**Broughton Parish Council**

Minutes of the meeting of Broughton Parish Council held at Little Broughton Village Hall on Tuesday 18th September 2018 at 19:00

**Present:** Mrs Mary Bradley (Chair), Mrs Joanne Sewell, Mrs Alison Carruthers, Mr Bill Smith, Mr Richard Gildert, Mr Carl Jackson, Mrs Claire Winter, Mr Maynall Weir, Mr Steve Hannah, Mrs Jackie Hobden, A/BC Cllr N Cockburn, Mr Simon Sharp (Planning & Implementation Manager Allerdale Borough Council).

**Apologies:** Mrs Sue Hannah, Mr John Wilson, A/BC Cllr J Farebrother

**167/18 Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received and noted from the above.

**168/18 Chairman’s Announcements**

Cllr M Bradley welcomed Mr Sharp from Allerdale Borough Council and thanked him for attending.

Other issues of interest noted by Cllr M Bradley included the ongoing Allotments Works, and the recent large presentation meeting regarding the future of the Derwent Forest Development which was held in Rheged recently.

In addition concerns have been raised across the parish in particular on the allotment sites regarding dog fouling. Cllr C Jackson has prepared some signs for erection on the allotments.

**169/18 Requests for dispensations and declarations of interest**

None

**170/18 Minutes of the meeting held on the 20th August 2018**

All members of the council had received a copy of the minutes.

**Resolved** by all present that the minutes be signed as a true and accurate record by the Chair Mary Bradley

**171/18 Police Matters**

**Resolved** by all present that the Police Report be noted as received along with the 2 incidents listed within it.

**172/18 Public Participation**

None present

**173/18 Simon Sharp, Planning & Implementation Manager- Allerdale Borough Council**

Mr S Sharp attended to provide an overview of his role, his position with Allerdale Borough Council and how planning applications are handled currently and the future direction of the Allerdale Planning Department. In addition he confirmed that he would where necessary take note of issues raised and either deal with them during the meeting or provide a written response following the meeting. Mr Sharp acknowledged that he was aware of some issues within the parish e.g. the need to differentiate between Great & Little Broughton as two separate settlements, and the ongoing issues at Coldgill Avenue (Rigg Top & Derwent View).

 A summary of the presentation delivered is provided below.

Mr Sharp replaces Mr Kerrigan who is now the Head of place development (which includes planning functions, but also includes tourism & destination management and building control).

The role of Planning & Implementation Manager is to manage the day to day planning applications team (development management), compliance (planning enforcement) and trees & conservation. Mr Sharp took over his new role in May and is working his way around the Parishes within Allerdale to try and understand the issues prevalent within each Parish and the wider issues that affect more of the Borough.

*Overview of the Current Planning System*

Allerdale Borough Council have a Part 1 Local Plan which outlines all development management policies (this was adopted back in 2014). By law ABC turn to this document in the first instance in decision making (it is the primary source of policy reference).

The weight afforded to this document when making decisions can be affected by other considerations e.g. ministerial statements, case law/precedent, planning inspector decisions and National Planning Policy Framework (revised in July 18). In addition emerging Neighbourhood Plans within the area can have an impact on weighting.

Allerdale Borough Council Local Plan Part 2 is hopefully going to be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination later this year prior to adoption. The Local Plan Part 2 will include settlement limits & housing allocations.

Additionally further consideration has to be given to other material considerations e.g. public inquiry outcomes. The most significant locally is the recent decision on the Broughton Park, Story’s application. Part of the decision on this appeal was that the old settlement limits from the 1999 local plan were deemed to be out of date so are currently being afforded little weight. Therefore if an application comes in for new housing and they are in sustainable locations, e.g. on green field land adjoining a settlement it is likely that ABC as the planning authority in light of the recent public inquiry decision will look favourably on these applications. As a result there is a flurry of applications where people are looking to take advantage of this decision. This will change when Part 2 has been examined, including the new settlement limits. Once the Local Plan Part 2 is adopted it will carry full weight and the settlement limits will be defensible once more.

