

WRIGHTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

At the remote Meeting of the Parish Council (called under the provisions of the Coronavirus Act 2020, and The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020) of the Parish of Wrightington held on Monday 18th January 2021 at 7.30 pm via the Zoom Platform the following were present:

Councillors: Mrs J Burton (Acting Chairman), Mr F Johnson, Mrs K Jukes, Mrs R Critchley and Mr C House. Also present were members of the public

OPEN FORUM

(At this point in the Meeting members of the public present can report, ask questions, raise issues and make observations on parish matters or items appearing on the Agenda. Reports will also be received from the Police, District and County Councillors if attending – Once open forum is closed the Chairman will only suspend standing orders to allow public participation in extreme circumstances.)

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the first Wrightington Parish Council zoom Meeting. It was requested that items a), b) and c) under correspondence be discussed in Open Forum as they are all linked overall by the original planning application. The Chairman confirmed that any comments made in Open Forum on these items would be taken on board by the Parish Council. A representative of the Parbold Hill Group explained the current position. The group has realised that Parbold Quarry and West Quarry should be dealt with as one. Most of the infrastructure for Parbold Quarry is on West Quarry and therefore, the greatest problem is for Appley Bridge. From the information gathered it proves that the residents have been let down by Lancashire County Council (LCC), the Environment Agency (EA) and West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC). Responses received by the Parish Council from the EA and WLBC have been forwarded to the Parbold Hill Group however, the responses appear to fob the Parish Council off. The Group has now complained to the EA about this fact, as it is now difficult to distinguish the actual truth of the situation. Dealing with the planning application to infill Parbold Quarry, it was reported that LCC ignored much of the advice given and granted planning permission. Legal advice taken suggests that the decision can be challenged. To successfully challenge the decision will be costly. Initial costs were in the region of £15,000, with over £20,000 spent on the fight up to now. To engage a QC to fight the decision will cost £7,800 therefore; the Parbold Hill Group is asking the Parish Council and the residents in Appley Bridge to financially support the challenge to LCC and the EA. It was confirmed that other Parishes such as Parbold and Dalton have agreed to support the group. It was confirmed that once compiled the QC's report will be sent to LCC and the EA. As no decision document has as yet been issued for the planning application to infill Parbold Quarry by LCC, time is of the essence. Residents were not aware that Wrightington Parish Council had submitted observations and objected to the abstraction licence application for East Quarry. A member of the Millbank Flood Group raised concerns in relation to flooding following the grant of the abstraction licence to empty 70% of the water from East Quarry. The Parish Council will contact the EA and ask that a robust system be put in place before pumping out is allowed to ensure that residents' homes are not flooded in the event of a failure to switch off the pump, or a failure of the discharge pipe. Confirmation will be requested that the Highly Critical status remains in place for the full term of the licence and does not start and end only when actual pumping out is undertaken. The residents expressed their disgust with the Parish Council for not supporting the Parbold Hill Group financially as they feel all the Quarries are linked and will impact on the Health and Safety of the residents of Appley Bridge. The Clerk confirmed that she has emails drafted to send to numerous LCC and WLBC officers, including Borough Councillors and the County Councillor on the issues raised at West Quarry. It was added that, at the LCC planning committee meeting County Councillor Fillis reported that there is enough landfill in Lancashire for many years to come and there is no need to use Parbold Quarry for this purpose, he made all these points clear at the Meeting but the Committee went against this. It was stressed that it is important to share information obtained on this subject or the information is useless. An email from the EA was read aloud which appears to put pressure on LCC to regulate the gas monitoring equipment, described as having operational problems at West Quarry, which could be what put pressure on LCC to grant permission. There are particular issues which really affect Appley Bridge and the feeling is that Parbold now has a planning application permitted because LCC have failed to deal with operational matters in Appley Bridge. It was suggested that the Parish Council take legal advice to support a request to remove the pad, which had

