

Parbold Parish Council

*Clerk: Mrs Elizabeth-Anne Broad JP, LLB (Hons), MA, CiLCA
1 Pinewood, Skelmersdale, Lancashire, WN8 6UZ
e-mail: parboldpc.clerk@yahoo.com*

Minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council at 7.30 pm on Friday 5th July 2019 in Parbold WI Hall.

Present: Cllr Arnold (Chairman), Cllr Bithell (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Blake, Cllr Carruthers, Cllr Gill, Cllr Quirk, Inspector Arian Jolley, five members of the public.

1. To record apologies for absence

Apologies were accepted from Cllr Holland, Cllr Schaffel, Cllr Stopford, Cllr Butts.

2. To receive declarations of interest

None declared

3. To sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held 7th June 2019

The minutes were accepted as a correct record of the meeting and duly signed.

4. To hear Inspector Adrian Jolley report on policing in Parbold

Inspector Jolley gave an overview of his personal experience in policing and of the organisational review being currently undertaken. The College of Policing is a steering body nationally. Within West Lancs there are now five areas covered, with Parbold & Skelmersdale Rural Team comprising a Sergeant, a Community Beat Manager (CBM) and 2 PCSOs. Being conscious that Phone Number 101 gets queues, (which is a problem at Headquarters), contact details of the immediate team will be emailed to the Clerk.

Issues have been pretty stable for over 12 months; youths problems remain a priority with extra funding provided to tackle knife crime. The police are aware of Alder Lane Playing Fields, Bramble Way car park disturbances. There really are not enough patrols, but please continue to report non urgent issues as these are picked up and monitored to see how much is going on in your area. If at all possible gather as much information ie vehicle registration numbers etc, feed that in online via Lancashire Constabulary. Through the website you can contact an individual officer. We currently have one very new PCSO and one fairly new one, the CBM is brand new. They are all very keen to assist and be responsive. If there is a lack of communication, tell me, they are my staff and I will ensure your issues are processed.

Currently based at Ormskirk Police Station for nine to twelve months, maybe longer, due to refurbishment going on at Skelmersdale.

Rest assured, we are measured on response times so will respond to 999 in emergency, they will be here when you want them to be - contact 101 or email the neighbourhood team for less urgent issues.

Councillors asked how often will they come into the village will they be seen at all? We will try and ensure visibility.

Named officers covering our area are Sgt Darren Carr, 253, PC 851 Gordon Davies, PC 7248 Neil Smith, Chelsea Lane,

Looking at specific issues at Bramble Way car park and Alder Lane Playing Fields, using gates and cctv often simply moves the problem somewhere else. Also with gating, the public has a right of access, so this can be difficult logistically. However, with problems of 1-2am cars arriving, playing radios and drug taking, low class usually cannabis, illicit meetings, throwing litter etc, anything you can do to stop that is a bonus. Many off road, out of the way car parks like this, up and down the country have exactly the same issues.

Councillors asked the Inspector what can we do for you? What your challenges?

The Inspector answered that it is always the same really, there are not enough resources. PCSO's don't work past midnight - their shifts run - 8 am 4 pm, 12noon - 10pm, 12noon - 8pm. The new constabulary telephone system is a bit of a nightmare - we do have one you can contact.

Traffic issues were then discussed but no new approach advised. Parking is a traffic warden (LCC) issues unless it is a very clear case of obstruction. There can be no comment on suggested traffic problems at Parbold Hill until and unless there are any. No active investigations could be commented upon either.

The Chairman thanked the Inspector for attending the meeting and apologised that members of the public who had asked for a police spokesperson, had not returned to this meeting to listen to one.

5. Public Participation: The meeting will be adjourned for an appropriate time (four minutes maximum per speech) for members of the public to raise matters of concern or interest as notified to the Chairman.

6. To hear public concerns about proposal for development at Parbold Hill quarry and the LCC owned Parbold Hill Viewing Point, opposite Miller & Carter Restaurant

Items 5 & 6 were combined.

A Shevington Parish Councillor attended the meeting, mentioning Junction 27 improvements at Charnock Richard and asking if Parbold and Shevington could try and join up, with agenda and minutes emailed from Parbold over to the Shevington Clerk. The Clerk pointed out that agenda and minutes became available on the website once ratified and signed and collaboration on border issues is possible.

There was then discussion about the LCC application regarding Parbold Hill with all present concerned about the effect on residents and road users. One resident noted deficiencies in the application with a lack of environmental impact assessment or quantity and time scales; he questioned using a general architect for an engineering option, and the amount of 'spin' used in the application, particularly where the applicant implies parish council support. There appears to be no proof that the work is needed, that this leacheate still needs to be pumped

and if it does it is the land owners liability, they could put on a new membrane rather than this more lucrative option.