ABC (and all other planning authorities) have a duty to maintain a supply of housing and ensure sites allocated within the Local Plan are delivered to continue increasing provision of housing stock.

The current position regarding settlement limits (and the outcome of the public inquiry) is likely to continue into 2019.

The recent revision of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 18) placed greater emphasis on design & heritage matters which provides planning authorities with the ability to place greater emphasis on design & heritage matters that are fitting and appropriate for the Borough/local geographic areas. Mr Sharp is keen to ensure that the supporting statements submitted with planning applications be strengthened across the Borough.

Cllr M Bradley laid out the concerns of the Parish Council relating to the planning system and wider ABC development protocols:

* Parish Council views which are representative of the views of the parishioners and the local residents are often ignored or treated poorly by the ABC Planning Department.
* There is a lack of respect from the ABC Planning Department towards Parish Councils and their comments submitted as part of the Planning Process. The Parish Council recognise ABC have targets and systems to follow but there is a lack of open dialogue between the Borough Council & Parish Councils.
* Where plans/amended plans are submitted it appears to the Parish Council that these often don’t follow the same/correct consultation process or are approved without consideration or consultation on the wider impacts of said amendment/alteration.
* Specifically the Parish Council have concerns about future expansion plans for the villages and infrastructure inadequacy e.g. the recently defended Broughton Park/Storey’s appeal regarding traffic impact on the surrounding junctions/A66 junction. The Parish Council have heard previously from CCC Highways who provided detail on the size/scale of a development that would be required to trigger any Highways capacity concerns. The views of the Highways Dept at CCC & the Parish Council regarding infrastructure impacts are very different and there seem to be no way to align/compromise on these matters.
* Derwent Forest/Utopia Development with a potential 1800-2000 homes promised with no assurances given on the traffic flows if a new bridge/road weren’t constructed. This volume of traffic coming through Great or Little Broughton would threaten the viability of the settlements and this needs to be borne in mind by the ABC Planning Team.
* Lack of unity between ABC as the Planning Dept, CCC as the Highways Dept and the Parish Council, no/limited consideration given to the wider impacts of housing developments e.g. the recent developments in Dearham have resulted in Little & Great Broughton being used as a ‘rat run’ to access the A66 yet no infrastructure improvements were requested/required on the access routes.
* Imbalance between volume of new housing developments approved by ABC and lack of local employment opportunities for parties interested in any new housing. ABC appear to continue to approve housing with no consideration on the wider social/community/employment impacts of developments or of the impact on existing housing stock.

Mr Sharp responded noting that as with many officers at all levels of governance personal & professional views will differ. Local people are likely to recognise that the access route into Great & Little Broughton (Broughton Bridge, Harris Brow) is less than ideal however in terms of a planning & highways point of view the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has to be followed. This requires a ‘severity’ test to be undertaken on areas such as access infrastructure and congestion, the bar for the ‘severe’ is very high and applies across the UK, as such it is very difficult for any developments within Parishes such as Broughton to result in sufficient severity, as such it is rare that CCC Highways can resist a planning application on the grounds of congestion/infrastructure impacts. (NB this differs from Highways Safety Concerns which has a more subjective application).

Mr Sharp agreed that ABC as Planning Authority have a duty to listen to local community comments regarding applications and the wider impacts of them as they have the on the ground local knowledge of things such as wider traffic flows and infrastructure impacts. Mr Sharp recognised there is a responsibility to think more clearly about wider planning impacts within the constraints of the planning system and its governance.

In terms of ongoing support Mr Sharp confirmed that he was willing to provide support to Broughton Parish Council on the planning process and how Allerdale Borough Council are likely to be considering specific applications and their wider context within the Allerdale Borough Council development system.

*Derwent Forest*

Cllr M Bradley asked if Mr S Sharp would remain present whilst this was discussed to provide guidance/information on how the Parish Council should approach this issue.

A public event was held recently at Rheged to give an over view of the aims & objectives of this development and the next steps. The overall ethos as laid out by Nigel Catterson was for an environmentally sustainable and sound development. Encompassing 3 or 4 villages totally circa 1800 homes, and an 150 bedroom ‘spa’ style hotel with outlying wooden lodges for holiday rental.

The access arrangements were not fully detailed in the presentation but appeared to suggest either access out on to Moor Road in close proximity to the recently registered Bridleways & Public Rights of Way and Community Asset of Soddy Gap. Or out in a northerly direction on the A594 (it was noted that this would only account for circa 30% of the traffic. Consideration was noted to the creation of a new access road and bridge to link the development with the A66.

Concern was identified by Cllr M Bradley & A/BC Cllr N Cockburn that if new infrastructure (new bridge and A66 junction) was not viable (due to cost/structural issues with building a bridge on a flood plain/a66 joining) the potential impact of circa 4000-8000 additional vehicle movements a day would fall very heavily on the villages of Great & Little Broughton resulting in a severe and detrimental impact on both villages.

It was noted with disappointment that a key theme of the presentation appeared to be creating new ‘villages’ to provide new residents with a ‘village experience’ including the provision of allotments, and village services with no apparent consideration being given to the impact this would have on the surrounding communities (Great & Little Broughton, Broughton Moor, Dovenby) which already enjoy these benefits.

Support was noted for the proposed redevelopment of this brownfield site, and the admirable nature of the overall environmental aims of the site, but that the wider impacts on the existing local communities and infrastructure needs to be considered.

The Parish Council would like to see the Planning Authority (ABC) require developers on this site to complete infrastructure improvements PRIOR to any site development taking place to ensure they actually occur rather than being varied/waived during or after the project resulting in ever increasing pressure on local amenities/infrastructure with no reparations from large scale developers. A serious concern of the Parish Council is that the development would occur in an incremental creep fashion resulting in limited or no infrastructure or community benefits being required as a planning obligation.

It was noted by Councillors present that the idea/possibility of this development has been around for over 20 years with a number of flagship public events and then little progress being made.

Mr S Sharp provided a response to the points raised:

* The Allerdale Borough Council Local Plan Part 1 has a policy (S18) for the development of Derwent Forest which supports a mixed use development, ABC have a corporate desire to see the site redeveloped.
* There are concerns regarding the viability of developments on this site given the previous use of the site and there is recognition of the constrained infrastructure in this locality.
* In terms of professional experience what is likely to happen is that the developer/owner/consultants will submit an outline application for the overarching design and what will then follow is a series of revisiting/revising as more detail is obtained/costings calculated.
* Additionally it is recognised that where possible developers try and undertaken phased/staged developments to avoid significant site opening up costs (e.g. infrastructure). This also means that depending on the size/scale of the applications that they may fall below/on the smaller side of required infrastructure or local community benefit improvements.
* Mr S Sharp suggested that for a possible development of this size and scale with wide impacts across more than just Broughton Parish that a successful approach elsewhere in the country has been for local communities/parishes to join together to respond to/consult with the Planning Authorities and Developers to ensure that appropriate community and infrastructure improvements are obtained. A crucial thing is to consider the cumulative impacts of developments rather than piecemeal.
* As a tool to help Parish Councils/residents to respond to planning proposals it can be helpful to try and think ahead as to where a developer/consultant may be hoping to end up, to ensure that evidence and rationale is prepared to deal with such eventualities when they arise.
* Timescale- Most developers work on 3-4 house sales per month, with a production target of circa 10houses being completed per month based on the assumption of 3 developers working on the site at any one time, it would therefore take in the region of 15 years to develop the volume of houses being suggested.

Cllr M Bradley raised concern that during the presentation event at Rheged reference was made to a ‘lay persons reference group’ that was meeting led by ABC regarding this site and its proposals, as far as Broughton Parish Council is aware NO representation from any of the impacted Parish Councils has been invited on to this group, which further supports the feeling of lack of trust/faith between Parish Councils & ABC.

**Action: Mr S Sharp to confirm who is leading/organising this lay persons reference group and ensure an invitation to be represented on this group is extended to all directly impacted Parish Councils.**

Q: Do Allerdale Borough Council have a figure for how many additional homes the existing infrastructure in Broughton Parish can withstand without significant infrastructure improvements being required?

A: No, but this is a role that ABC as a Planning Authority needs to consider

Q: Do you have a plan to deliver this figure?

A: No, there is a local plan policy for this site but it is relatively ‘open’ the policy responds to a desire by ABC to see the site developed, but there is a need for work to be undertaken to define the numerical amounts linked to the infrastructure capacity etc.

**Action: Mr S Sharp agreed to take back this point and feed back to the Parish Council in writing on when/how this work will be programmed to ensure the information is prepared in anticipation of any planning application being submitted, and also to inform local councils to facilitate there responses to any applications.**

Q: If a figure on the existing infrastructure capacity is determined would this then be enforceable as part of the planning process?

A: Developers are always likely to challenge any such information on the grounds of viability (which is a material planning consideration as per the NPPF), but as this is an open book process now it will be more transparent.

Q: Has consideration been given to what impact such a development would have on the existing housing stock, in terms of negative impacts e.g. from increased traffic movements/pedestrian safety etc.

A: As covered above infrastructure capacity is something that can be considered, impact upon existing housing stock values is not a material planning consideration.

**Action: Clerk to contact Derwent Forest Developers to ask for copies of the presentation/information distributed at the Rheged event for distribution to all councillors for information.**

*Coldgill Avenue (Rigg Top, Derwent View & Application 7/2018/0397)*

The background to this site and the concerns were laid out, that there appears to be a planning history on these sites of lack of enforcement of planning permissions and conditions, and lack of appropriate consultation regarding amendments, the threshold of a material/non material change (significant increase in size and height of one of these bungalows dealt with as a non material change under delegated authority).

It appears to the local community that with regards to these particular sites that when non compliance with planning has been identified on these sites that the applicant has just been encouraged by ABC to submit a retrospective revision which have consistently been approved.

Reassurance is required to local residents that planning and planning conditions will be enforced if applied to applications, the current position is that the whole planning system is being made a mockery of, with conditions being waived/not enforced it is calling into question in local minds the purpose of consultation at all. It is also widely known that there is no funding for enforcement which people are starting to take advantage of.

Mr Sharp responded to the points raised:

* Amendments- A judgement is made at officer level on how ‘material’ an amendment request is. This decision will determine how the request is handled. The definition of ‘material’ depends on the nature of the amendment, but also the impact of the change on the approved development. If a revision was classed as a material change then a new application would be requested unless it was expedient to take action.
* Non compliance/material amendments could go through a S.73 application process (A system that covers the carrying out of development in non compliance with 1 or more planning conditions). If an application goes through a S.73 application process then the Parish Council should still be consulted as standard. However the outcome of this process can’t impose obligations on a permission that were more onerous than the original application.
* Enforcement of non compliance. If a development is built in non compliance with planning then it is a decision for ABC if it is expedient to pursue enforcement action.

Q: Would an officer undertake a site visit on all amendment applications received to consider the requested impacts in the context of the site or would it be desktop exercise? If it is desktop exercise at which point does it cease to be come a desktop exercise and planning staff would attend the site?

A: Generally it is a desktop exercise to determine if the request is ‘materially different’ to existing plans. If this were the case then a new application would be required.

The Parish Council and local community are seeking reassurances that the failings that occurred with the initial two developments on these sites don’t occur again. The impact of the problems with these developments is that the community within this area of Great Broughton has been destroyed. Locally residents feel like ABC is working to support the minority rather than listening to the concerns of the majority. Faith has been entirely lost in the planning system.

**Action: Mr S Sharp to look into the planning and process history of the Rigg Top & Derwent View sites and provide a written response to the Parish Council regarding this matter for reassurance/clarity on how the same issues can be avoided in future.**

* Condition enforcement/compliance. Mr S Sharp noted that nationally there is an issue in terms of planning where conditions have been applied to developments to ‘get them through’ the system. The issue with this is when a condition is breached a decision is then made on if it is expedient to pursue, in the majority of cases the decision is normally that it is not expedient. Therefore to avoid this situation in the future further emphasis is being put on ensuring that full applications are correct in the first instance to avoid the need for conditions to be applied.
* Mr Sharp confirmed that any conditions that are applied to approvals going forward need to be reasonable and enforceable to prevent such situations arising again. (The example was used by Councillors present of the conditions on the Rigg Top & Derwent View developments of the need to provide a footway along the front curtilage of the developments, this was never done, when non compliance was reported a decision was taken by ABC in conjunction with CCC Highways that a grass verge would be acceptable instead so the footway condition was waived. It is now an overgrown verge that can’t be walked on resulting in pedestrians walking in the road again). Mr Sharp confirmed that he could understand the local frustration regarding this, but that it would be unlikely that it would be considered expedient to pursue such a breach.
* Mr Sharp confirmed that when submitting comments on applications Parish Councils should think about Planning Policies and their application to the proposal in question. Responses that quote the appropriate Local Plan & material considerations (design, landscape character impact) will be afforded greater weight than less specific comments.
* Mr Sharp confirmed that whilst right to a private view is a not a material planning consideration a public bridleway would be classed as a ‘sensitive visual receptor’, as such the impact of a development on the public view would have weight in planning terms. Another factor that can be quoted is the rhythm and design of dwellings.

Mr S Sharp offered to provide further training to Parish Councillors if they wished on the subject of planning and the role of Parish Councils within the planning process.

**Resolved** by all present that Mr S Sharp be taken upon this offer and training be organised in the future.

**Action: Clerk to liaise with Mr S Sharp to organise a training session.**

Prior to leaving Mr Sharp circulated to the Parish Council a copy of the extract from the draft Part 2 Local Plan showing the Settlement Limits and Allocation plan for the Broughton Parish.

**Action: Clerk to circulate this information to all councillors.**

Mr S Sharp confirmed he was willing to remain present whilst the planning item of the agenda was discussed to.

**Resolved** by all present that the planning agenda item be moved up the agenda.

**174/18 Planning Application for consideration**

**Ref: 2/2018/0397 & Revised Plans**

Location: Land adjacent to Rigg Top, Coldgill Avenue, Great Broughton

Proposal: Erection of detached dwelling with a detached glass house

It was noted that correspondence had been received from 2 residents of the Parish objecting to this development.

**Resolved** by all present that Broughton Parish Council have serious concerns relating to this development given the previous planning history in the locality and the community feeling around this site in addition there is insufficient information available on the plans provided to allow a final decision to be made and to provide in the Parish Councils opinion to provide a sufficiently detail plan to form part of any future planning approval.

In particular the information missing from the plans is the height & elevation of the proposed new dwelling, and in relation to the neighbouring dwellings (Rigg Top & Derwent View).

**Action: Clerk to submit this comment to ABC and request revised plans with elevations & height included on them.**

Mr S Sharp confirmed that this application would be a panel decision and not undertaken by a delegated authority and the earliest possible panel meeting it would be going to is the October 2018 Development Control Committee meeting at the earliest. If ABC deem that the lack of detail on the plans is material then an extension could be granted to allow for Parish Council consideration at the October PC meeting with the application being taken to the November DCC meeting.

Mr S Sharp agreed that he would ask CCC Highways to re-asses their comments on this application in light of the registered highway width rather than the width on the ground (acknowledging that the grass banking opposite the development is privately owned and has been damaged during the Rigg Top & Derwent View developments).

**175/18 Applications for co-option**

None

**176/18 Update on matters arising from previous meetings**

1. Youth Shelter/Outdoor Recreation Project

Home Group have confirmed that they are unwilling to sell the area of land in question as they have a moritorum on the sale of low value areas of land due to the volume of requests they receive.

**Resolved** by all present that the Council were not looking to purchase the land but rent it for the purposes of creating an outdoor gym & youth shelter.

**Action: Cllr Winter to go back to Home Group to further discuss this matter.**

**Action: Clerk to send Cllr Winter a copy of the map showing the area that the Parish Council currently rent at Welfare Field from ABC.**

Cllr Winter confirmed that she has approached a couple of companies who can provide both an outdoor gym and the youth shelter including Playdale who already provide the maintenance on the Welfare Field Playarea. The equipment that Playdale can provide is not as wide ranging as other companies but may offer a more economically viable maintenance option.

**Action: Cllr C Winter to seek quotes from a number of companies for a range of equipment to further the discussions regarding cost/funding requirements. Quotes to include costs for regular maintenance/servicing.**

It was noted that it would be likely that planning permission would be required for this and would need to be sought once the land is identified.

**Action: Clerk to approach ABC informally to confirm that Planning Permission would be required for these structures.**

The Clerk noted that Keswick Town Council are considering an outdoor Gym and it maybe worth discussing their research with them.

**Action: Clerk to speak to Keswick Town Council and obtain contact details for the councillor/s in question and pass this information to the Broughton Parish Council working group.**

It was noted that consideration needed to be provided to a) if an outdoor gym would be used sufficiently, and b) to making some if not all of the equipment being disabled accessible.

1. Bus Shelters

**Resolved** by all present that consideration of how to proceed with the Main Street shelter be deferred until the result of discussions with Persimmon regarding the Church Meadows land is known as these structures could potentially be included in a wider heritage/village history trail.

**Action: Clerk to defer this matter to the Sept 2018 agenda.**

**Action: Clerk to pursue the next steps regarding the Persimmon land following a response from ABC confirming they wouldn’t be adverse to the land being used for community purposes.**

**177/18 Clerks Report**

**Resolved** by all present that the Clerks report and its contents be noted as received.

**178/18 Play-area**

1. Damage to double gates

An update has been received and the gates per see are not damaged but they need a new padlock. At least three have been removed over the last 6 months. The Clerk confirmed that she had asked Tivoli (ABC) Contractors to replace the padlock and recharge the Parish Council if required to secure the play-area.

**Action: Clerk to continue to work with Tivoli on this matter, and provide a padlock if required.**

Cllr J Wilson’s report confirmed that all works by Playdale had been done to a high standard and there were no further identified issues.

**179/18 Reports from Visiting Councillors**

*Cumbria County Councillor H Graham*

Not present

*Allerdale Borough Council -Cllr Nicky Cockburn*

An update was provided on a number of items:

* *Derwent Forest-* Following the discussion held earlier in the meeting the following resolutions were made:

**Resolved** that Broughton Parish Council contact the neighbouring Parish Councils (Camerton, Broughton Moor, Dovenby, Seaton, Papcastle) to discuss a way forward in terms of responding to any potential future planning applications relating to the Derwent Forest Site. It was noted that once a way forward had been agreed officer time was likely to be required to undertaken the necessary research & evidence collation in anticipation of an application being submitted.

**Action: Clerk to contact the Clerks of all neighbouring Parish Councils and relevant District Councillors to convene a meeting to discuss the matter and ways forward.**

**180/18 Reports on other meetings attended**

None

**181/18 Allotments**

1. *Appeals against New Tenancy & Fees*

Cllr M Bradley confirmed that within the timescale 2 appeals were received. Both of these concern the measuring of the sites.

**Action: Cllr M Bradley to liaise with the tenants and Carl Jackson & Alan Nelson to organise the re-measuring of both plots in question and confirm the results to the Clerk & the tenant.**

1. *Authorisation of strimming alongside the stream (Nook)*

Allotment tenants and members of the Allotment working party have strimmed as much of the stream sides as possible, but a greater sized strimmer is required.

**Resolved** that the Clerk contact the Parish Maintenance Contractor and ask him to undertake these works.

**Action: Clerk to organise this.**

1. *Nook Allotment Wall Works*

These works are underway and during the works additional works have been identified by the contractor. A revised quote is awaited to cover the additional works (extending the area of wall to be removed, and building up an area of retaining wall as required).

**Resolved** that this matter be deferred until the quote for the additional works is received.

**Action: Clerk & Cllr Bradley to continue working on this matter.**

1. *Consideration of use of Nook Plot 1*

The request linked to has been withdrawn.

1. *Allotment Task & Finish Group*

It was noted that now the new tenancies have been issued the terms of reference and aims of this group need to be reviewed.

**Resolved** that a meeting of the group be called and a revised terms of reference be prepared for approval at a future Parish Council meeting.

**Action: Clerk & Cllr Bradley to liaise and agree a date to call such a meeting.**

**182/18 Parish Maintenance & Highways Matters**

1. *Parish Grass Cutting/Maintenance*

It was noted that the tree removal works on Harris Brow have been completed but the brashings have not been removed.

**Action: Cllr J Sewell to contact the contractor to organise the removal of these brashings.**

1. *Camerton Road Street Lighting*

A request has been received from the residents of Camerton for additional footway/street lighting on this route due to it being a ‘dark spot’.

**Resolved** that consent be sought from the requesters to share their information with ABC who are the footway lighting authority for the area.

**Action: Clerk to action this.**

1. *Monkey Villas Footway/Bridge*

It was noted again that this area is still damaged following Storm Desmond and the damage is increasing, a recent parishioner has suffered an accident at the site.

**Action: Cllr B Smith to provide information/photos of the site to the Clerk.**

**Action: Clerk to report this matter to Cumbria County Council**

**Action: Clerk to circulate details of how to report public right of way issues to CCC to all Parish Councillors.**

**183/18 Correspondence received**

**Resolved** by all present that all correspondence listed in the Clerks Report be noted as received.

1. Letter regarding Defib provision in the Parish

The receipt of a letter from a parishioner requesting defib provision following a family medical emergency was noted as received.

A/BC Cllr N Cockburn confirmed that publicly accessible defibs are due to be installed within the month on Little Broughton Village Hall & Great Broughton Post Office.

**Action: Clerk to confirm this to the parishioner raising concerns.**

It was noted that once the two defibs were installed signage may be required to sign them on all the entrances to the villages.

**Action: Clerk to obtain quotes for such signage in advance of the October 2018 meeting and seek consent for them to be installed on the village name/30mph signs.**

1. Letter re Local Plan Part 2

It was noted that a letter had been received regarding the possible contents of the Allerdale Borough Council Local Plan Part 2 Consultation which has not yet been received.

**Resolved** that this matter be deferred until the October 2018 meeting when the consultation will be open.

**Action: Clerk to communicate this to the correspondee.**

**184/18 Planning Decisions**

**Resolved** by all present that the below decision be noted as received:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref** | **Location** | **Proposal** | **Decision** |
| 2/2018/0346 | Plot 1 Moor Road, Great Broughton | Erection of a detached dwelling (Retrospective) | Approved with conditions |
| HOU/2018/0155 | Glen Cottage, Little Broughton, Cockermouth, CA13 0YA | Extension | Approved with conditions  |

**185/18 Finances, Accounts & Governance**

1. Payment of Accounts

The Clerk left the room during discussion regarding her extra hours payment.

**Resolved** by all present that the below accounts be paid with cheques signed by 2 authorised signatories

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| From | Reason | Amount |
| HMRC | PAYE Sept | £137.60 |
| Becx Carter | Salary (Via SO) | £550.08 |
| Becx Carter | Expenses | £112.42 |
| Playdale | Annual Repairs | £937.75 |
| Becx Carter | Additional Hours 1st April-1st Sept 18 (Allotments) | £355.97 |
| Jackson Hetherington | Grass Cutting | £307.65 |

**Action: Clerk to pay these accounts.**

1. Approval of Bank Reconciliation & Spend against Budget for July 2018

**Resolved** by all present that these be noted as a true & accurate record. This was signed as such by Cllr R Gildert

**186/18 Councillor Matters**

None raised

**187/18 Date & Time of Next meeting.**

Tuesday 16th October 2018 19:00 Little Broughton Village Hall

Meeting Closed 21:25

Signed……………………………………………. (Chair) Dated………………………………………………..