temporary permission and should have been removed in 2018. The original planning permission for West Quarry said that the rail pad should be removed and the area returned back to Green Belt. It was confirmed that the Parish Council has written in the past requesting the removal of the pad. It was reported that no monitoring is, or has been, done by LCC, WLBC or the EA. The residents present hope that the Parish Council make a decision to support a financial contribution to the Parbold Hill Group. It is also thought that LCC should contribute towards the cost as it is because of their failings that this has been allowed to happen. However, it is the immediate cost which has to be paid which is the issue. It was reported that 5 Parish Councils are already supporting the group even though the impact on some of these Parishes is not as great as it is on Appley Bridge. Again residents asked if the Parish Council will make a financial contribution to the group as it was confirmed that some Appley Bridge residents have already attended meetings on this subject and have donated towards the legal costs. Councillor Johnson asked if the Parbold Hill Group website is "Stop Parbold Hill Landfill", which was confirmed and asked if this is what they wanted to do, stop the landfill, or is there something else? It was reported that water is leaching from Parbold Quarry which, if not stopped, will ultimately go in to the River Douglas and pollute the River. It was asked, if the infill is stopped, will the problem of leaching of water not still be a problem? LCC made their decision based on this premise. It was again confirmed that monitoring has not been happening and information has not been passed on. As the sites are 30+ years old there is no water which can contaminate the watercourses. The legal position is to challenge this assertion, because there is no data, information or monitoring reports to prove this. Water in the chamber is supposed to go through infrastructure located at West Quarry which is dysfunctional, therefore there is no data to prove it. It was expected that an automatic switch would be found in the leachate chamber, however, it is manually operated, which is currently also the situation with the proposed abstraction of water from East Quarry, this is to be manually operated. Concern was expressed about the consequences of not pressing the switch at the right time, having to travel miles to do this, having to react quickly to do this and not being able to, or not being on site when it needs to be pressed. It was pointed out that residents put their trust in the operator, the EA and LCC none of whom are doing what they should. None of the agencies are communicating with each other. A resident submitted a Freedom of Information request to the EA for a copy of the leachate audit they conducted in July 2020, which is very damning. The system is not fit for purpose. The EA has now been asked for full details of what is on West Quarry. The only way forward with this is by instructing legal consultants and specialists. It is also not possible to distinguish where the leachate gathering is coming from, Parbold Quarry or West Quarry. It was confirmed that the bill for the QC is £7800 and the shortfall is approx. £2000. It was suggested that the group could put out a campaign leaflet asking for assistance and donations to support this. A resident of Appley Bridge confirmed that he had listened to all the information and arguments put forward. He thanked the Parish Council for the pressure they have tried to apply recently and in the past, which it would appear has been ignored. It is obvious that the Quarries are linked and that the group has undertaken work which will assist with issues relevant to West Quarry and Appley Bridge. It is clear that all the sites require regular maintenance but that the owner is deficient and has failed to come up to the required standards. It appears that the authorities are not taking notice of the residents or the Parish Council. The residents of Appley Bridge are saying to the Parish Council that they feel it is time to make a financial contribution. It was further reported that the abstraction licence asked for an ecology report which has not as yet been received and there is no indication that this will be received. One of the reasons given for the requested abstraction licence is to resolve an anti-social behaviour problem. No dates are given for when the abstraction will take place during the 7+ year term of the licence. It was reported that if the level of water in East Quarry is reduced to a 10m depth the whole floor of the Quarry will not be covered. Therefore, by addressing an 8 week, seasonal, anti-social behaviour problem this will be replaced with a dirt biking problem in the Quarry, all year. It was reported that the Quarry owner has refused to prevent incursion into his site because his fencing is inadequate and too low. It was reported that there is sufficient evidence and information to be put forward by proper legal officers, who could put the points over. It was stated that the Parbold Hill Group have gone out of their way to support Appley Bridge and that the residents feel that Wrightington PC needs to go out of its way to support them rather than looking to be accepting incorrect information. It was reported that cyclists are currently going round The Slacks on dirt bikes but the problem could be extended to East Quarry if the water level is lowered. The Chairman thanked everyone for their input and confirmed that the Parish Council do support Appley Bridge and its residents. A resident thanked the Parish Council for doing so but said they think the Parish Council is

being ignored and they feel that legal representation is needed to carry this forward. It was reported that the work undertaken to date by the owner of the Quarry is not up to standard and is dangerous. The existing outlet pipe has been switched on by accident in the past. A resident said it was the first time she had seen the Parish Council working together with, and they owe a lot to, the Parbold Hill Group. The group has put a lot of work in to date and the Parish Council need to back this group for the work done so far furthermore, if the Parish Council do not support them then, as a resident, they would be very disappointed. People in Shevington are also worried. Another resident confirmed support for what had just been said and confirmed that she was grateful for what the Parish Council has done so far but if the bodies do not join up then the Parish Council will look like the weak link and will be failing Appley Bridge. Discussions from the public criticised the Quarry owner and the company and stated that there is no-one in the company who is qualified to run a Quarry. It was reiterated that the owner has just-under 8 years to start the abstraction of water from the Quarry but this does not, and will not, solve the anti-social behaviour problems. The owner should be doing it now if this is solution. Newspaper reports elsewhere show that reducing water levels in quarries will not stop anti-social behaviour and confirmed that in another area, it actually made the problems worse. Therefore, using the removal of the anti-social behaviour as the reason for the abstraction licence request is not true. Another resident confirmed that it appears that the owner is unreliable and untrustworthy. That he does not have permission to store the tyres and combustible materials currently on West Quarry and, that the EA served him with a notice to remove these by November 2020 which has not been complied with. The owner is ignoring officialdom and therefore greater weight is needed to fight this.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their comments and closed Open Forum at 8.35pm.

72. **APOLOGIES** – Were received and accepted from Councillor Hodgkinson who has had some health issues during lockdown and currently has computer problems.
73. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** – Members were asked to consider any personal/pecuniary interest they may have to disclose in relation to matters under discussion at the Meeting. **Councillor Mrs Burton declared an interest in groundwork discussions at the village halls. No further declarations were made at this point in the Meeting however, should a Councillor feel he/she has any interest in later matters he/she will declare it at that point.**
74. **MINUTES** – The Minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council in August 2020 and the agreed Interim Action of the Parish Council for what should have been the Parish Council Meetings in July, October, November and December 2020 had been circulated in advance of the Meeting. **Resolved – The Minutes and Interim Action were accepted as a correct record, and will be signed by the Chairman.**
75. **UPDATE/PROGRESS WITH ISSUES RAISED AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING** – None.
76. **CORRESPONDENCE/INFORMATION ITEMS**
Items reported to, & noted by, the Council – no decision required: REPORT 1 – page 8 – ACCEPTED.

Items requiring discussion, observations or action by the Council:

- a) Several items of correspondence relating to the application to infill Parbold Quarry and the securing of a QC to assist the Parbold Against Infill Campaign Group to try to have the grant of permission overturned as, amongst other things, the Environment Agency report upon which the decision was made was/is incorrect – **Noted.**
- b) Request for financial support from the Parish Council towards the cost of securing a QC by the Parbold Against Infill Campaign Group – **Councillor Critchley proposed that the Council financially support this. The Chairman asked Councillors to think back to the Residents Against Wind Turbines Group, where the Parish Council made a £100 donation and the group funded their work by contacting residents affected who contributed. Members of the public interjected at this point and reported that quite a few residents have already contributed to the Parbold Hill Group. The question of whether other Parish Councils have contributed towards the funds required for the QC was raised. A representative of the group reported that they have not gone public on this because the LCC decision notice has not been made yet and therefore, the group need to have the QC**

put the report in before the decision notice is issued. It was confirmed that other Parish Councils donations towards this have differed because of Budget issues. The Chairman confirmed that the Parish Council could assist towards the cost of leaflets and circulating them requesting assistance. It was confirmed that the Parish Council has given £100 already to the group following a request some months ago. It was stressed by the residents' that this will have a huge impact on Appley Bridge and the area around it. It was confirmed that the Parish Council will continue with their plans to email LCC & WLBC officers, Borough Councillors and the County Councillor following this meeting requesting assistance in resolving issues at West Quarry. The EA will be emailed regarding the concerns about flooding following the issuing of the abstraction licence. Councillor Jukes stated that as their elected representatives the Parish Council should be fighting on their behalf and support the residents, confirming that she could not vote on this matter but is speaking on behalf of the residents. It was stated that all residents of Parbold and Wrightington will be impacted. Councillor Johnson expressed his concern that if a financial contribution is made it will look like the Parish Council are taking sides, that legal expenses may not stop at the £7800 and, confirmed that he is not in favour of making a financial contribution to the Parbold Hill Group. Councillor House said that he would support a one-off donation to the Group. The proposal to support the group with a financial contribution was made and seconded however, on a vote, 2 Councillors supported this and 2 were against this. The Chairman suggested a donation of £100 could be made as is the usual higher rate for Parish Council donations. Residents again interjected stating that this is a one-off situation and that the majority of people in Appley Bridge want the Parish Council to support this financially, and asked that the Parish Council back the residents. It was pointed out to the Parish Council that last year £1000 was contributed to the Parish Council by the residents of Stonemill Rise in Council Tax. In response to a question, it was confirmed that no emails had been received to say that Appley Bridge residents did not want to contribute towards this. It was reported that this group has been working on this issue for the past 2 years and they feel it is an insult to the residents and it is shameful for the Parish Council not to contribute. The Chairman, in a bid to stop further discussions on this matter by residents at this point in the meeting, asked the Clerk to mute them, however, this proved difficult. Discussions continued and it was pointed out that Appley Bridge is in the remit of the Parish Council for support and, that many residents have already personally donated more than the £100 suggested. A resident held up a response received from the EA this evening at 9.02pm, confirming that they are pursuing this on behalf of the residents of Appley Bridge. It was reported that all the house prices in all areas, both in and around Appley Bridge, will drop considerably. It was stated that the Council need to look forward on this subject, that these are not normal circumstances. The group cannot hold meetings, knock on doors or canvas for funds and it has been explained why this cannot be made public. A handful of people have worked very hard, for many hours, fighting this. Parish Councillors were told they have been misinformed and work is being done to challenge this misinformation. The residents are trying to conserve the area, make it better and save it. It was reported that the QC has found irrefutable evidence to rebuke what has occurred. The Parish Council was asked why are they any different to other Parish Councils who are less impacted but who have donated. The group has the opinions of professional scientists on this matter. The Council were told they need to look at the bigger picture and follow other Parish Councils. It was reported that if this is put back it will be devastating for Appley Bridge and cause permanent damage. Councillor Critchley asked the Parish Council to re-consider their decision. At the end of discussions the Chairman once again closed public discussions on this subject.

Councillor Critchley made a proposal of £1000 or £1500, the proposal for £1000 was seconded however, it became obvious from discussions that voting on this proposal would not proceed. Councillor Burton said that, if it was understood that the money given to the Parbold Hill Group is in recognition of the Health and Safety threat and to