The Parish Council confirmed that they were following the formal process and had submitted a good technical response.

7. To distribute Network Rail's recommendations for Chapel Lane level crossing that an unmanned crossing is now preferred, rather than extending Bramble Way

The following statement had been received from the project engineer: Taking into consideration the environmental impact of undertaking this work; the concerns raised by the Parish Council, WLBC and local residents as well as the level of investment required to implement this proposal, it is felt that closing the crossing is not the appropriate solution for this project.

8. To ratify accounts and authorise payment of accounts presented

010719	HMRC	Tax & NI x 3 months	d.d.	£257.31
050719	Whitehill Direct Ltd	notice board repairs	2840	£1,401.60*
050719	Parbold WI	room hire - 7th June 2019	2841	£32.50
050719	OPSTA	Annual subscription	2842	£10.00
	Ormskirk, Preston & Southport Travellers Association			
050719	Wrightington Windows	village hall July	2843	£25.00
050719	Sandra Jones	Internal Audit	2844	£190.00
050719	Parbold WI	room hire - 7th June 2019	2845	£32.50
050719	E A Broad	Stamps 12 x first, 12 x second class	2846	£15.72
050719	Parbold Tree Wardens	recompense spoiled plants	2847	£25.00
050719	Parbold Flood Action Group	donation towards activities	2848	£250.00
050719	B Rawthorne	grass cutting contract	2849	£957.00
080719	UKHost4U	Website - domain name renewal 2 years	d.d.	£119.99
190719	RBS	Bank charges	d.d.	£6.65
280719	E A Broad	salary July 2019	s.o.	£818.63
280719	NEST	Pension (£27.89 from parish, rest is employee contribution)		£94.83

The accounts were ratified and authorised for payment.

Bank Balance as at 31st May current account = £51.36: reserve account = £128,366.63.

9. Receipt of Internal Audit 2018/19 and ratification of any outstanding audit issues

The following report was received and issues addressed:

INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT 2018-19

An internal audit was undertaken following examination of the accounts and minutes as presented by Mrs Elizabeth Broad, Clerk to the Council.

Sample checks of income, expenditure and bank statements were carried out and the audit trail was generally found to be in order. The cashbook is maintained and balanced on a regular basis. In addition, the risk assessment register, standing orders and financial regulations have been reviewed during the year.

However, there were a few instances, which I bring to the Council's attention:

1. **Expenditure – Supporting Documentation**

Most invoices were found to be in place when the sample checks were undertaken. However, there were some instances where insufficient documentation was found:

- £35.00 Direct Debit payment to Information Commissioner Office
- £32.50 payment to Parbold WI for room hire – chq 2772
- £68.00 payment to Parbold WI for room hire – chq 2786

It is recommended that documentation be provided for all expenditure to ensure that the charge has been incurred and that the amount is correct.

2. **Income – Supporting Documentation**

Most items of income were found to be supported by a receipt, however, there was an instance where no documentation was found:

- Rent due from McColls (£1,000 annual fee) and Parbold Community Association (£400 quarterly fee).

It is recommended that documentation be provided for all income to ensure that the correct fee has been paid and the fee has been accurately attributed to the appropriate person/organisation.

3. **Minutes not matching Cash Book**

There were instances found where the minutes did not reflect the information detailed on the cash book spread sheet for expenditure:

- Chq 2751 to Parbold Village Festival Committee – the cash book states £250 but the payment appears to have been omitted from the minutes
- Direct debit payments to UK Host for you made in July – the cash book states payments of £47.99 and £119.99, but the payments appear to have been omitted from the minutes
- Chq 2790 to Chris Horridge – the cash book states a payment of £230, but the minutes note a payment of £360
- Chq 2812 to Midstream Garden Centre – the cash book states a payment of £384, but the minutes state a payment of £360

It is recommended that all minutes are checked against a payments list or the cheque book before being signed or initialled by the Chairman to provide reassurance that the minutes represent a true and accurate record.

10. To receive any update on WLBC Public Waste Bin Protocol and address street scene issues of weeds in gutters

The actual Bin Strategy had not been made available to parishes but comments made in the Clerks' liaison meeting at WLBC implied that parishes would be asked to take on the liability of emptying public bins in the future. Cllr Blake as Borough Ward Councillor will make further enquiries on this issue. At this point Borough Councillor Blake pointed out that the Borough Council had done weeding near The Stocks and over the bridge, and Broadmead and Burnside would be done during July. They would also tackle the hog weed at Mill Leat hopefully before the school holidays.

11. To note Planning and Planning Applications

The following applications were noted:

Ref. No: 2019/0637/CON

Approval of Details Reserved by Condition No. 3 of planning permission 2019/0145/FUL relating to external facing and roof materials
11 Brookfield Parbold Wigan Lancashire WN8 7JJ

Ref. No: 2019/0568/CON

Approval of Details Reserved by Condition No. 3 of planning permission 2019/0303/FUL relating to details of facing and roofing materials.
18 Mill Lane Parbold Wigan Lancashire WN8 7NW

Ref. No: 2019/0610/LDP

Certificate of Lawfulness - Proposed two storey rear extension; single storey side extension and material alterations including installation of 3 no. roof lights to front elevation.
28 Wood Lane Parbold Wigan Lancashire WN8 7TH

Ref. No: 2019/0615/FUL

Extension to dwelling
2 Scarisbrick Avenue Parbold Wigan Lancashire WN8 7HE

Parish Council Response: No objection to this proposal.

Ref. No: 2019/0594/FUL

Single storey rear extension.
27 Mill Lane Parbold Wigan Lancashire WN8 7NW

Parish Council Response No objection to this proposal.

County Matter - Proposed land restoration and regrading works using inert material, associated highway works including construction of a temporary public car park.
Former Parbold Quarry Parbold Hill Parbold Lancashire

Ref. No: LCC/2019/0028 | Received: Fri 07 Jun 2019 | Validated: Fri 07 Jun 2019

Application Reference Number: LCC/2019/0028

Objection by Parbold Parish Council

Summary

The proposed waste development in the Green Belt would be inappropriate and highly damaging in terms of landscape value, public amenity, highway safety and convenience, and waste planning policy.

The proposal is in no way justified by the policy provisions of the relevant Waste Development Plan Documents/Local Plans, and would be so disproportionately large that it could cause significant harm in waste planning policy terms, as excessively beyond the quantities for which those Plans provide.

The submitted 'technical' evidence is superficial, patchy, unconvincing and inconclusive. It does not demonstrate that existing conditions at Parbold Hill constitute a problem of sufficient consequence that it could only be remedied by the proposed deposit of waste. Nor does it demonstrate that such problems as may exist could not be remedied by other, far less damaging means.

Consequently there is no need for the proposal; and certainly none that might be sufficient to constitute the very special circumstances necessary to outweigh harm through inappropriateness together with the additional harm identified. Accordingly the application should be refused.

Section 1

Objections on Grounds of Statutory Waste Development Plan Policy

The Applicant clearly sees the proposal as a lucrative opportunity- to deposit hundreds of thousands of tonnes of inert waste. But the first and foremost planning policy objection has to be that the site is in the Green Belt, which imposes a discipline which is very hard to satisfy. The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt. So the question to be answered is not 'could this be done?', nor even 'would this bring some benefit'? The question to be answered is 'is this development needed, to the point where Very Special Circumstances are demonstrated, sufficient to outweigh the harm from inappropriateness together with any other harm which can be identified?' We say that the development is not needed to the extent that it meets this policy requirement, and so it should be refused.

We start with the Development Plan.

In terms of the Lancashire (with Blackpool and Blackburn & Darren) Waste and Minerals Development Plan the proposal is not needed. Policy CS8 states that the Plan 'ensures that adequate disposal capacity will be available for non-recyclable inert wastes', and Policy LF2 specifies only 2 sites for the landfill disposal of inert wastes. It is true that Policy CS8 also allows for 'the suitable restoration of quarries and landfills through the tipping of inert materials that may otherwise be recyclable'. But the Plan does not specify quantities

envisaged under this part of the policy - suggesting that they should be incidental to the annual quantities set out in the Statement of Needs. At Parbold Hill, however, the quantities proposed to be tipped so far exceed the forecasts for the entire Plan area, and are so disproportionate, that they ought properly to have been included under a specific site-related policy. They were not. What is more, the Plan has quite recently been reviewed - and reviewed since the occasion when a similar proposal was made for Parbold Hill (not by the current Applicant). If at that point the proposed development had been judged by LCC to have been necessary, it could and should have been included in the latest edition of the Waste Development Plan. And it was not included. Nor is the application site needed to receive inert waste exports from adjoining local authorities. The Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside recognises that inert landfill capacity is limited within its own area; but concludes that export movements under existing commercial contracts would adequately deal with inert waste disposal requirements for the Plan period. Greater Manchester sees no requirement for exports of inert waste from its authority area. So, in development Plan terms, the proposal is not needed.

Therefore, there must be considerable uncertainty over the source(s) of materials to be used in the proposal. The Applicant has been very vague about the sources. