of the 25 January meeting would be posted on the Parish Council website</b>  <u>Matters arising:</u>  a) <u>Concerns reported to LCC</u>  The Clerk updated members on 2 matters which he had been required to report to LCC. Members were pleased to note the following:	Clerk

	<p>a) the pothole which had appeared in the entrance to Halstead’s Farm had now been repaired; and</p> <p>b) a 10m stretch of damaged retaining wall on Clitheroe Road (adjacent to the Hippings House) would also be repaired as resources permitted.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Public questions, comments or representations:</b></p> <p>None</p>	
4.	<p><b>Update from Ward Councillor present:</b></p> <p>Cllr Horkin and County Cllr Mirfin commented at length on the latest HARP developments; this discussion is recorded in detail in minute item 6 below.</p> <p>County Cllr Mirfin also suggested that it may be helpful to invite County Cllr Joan Burrows (LCC Champion for Older People) to a future meeting, as she had access to a number of funding streams.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to pass this suggestion on to the Chair of the VHMC</b></p>	Clerk
5.	<p><b>Bradford Bridge</b></p> <p>No update</p>	
6.	<p><b>Haweswater Aqueduct Resilience Programme (HARP)</b></p> <p>a) <u>Update – documents submitted by United Utilities (UU) in support of planning application 3/2021/0661</u></p> <p>The Clerk advised members that UU had now submitted revised documents relating to planning application 3/2021/0661. Their content (set out in considerable detail) had been made available to him by the Borough Council’s Director of Economic Development and Planning, Nicola Hopkins.</p> <p>It was understood that the documentation would be formally considered by RVBC at a meeting on 9 March, and members had been invited to comment. In order to give members an advance sighting of what was complex and technical information, the documents had been circulated by the Clerk on 8 February.</p> <p>Many of the detailed proposals related to road improvements required in Waddington, specifically at the junction of West Bradford Rd and Slaidburn Rd at the Higher Buck, and as such fell largely outside the remit of West Bradford Parish Council. However, the main document - which impacted the village of West Bradford directly - was the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The Clerk presented an overview of the CTMP’s contents, summarised below.</p> <p>Members noted with approval that the proposed temporary crossing of the River Ribble had been retained in these latest proposals. Use of the temporary crossing (identified as “Route 2” in the CTMP) would thereby keep much heavy traffic out of the village for the greater part of the construction period, as well as promoting road safety in the vicinity of the Waddington and West Bradford School.</p>	

Unfortunately, however, the CTMP indicated that - during at least the 9-month period when the temporary Ribble crossing was under construction - UU intended to transport the piling equipment etc required to build it through West Bradford on heavy vehicles. The proposed short-term use of this traffic route (identified as "Route 1") was said to be used on an "infrequent" basis only, and no road modifications to accommodate it were proposed.

The CTMP listed a number of measures seeking to mitigate the impact on the village during the estimated 9-month construction period of the temporary crossing. Members considered these at length, commenting as follows:

Proposed Mitigation	Member comment
The use of time restrictions when heavy vehicles would not travel, thereby avoiding the "school run", as well as restrictions on the number of convoys per day / week	Members sought specific reassurance that heavy traffic would not impact the already heavily-congested road outside Waddington and West Bradford School, the safety of children and their parents being of paramount importance. It was imperative that any restrictions on the passage of heavy vehicles was adequately policed, as experience suggested that time restrictions were often ignored by contractors with deadlines to meet
The use of rolling roadblocks at key locations such as the difficult bend next to the 3 Millstones restaurant	Members were accepting of the need for rolling roadblocks, but would expect them to be adequately managed, with the deployment of appropriate staff / escort vehicles in order to ensure safety and minimise inconvenience to road users
Access to PROWS should not be restricted	Members noted with approval

In addition, members identified a number of other concerns arising from the documentation:

Concern	Comment
Section 6.4 of the CTMP states that a precondition survey will be carried out (presumably to act as a baseline for vehicular impact), from "West Bradford Road, Waddington from the proposed junction with Ribble crossing temporary haul road to The Square,	Members were clear in their view that a pre-condition survey of roads should also be undertaken in the village of West Bradford itself. It was not long since the surface of Grindleton Rd had been re-laid, and members were

<p>Waddington". It therefore makes no reference to the village of West Bradford itself.</p>	<p>insistent that any damage arising from heavy vehicles should be made good.</p>
<p>The CTMP makes no reference to a legacy fund to compensate residents for their lengthy inconvenience etc.</p>	<p>Members accepted that the CTMP may not be the appropriate document in which to outline details of a legacy fund. However, the apparent lack of progress on this topic (which had been raised several times previously) was worrying, and members were keen to ensure that this matter was not overlooked.</p>
<p>Whilst it is good that a Highways Stakeholder Group (HSG) will be established to oversee the process, section 7.2.2 states that "Local community groups (e.g. Parish Councils, special interest groups) will be made aware of the HSG as a vehicle for collating and investigating enquires from the public".</p>	<p>Members were unclear as to the role of the proposed HSG, and whether they would have any access to it (as opposed to being made aware of it).</p>
<p>There will also be a Community Engagement Group and a Travel Plan Co-ordinator (sections 7.2.2 – 7.2.4), both of whom seem to be leading on contact with residents etc.</p>	<p>Members saw the issue of communication as key to the successful delivery of the project. Given the length of the construction period it was inevitable that problems would arise, and parish councillors would bear the brunt of any community concerns. Members were insistent upon having a direct and open channel of communication by telephone to a dedicated Single Point of Contact (SPOC), either within LCC or UU, who was at a senior level and with enough "clout" to be able to resolve issues as they arose. Members would expect any SPOC to adopt a flexible, dynamic and proactive approach to community engagement; only time would tell whether this was the case.</p>

In conclusion, members wondered whether they would be entitled to attend the meeting on 9 March, and asked the Clerk to establish whether this were possible.

	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to respond in writing to Nicola Hopkins prior to 9 March, setting out the member comments / concerns outlined above</b></p> <p>Cllr Mirfin then pointed out that – whilst sending a letter to Nicola Hopkins prior to 9 March was advisable – the situation had moved on somewhat since the Clerk had received the CTMP. He forwarded to the Clerk by email a later document from LCC which commented at length on the draft CTMP submitted by UU; the document (which was not yet in the public domain) was said to make a number of comments / observations which – if adopted - would seek to strengthen the protection offered.</p>	Clerk
	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to circulate the LCC document to parish councillors only</b>  <b>After circulation, and with members’ agreement, Clerk to comment on the LCC document in any letter sent to RVBC prior to 9 March</b>  <b>Clerk to include a discussion of the LCC document on the agenda for the March meeting</b></p> <p>Cllr Mirfin went on to suggest that the Parish Council may wish to take the lead in setting up a formal body (independent of the Parish Council) to act as a lobbying group on future HARP issues. Such a body, with its own constitution and identified officers, would be in a position to bid for LCC funding otherwise denied to parish councils. It would be able to hold public meetings, conferences and other events in a non-political manner and as such would be an effective vehicle for local community representation. The nature and membership of the group would be for the Parish Council to decide, but it could include representatives of other parishes impacted by HARP if members so wished.</p>	Clerk Clerk Clerk
	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to explore the constitutional arrangements for this potential body and report back to the March meeting</b></p>	Clerk
b)	<p><u>Recompense for meeting in June 2022</u></p> <p>At the January meeting, members had been advised that the issue of recompense for the Parish Council for the Clerk’s time in arranging the special meeting in June 2022 remained unresolved. As a result, an approach had been made to the Leader of LCC, Cllr Philippa Williamson, and supporting documentation had been provided at her request. Cllr Horkin had also offered to again raise the matter with County Cllr Mirfin.</p> <p>Following the January meeting, on 2 February the Clerk had – at members’ request – again contacted Cllr Williamson’s office for an update. On 15 February, the Leader of the County Council had confirmed in writing that the failure to pay was due to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">an apparent “misunderstanding around how your services as Clerk would be recompensed. However, County Councillor Swarbrick has offered to cover this expenditure from his Member Grant by providing a contribution</p>	

	<p>to the HARP Action Group, which I understand is a local community group.”</p> <p>In a subsequent telephone conversation with County Cllr Mirfin, it had been confirmed that the money claimed would be reimbursed to the Parish Council. It would appear that the “HARP Action Group” was to be a consultative body through which parish councils may be asked to engage with UU (see minute item 6a above), to which the Clerk may be asked to provide administrative support in future.</p> <p>Members were grateful for the direct intervention of the Leader of the County Council on this matter, and asked the Clerk to thank County Cllr Williamson for her support. However, in the absence of any further detail about the nature of the proposed HARP Action Group, members felt that the response as given begged a number of questions. Specifically, would the funding claimed now be provided directly to the Parish Council (and if so when), as opposed to the HARP Action Group (once established)?</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to write to the Leader of the County Council and thank her for her support, whilst seeking further clarification on the issue of payment</b></p>	Clerk
7.	<p><b>Overview of financial position:</b></p> <p>a) <u>Monthly accounts – January 2023</u></p> <p>The Clerk submitted details of income and expenditure for the month of January 2023 for approval by the Parish Council and signing-off by the Chair.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>That the record for January 2023 as presented would be signed off</b></p> <p>b) <u>Invoice – RVBC, grass cutting 2022/23</u></p> <p>The Clerk submitted details of an invoice for grass cutting services provided by RVBC in 2022/23, which had now been received. It totalled £796.46, of which £132.74 was recoupable VAT; the net charge was therefore £663.72.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>That the Clerk would be asked to arrange payment</b></p>	Clerk
8.	<p><b>Governance</b></p> <p>a) <u>Parish Council elections</u></p> <p>Following the discussion at the November meeting on forthcoming elections in May 2023, Cllr Fox had provided the Clerk with a signed copy of the forms which were likely to be required. The Clerk had agreed to keep these safely and re-assess the situation once further procedural guidance from RCBC is obtained.</p>	

The Chair confirmed that the elections had been discussed at the Parish Council Liaison Committee on 2 February. At this stage, key dates were understood to be as follows:

- 27 March -deadline for publication of notice of election
- 4 April – deadline for delivery of nomination papers
- 17 April – last date for electors to register
- 5 April – publication of statement of persons nominated
- 25 April – publication of notice of poll
- 4 May – elections held
- 9 May – counting takes place

It was also explained that this would be the first election when voters were required to provide photo identification when attending the polling centre.

On 22 February, the Clerk had received an update from the RVBC Monitoring Officer which confirmed that each Parish Council would shortly receive a set of election materials from Theresa Sanderson, the Borough Council’s Communications Officer. A meeting would also be held on 13 March for prospective candidates.

**Resolved**

**Members noted the key dates**

**Clerk to display materials provided by RVBC as appropriate**

**As the meeting on 13 March was for prospective (rather than returning) candidates only, there was no need for existing parish councillors to attend**

Clerk

b) Casual vacancy arising where Parish Council is quorate after an election

The Clerk informed members of the procedures to be followed in the event that a casual vacancy arose following the forthcoming May elections.

c) Village Hall Management Committee (VHMC)

The AGM for the VHMC had been held on 8 February 2023. At this meeting, the previous Chair of the VHMC (Andrew Marsden) had resigned after many years of voluntary service to the community. It was agreed that the Clerk would write to Andrew and thank him for his support over the past decade, and a donation of £25 would be made to his leaving present.

The new Chair of the VHMC was Sue Wright, and – given the close relationship between the VHMC and the Parish Council - it was agreed that the Clerk would write to Sue and welcome her to the role.

**Resolved**

**Clerk to send a letter of thanks to Andrew Marsden**

**Clerk to arrange a donation to his leaving present**

**Clerk to send a letter of welcome to Sue Wright**

Clerk  
Clerk  
Clerk

<p>d)</p> <p>e)</p>	<p><u>Information Commissioner – payment of annual fee</u></p> <p>Organisations that process personal data are subject to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018.</p> <p>Under the Data Protection (Charges and Information) Regulations 2018 (the Regulations) they must also pay an annual data protection fee, unless they are exempt. The Parish Council had now been required to pay its annual fee of £40; payment had been sent by the Clerk to the ICO on 1 February 2023.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members noted that payment had been made</b></p> <p><u>Renewal of domain name</u></p> <p>Jon Pendrill had kindly arranged for renewal of the domain name used on the Parish Council website, at a fee of £192 + VAT (£230.40 in total) for the 2 years from 26 February 2023. Jon had now been provided with a cheque to cover the costs.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members noted the above, and thanked Jon for his ongoing assistance in managing the website</b></p>	
<p>9.</p> <p>a)</p> <p>b)</p>	<p><b>Planning applications considered</b></p> <p><u>Planning Applications</u></p> <p>None received for comment</p> <p><u>List of contested applications</u></p> <p>As requested, the Clerk continued to compile a list of contested applications which would be submitted to members on a regular basis for their consideration. The purpose of the list was to assist members in keeping track of contested applications, and to have more clarity around the subsequent determinations made by RVBC / Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Members noted the refusal of application 3/2022/0446 for Marylebone Farm, the decision notice stating:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policy DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in that approval would result in the creation of a residential annexe that would provide a level and provision of accommodation which exceeds that which could reasonably be considered as being 'modest'.</p>	



10.	<b>Lancashire Best Kept Village Competition (LBKVC) 2023</b>	
a)	<u>Entry to the 2023 competition</u>  The Clerk had received the entry forms for the 2023 competition; these were due to be returned to the organisers by 30 April 2023.  Members were invited to make a number of decisions about this year’s entry, as set out below:	
i)	<u>Approval of entry</u>  Subject to perusal of the 2021 census, it was anticipated that the Parish Council would once again be entered into the Small Village category (less than 1000 population with 5 or more Amenities), with an entry fee of £25.  <b>Resolved</b> <b>Members approved entry and fee payment – Clerk to arrange</b>	Clerk
ii)	<u>Wilding etc</u>  The entry form required identification of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “any areas left to nature and therefore not neatly mown”.</li> </ul> Members recalled that, in its 2022 entry, the Parish Council had declared “all grass verges in the village will be unstrimmed and left to grow wild”. (Strimming had resumed once judging was complete).  <b>Resolved</b> <b>The same approach to wilding would be adopted in 2023</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>“any areas to be excluded from judging” and why</u></li> </ul> No other areas to be excluded were identified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Dates of any village fetes etc</u></li> </ul> No other dates were identified when judging should be avoided. It was noted that the proposed Coronation celebrations (6-8 May) pre-dated the judging period.	
iii)	<u>Outstanding Features</u>  In previous years, members had asked the Clerk to approach the following as nominees for entry in the relevant category of Outstanding Features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Place of Worship and Grounds – St Catherine’s Church</li> <li>Village Pub or Inn / Restaurant – 3 Millstones</li> <li>Hotel / Guest House – Eaves Hall</li> <li>Public Building – Village Hall</li> </ul>	

	<p>Children’s Play Area – Village Hall</p> <p>Community Notice Board (adjacent to junction of Chapel Lane / Westfield Drive) – Parish Council</p> <p>War Memorial (Coronation Gardens) – Parish Council</p> <p>In addition, a new category had appeared for 2023:</p> <p>Public Playing Field / Sports Ground – Village Hall</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Members agreed that they would once again recommend the above for entry, and gave formal approval for the Clerk to enter the War Memorial and community notice board in the appropriate categories</b>  <b>Clerk to gain the consent of all other proposed nominees prior to including them on the entry form</b>  <b>Clerk to purchase replacement banners for display in village</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
b)	<p><u>Attendance at Information Event</u></p> <p>Members were advised that, on Wednesday 1 March, LALC would be holding a member information event at Salmesbury Memorial Hall at 7.30pm. Here, members would be invited to “ask the questions you want to of the Committee and swap advice with other villages in the Competition.”</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Due to other commitments, members were unable to identify a representative to attend</b></p>	
c)	<p><u>Plaque to commemorate success in 2022 competition</u></p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that he had made an initial attempt to contact the supplier of plaques, but no response had yet been received. He would continue to seek clarification on the likely costs of purchase and place before members for their consideration.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to pursue</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p>
d)	<p><u>Proposed replacement of Notice Boards</u></p> <p>The Clerk had taken possession of the notice board on 11 January 2023. At the January meeting, it had been agreed that – on receipt of the new board - the Chair would examine it during March and consider how best to install it as a replacement for the existing version.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to view notice board and consider how best to install it</b></p>	<p>Chair</p>

Once in situ, members were reminded that they would be invited to consider whether they would wish to purchase a comparable interpretation board from the same supplier.

e) Re-painting of the Millennium Stone

At the January meeting, the Clerk had presented a draft design for a new stone produced by Mr Jack Kelsall. Members had considered the proposal but identified a number of changes which the Clerk had been asked to pass on to the designer. These had included:

- the proposed wording should be amended to read “2023 West Bradford”, thereby commemorating the forthcoming coronation of King Charles III. This would allow the existing stone (erected to celebrate the millennium) to be removed to the front of the Village Hall; and
- it would be helpful to see a draft in which a more stylised font (eg slightly italicised) was used; and
- the main concern was the depiction of the bridge, which bore little resemblance to the village landmark it was intended to reflect. The representation of the bridge would benefit from a greater curve at each end, and ideally water flowing beneath.

In response, on 8 February Mr Kelsall had provided 2 amended designs of the bridge which had then been circulated to members for comment.



shutterstock.com · 1694530921



shutterstock.com · 1694530927

Members gave careful consideration to the new designs, but did not feel that they presented a more recognisable aspect of the familiar village landmark. Cllr Wood put forward an alternative proposal to rejuvenate the appearance of the Millennium Stone, suggesting that an aluminium plate could be affixed to the lower portion of the Stone, on which could be inscribed a reference to the forthcoming coronation of King Charles III. Even allowing for the existing paintwork on the Stone having to be re-touched, this could potentially provide a cheaper method for rejuvenating the Millennium Stone.

	<p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to contact Mr Kelsall and advise him that members were still deliberating on the way forward</b>  <b>Clerk to research the cost and availability of aluminium plating and report back to the March meeting</b></p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
11.	<p><b>CCTV</b></p> <p>No further update.</p> <p>It was agreed that – given the ongoing lack of progress with this issue, and the lack of satisfactory engagement to date from the RVBC preferred contractors – this matter would now cease to be a standing item on the agenda.</p>	
12.	<p><b>Land in which the Parish Council has an interest</b></p> <p>a) <u>Land for sale on Chapel Lane – issues arising</u></p> <p>Motion to exclude public</p> <p>That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Schedule 12A of the Act: namely “information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and “information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)”.</p> <p>This motion was not considered as no members of the public were present.</p> <p>Members considered the confidential report and letter presented by the Clerk in some detail, and were pleased to note that he had now received a holding response from the legal representative of the third party concerned.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to chase up a further response if no further correspondence had been forthcoming by the end of February</b></p> <p>b) <u>Pinfold</u></p> <p>i) <u>Land ownership</u></p> <p>Following the January meeting, the Clerk had commissioned a search of the register of title held by the Land Registry. With regard to the Pinfold, the following confirmation had been received:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">After searching the relevant Government indexes, no Titles have been located using the details provided on your application and therefore no documents will be sent.</p> <p>Members noted that unregistered land was in essence land that had not yet been registered with the Land Registry. In such cases, proof of ownership could be</p>	<p>Clerk</p>

	<p>evidenced by a bundle of title documents or deeds. (Any land sold since 1925 was obliged to be registered with the Land Registry).</p> <p>Members accepted that this absence of records held by the Land Registry cast doubt on the understanding that the Parish Council was the owner of the Pinfold, having allegedly purchased the land for a nominal sum of 1p from Lord Clitheroe.</p> <p>ii) <u>Proposals to improve Pinfold site</u></p> <p>In August 2022, members had considered proposals from a local resident to increase local use of and access to the Pinfold site. The proposals, which had been positively received by members, included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• growing wildflowers around the perimeter of the site, with LCC merely mowing a narrow central strip to provide access to the bench at the rear;</li> <li>• the installation of other facilities to encourage wildlife, such as bug hotels etc;</li> <li>• the display of an interpretation board (possibly using grant funding) with information about the history of the Pinfold; and</li> <li>• the possible involvement of pupils from local schools to promote / develop the project.</li> </ul> <p>It had been agreed that the above proposals would be revisited in early 2023.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>In light of the ownership concerns set out in minute item 12bi above, members agreed to defer any further action pending clarification of the legal situation</b>  <b>Clerk to place on the agenda for further consideration at the March meeting</b></p>	Clerk
13.	<p><b>Draft Action Plan 2022</b></p> <p>a) <u>Review of Action Plan 2022</u></p> <p>The Clerk presented an updated Action Plan for 2023, and members discussed the following issues arising from it:</p> <p>i) <u>Oak Trees</u></p> <p>The Chair reported that the oak trees acquired for the 2022 Jubilee, and subsequently maintained by him, were due to be examined by David Bristol in the coming days and planted in the near future.</p> <p>c) <u>Coronation – King Charles III</u></p> <p>County Cllr Mirfin reported that each county councillor had been given a budget of £500 to support community events held in honour of the Coronation. Bids for this grant funding were not open to parish councils, but other “good causes” could apply via the Coronation Grant Funds soon to be available on the RVBC website.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to advise Chair of the VHMC of this potential funding</b></p>	Clerk

	<p>It had previously been agreed that members would hold further discussions on the proposed celebrations at the March meeting. For the proposed celebration on Sunday 7 May, arrangements made to date included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VHMC – afternoon tea, and a ukulele band had now been booked by the VHMC (7pm); and</li> <li>• firework display (9.15pm).</li> </ul> <p>Members were asked to consider whether interested parties should be invited to attend the March meeting so that further discussions / planning could take place.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Once dialogue with the VHMC had commenced on 8 March, the Clerk may be asked to invite representatives of the VHMC to the March meeting of the Parish Council, and Frank Taylor to the April meeting</b></p> <p>Members noted that, according to the Parish Council’s insurers, adequate public liability insurance cover would be in place for an event with less than 2000 attendees so long as the following steps were taken: :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Carry out a thorough risk assessment</li> <li>2. Comply with HSE guidance for bonfires, beacons, fireworks or inflatables</li> <li>3. Train your event volunteers and staff</li> <li>4. Ensure that third-party suppliers have their own Public Liability Insurance</li> </ol>	Clerk
14.	<p><b>Lengthsman</b></p> <p>a) <u>Work undertaken since the last meeting:</u></p> <p>None</p> <p>The Clerk reminded members that, under paragraph 1 of the Lengthsman’s contract of employment, the Lengthsman was expected to be available to work from 1 March. Members concluded that no work would be required until around 1 April, when weeds may have begun to grow.</p> <p>The current Clerk / Lengthsman indicated that, due to the stress it placed on his back, he no longer wished to undertake strimming duties. The Chair confirmed that he had identified a volunteer who was willing to take on this role.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Chair to liaise with the volunteer re strimming requirements and payment of his costs</b></p>	Chair

15.	<p><b>NatWest banking arrangements</b></p> <p>a) <u>Mandate</u></p> <p>At the January meeting, the Clerk had been requested to resubmit the application to (i) remove certain signatories from the banking mandate and (ii) add the Chair and Vice Chair to it. This would then allow a further application for online banking to be made.</p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that he had not yet had the opportunity to re-submit the mandate, but would do so at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to re-submit</b></p>	Clerk
16.	<p><b>Website / use as a communications tool</b></p> <p>At the January meeting, Cllr Chew had requested information on the extent to which the Parish Council website was accessed by local residents. Jon Pendrill had subsequently confirmed that, from 1 January – 31 December 2022, there had been 291 different visitors to the site, making a total of 408 visits (ie some people had visited the website more than once).</p> <p>Informal discussion with Jon had confirmed that this was not a large figure and it had to be concluded that the website is not being particularly widely used as a source of information by residents.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to place a notice on the village noticeboard promoting the Parish Council website and encouraging residents to view its content</b></p>	Clerk
17.	<p><b>Reports from sub-committees / other meetings attended</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Playing Field / Village Hall</b> – Cllr Wood reported that the zip wire should be installed on the playing field within 4-5 weeks</li> <li>• <b>Parish Councils' Liaison Committee</b> – the Chair updated members on the meeting held on 2 February 2023. In a lengthy session, matters discussed included (i) the enforceability of 20mph speed limits and (ii) reports that the cost of defibrillator pads (which needed to be replaced after use) were currently in short supply.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolved</b> <b>Clerk to check with Darren Hudson whether any new pads were required</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lancashire Association of Local Councils</b> – no update</li> <li>• <b>Hanson Cement Liaison Committee</b> – next meeting to be held on 23 March 2023</li> <li>• <b>Lengthsman scheme</b> – discussed in minute item 14 above.</li> </ul>	Clerk

18.	<b>Correspondence / requests received</b>		
a)	None		
19.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>a) <u>Motorhome parked on Grindleton Rd</u></p> <p>On 19 February, a complaint had been received from a local resident expressing concern at the parking of the motorhome on Grindleton Rd. Members debated whether the parking of the vehicle would amount to an obstruction of the highway (given its close proximity to the bus station used by local school children), but concluded that this was unlikely. It was noted that Cllr Chew had offered to approach the owner of the motorhome and seek a negotiated solution to the problem, and it was agreed that no further action should be taken pending Cllr Chew's intervention.</p> <p>b) <u>Increased dog mess – Grindleton Rd</u></p> <p>The Clerk had been contacted by a local resident to complain about the increased dog mess found recently throughout the village. The problem was said to be particularly bad on Grindleton Rd, in the vicinity of Kirkside and Pillings Farm Bungalow, to the extent that the complainant had herself felt obliged to clear up the mess left by other walkers' dogs.</p> <p>Bowland Gate Lane and the Coronation Gardens were also listed as areas of concern.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b>  <b>Clerk to report the complaint to the RVBC Dog Warden</b></p>		Clerk
<p><b>Date / time of next meeting:</b></p> <p>The next scheduled meeting of West Bradford Parish Council was due to be held on <b>29 March 2023</b> at 7.30pm.</p> <p><b>The meeting closed at 9.20pm</b></p>			
Signed by:			
		Date: 29.3.23	Cllr A Bristol Chair 