- safeguard Appley Bridge and its residents, not to fight a planning matter, and proposed a donation of £500. This was seconded and, despite some Councillors reluctantly agreeing to this, it was **Resolved** – that a donation of £500 be made to the Parbold Hill Group (ARROW North West) in recognition of the Health and Safety threat and to safeguard Appley Bridge and its residents. The Group thanked everybody and said that the money would be used to pay the QC whose work is all embracing around this issue.
- c) Email from the Chairman of the Millbank Flood Action Group asking for Parish Council support and action in response to the recent granting of an abstraction licence for Maybrook Investments Ltd to extract 70% of the water from East Quarry with discharge to a man hole access point directly into the flood defence asset further downstream in the Calico Brook – **The Clerk read aloud all the emails received reflecting both those in favour of emptying East Quarry and those who are not. Councillor Juckes reinforced the points in the email received from the Millbank Flood Action Group and requested that the following be asked of the EA – When, during the 7+ years of the abstraction licence, will the enforcement suggested start and end? Is planning permission required for the installation of the pipe from the Quarry into The Slacks? Pressure must be emphasised on the safety aspects of the abstraction. Where has the evidence come from to say that removing the water from the Quarry will reduce Health & Safety issues or anti-social behaviour because, if this was the case, should the abstraction not have been immediate? Councillor Juckes requested that copies of the emails sent to officers be sent to Parish Councillors. Councillor Juckes reported that, as the abstraction licence has not yet been placed on the public register, there may be an influx of emails on this subject and proposed that an extra-ordinary meeting to discuss all Quarry issues be arranged in the future once responses have been received and suggested another Zoom Meeting. It was reported that there are concerns about the company which have been expressed by the residents and because all the Quarries are interlinked there are concerns about what could happen in the future.**
- d) Details of the Orange Button Community Scheme – **The Clerk will check that this information can be made public before putting it in the Notice Boards or on the website.**
- e) LCC Budget Consultation for comments or observations – **Resolved** – **The Parish Council object to the increase proposed.**
- f) Info. on Parish Council Allowance Schemes – **Noted as not relevant.**
- g) Update on Membership, Subscriptions and Renewals from OPSTA – **The Council will renew at the normal time in May.**
- h) Capital Funding Bid to West Lancs. BC for 2021/22 – **Repairs are required to the ceiling in the secure room as a result of the roof issues and raining in. New gutters and downspouts are required at the rear of Mossy Lea Village Hall as the water is running down the external wall and causing damp problems in the hall and gents toilets. The Clerk will check if these suggestions are suitable. Enquiries, prices and investigations in to the purchase of a SPID remain ongoing. The Chairman suggested that a CCTV camera on top could assist with littering detection/offences.**
- i) Late items received which may require discussion/action/observations – i) 6 emails received + 1 telephone call from residents in relation to the abstraction of water from East Quarry – 3 emails and 1 telephone call supporting emptying and filling in the Quarry and 3 emails against emptying and filling it in – **Read aloud earlier – Noted.** ii) A resident's email questions and opinions in relation to Quarry issues – **Noted as the resident is present and has spoken on this matter.** iii) Email report in relation to Chorley Concrete setting up a concrete mixing business at North Quarry without planning permission – **Will be reported to WLBC Enforcement Department.**

77. **HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS** – Councillors can email these matters directly to me for action to ensure the smooth flowing of the zoom meeting will include – removal of graffiti from the fence on Mill Lane, overgrown hedges on Appley Lane North. It was reported that a young person in the village has been litter picking on Moss Lane, Robin Hood Lane and other areas, voluntarily. The Council thanked this person for his work. The Parish Council will thank the Police for their involvement and action with ongoing visitor issues at Fairy Glen.

78. **REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES** – Nothing to report.

79. **VILLAGE HALLS**

MOSSY LEA – Remains closed. The Clerk purchased a replacement projector and connector lead for use in the village hall online for £25 + £2.34 = £27.34. It is not new but has only had 10 hours use. There is a damp issue in the village hall suspected to be as a result of missing guttering and downspouts at the rear of the hall and toilets. New guttering and downspouts are required along with re-plastering work internally once the damp wall has dried out.

APPLEY BRIDGE – Remains closed. Request from E.on to fit a smart meter – **It was reported that smart meters make it more difficult to change providers.** It was suggested that the cost of relocating the Gas Meter and the Water Meter, currently in the cellar, to a more accessible place should be investigated – **Enquiries will be made.**

Confirmation that both halls have been suggested as venues for covid-19 community testing – **The Clerk reported that recent developments mean that this is currently no longer required.**

Confirmation the Clerk has applied for national lockdown business support grants for both village halls. The Clerk reported that the contractor does think the grass under the trees could be improved over the next season, now the trees have been lifted and if the dead wood is removed, with regular maintenance it could come back and he would like the opportunity to try. There is an area to the side of the hall with no grass growth which may be suitable for some wildflower mix growth. Cost to remove the saplings adjacent to the village hall wall and treat the stumps to die back £120. Cost to remove all deadwood which has been revealed now the lifting and branch removal has taken place £130. Further quotations were received to – Clear and tidy around bus shelter on Wood Lane, paint and tidy £155. To pressure wash flags and steps to cellar at ABVH £70. To clear moss from the car park at ABVH £240.

Following discussion it was felt that the quotations for the bus shelter, pressure washing and moss clearing at ABVH were excessive and work should not be undertaken. **Resolved – The contractor be instructed to remove the saplings and treat the stumps and remove the deadwood from the trees at ABVH – total cost £250. The contractor will be asked to quote for wildflower planting on the grass at ABVH for next season. The contractor was commended for the tree work recently undertaken.**

80. **STANDING ORDERS - Resolved:** In Accordance with Standing Order No 19, Standing Order No 18 was suspended to allow the remaining items of business to be conducted.

81. **PLANNING** To discuss the following applications:

- 1) 2020/1123/FUL Demolition of former air raid shelter and conversion of an existing outbuilding into a separate dwelling including associated external works. 14 Speakmans Drive, Appley Bridge. **Resolved - The Council object to the proposal to build a separate dwelling at this location. The area is in Green Belt and the buildings being demolished have never had dwelling status, therefore the volume increases quoted are irrelevant. The proposals do not satisfy any of the exceptions for development in the Green Belt. The existing buildings are low level and well screened by flora and fauna which provide a valuable habitat for wildlife and add to the green belt nature of the area and the rural street scene. The proposed two storey dwelling would have a detrimental impact on the biodiversity of the site, on the neighbouring properties, on their privacy and amenity and, would result in additional vehicular movements on a private road which has already seen a significant increase in vehicle movements over the past few years. The proposed design of the dwelling would not be in keeping with the existing street scene nor with the green belt status of the land. A new access is clearly required for the property which could also severely impact on neighbouring homes and will reduce the available turning area for any larger delivery vehicles using the private road to access existing homes. The proposed boundary fences would not be in keeping with the locality and would provide a barrier for wildlife at ground level. There are no details of landscaping and compensatory planting which would need to be provided due to the significant loss of wildlife habitats, ecology, flora, fauna and biodiversity**

if the proposals are approved. There is no mention of storage facilities for waste and recycling which is an important factor when considering sustainable development. The applicant has not provided sufficient information or evidence to support the proposals being an exception to development in the Green Belt. No special circumstances have been proved and the proposals would constitute an intrusion in the Green Belt which would affect the openness and amenity of the green belt land.

- 2) 2020/1126/FUL Proposed extension to kitchen and living room, form utility room and study. The Poplars, Tunley Lane, Wrightington. **Resolved – No Objections.**
- 3) 2020/1213/FUL Extensions and alterations to 156 Mossy Lea Road, Wrightington. **Resolved – No Objections.**
- 4) 2020/1098/FUL Retention and renovation of the original two storey stone built property, comprising of new roof tiles, repointing, new windows along with a new door and open pitched porch. Demolition of low quality single extensions and outbuildings. Construction of a new two storey side extension and two storey rear extension with dormer window over a single storey rear ground floor extension. 1 Tunley Lane, Wrightington. **Resolved – No Objections.**
- 5) 2020/1212/FUL Double storey pitched roof extension to side of property, and single storey pitched roof extension to rear of property. 314 Mossy Lea Road, Wrightington. **Resolved – No Objections.**

Councillor House left the Meeting.

82. LANCASHIRE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL COUNCILS – Councillor Burton sent her apologies to the remote area committee meeting.

83. ACCOUNTS - To receive the following list of accounts for Approval:

For Payment:

Fire Equipmt Sers.	Fire Extinguishers – MLVH		£40.26
Mrs J Rogers	Honorarium – booking secretary ABVH		£200.00
Mrs E Armstrong	Honorarium – treasurer ABVH		£200.00
Mrs C A Cross	Honorarium – booking secretary MLVH		£200.00
Mrs C Hodgkinson	Honorarium – treasurer MLVH		£200.00
Mr G Ross	Honorarium - Website co-ordinator		£240.00
Mrs C A Cross	Reimburse cost of projector + Lead – MLVH		£27.34
Mrs C A Cross	Clerk’s Salary – Net		£820.56
HM Rev. & Customs	Tax & NI due by Clerk	£5.48	
	NI due by Parish Council	£12.98	£18.46
D/D Plusnet	Internet MLVH		£26.39
D/D British Gas	Gas use at ABVH		£267.70
D/D British Gas	Gas use at MLVH		£133.44
D/D E.on	Electricity use ABVH		£151.66
D/D E.on	Electricity use MLVH		£141.70

Honorariums are paid in arrears for the previous year. As the April Meeting at which they are normally paid was cancelled due to Covid-19 the Honorariums have not been paid to date, they are therefore included on this agenda for work undertaken in the 2019/20 financial year.

Councillor Jukes asked what an Honorarium is and how does one get one? It was explained that this is a one off payment in recognition of the unpaid work the village hall officers and web co-ordinator do each year. Councillor Jukes asked if members of the public could put themselves forward for the role and suggested that the jobs should be advertised. It was explained that the officers have been in these roles for many years. With regard to the website co-ordinator, he has updated the website as asked during the year, he has created and installed the website accessibility statement, and has ensured that what goes on to the website is accessible to all. Looking forward, the Parish Council need to discuss what they want from the website and how they would like to achieve it. Councillor Jukes asked about a neighbouring Parish’s website which, the Clerk confirmed is totally run, updated and maintained by 2 of the Parish Councillors. It was explained that Councillor Johnson pays the window cleaner for window cleaning at MLVH and the

Parish Council reimburse him for his payment. Councillor Jukes asked that if the honorariums are paid in arrears will the officers not be paid for the 2020/21 year, as the village halls have been closed. The Chairman said that she was sure the officers had done things throughout the year and did not agree with not paying them. Councillor Critchley suggested that a retainer be paid to the officers for 2020/21. **The Chairman proposed that the officers be paid the full Honorarium for 2020/21. This was seconded and it was Resolved – on a majority vote that the officers be paid the full honorarium for 2020/21. Councillor Jukes objected to the payment. Resolved – Payment of the above accounts is approved.**

84. DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved: That the next Meeting of the Parish Council will be held on Monday 15th February 2021 as a remote meeting via the Zoom platform. 7.00pm Budget Meeting. 7.30pm Parish Council Meeting

Minutes 72 to 84 will be accepted as a correct record and signed by the Chairman after the Meeting to be held on Monday 15th February 2020.

Members of the Public and Press are welcome to attend

Meeting Closed: 10.30 pm

Chairman:

Date:

REPORT 1

- a) Notification split decision (part refused/part granted) for certificate of lawfulness – proposed the construction of 2 single storey rear extensions and alterations to a window to the front elevation. Westgate, 10 Robin Hood Lane, Wrightington.
- b) Notification permission granted for removal of condition No15 of planning permission 2019/0098/FUL relating to a Natural England Licence. Sprodeley Brook Farm House, Finch Lane, Appley Bridge.
- c) Notification permission granted for proposed extension and remodelling of first floor loft space. To include the garage conversion to form a kitchen at ground floor, with a master bedroom extension at first floor to the outer wall position. Removal of left hand side hip roof to form a gable to match the RHS roof and increase the available room in roof accommodation. 8 Robin Hood Lane, Wrightington.
- d) Notification that the appeal was allowed against the West Lancs. BC decision to refuse permission for proposed part conversion of existing barn/storage building into self contained annexe ancillary to main house including dormer extensions to side elevations. Osprey House, Skull House Lane.
- e) Confirmation from Councillor Critchley that the Peter Lathom donation will be split as follows: £147.93 to Wrightington Pensioners. £250 to the Meadows. £250 to Appley Bridge in Bloom.
- f) Formal notification of temporary road closure of Tunley Lane, Wrightington, from 1st February 2021 until 3rd February 2021 to enable disconnection of old lead water supply and installation of new water connection on behalf of United Utilities.
- g) Info. on changes to Northern Train Services from 18th January 2021.

Remote Meeting Protocols: Please note the following procedures to ensure the smooth running of the meeting:

- The meeting will be recorded
- Members of the public will be muted and will only be able to speak during the Open Forum section of the meeting. If you wish to speak during this section please email the Clerk by 5pm on the Sunday before the meeting, with brief details of the subject matter being raised. When the Chairman asks the member/s of the public to speak he/she will be unmuted. Before speaking, the member of the public should state their name. Time permitting the Chairman will ask if members of the public wish to raise anything else, however, dependant on time, this may need to be held over until the next meeting. Each member of the public will be able to speak for a limit of three minutes.
- Parish Councillors will not be muted, however, to speak please raise a hand and the Chairman will invite him/her to speak.
- To vote, members should raise their hand as appropriate.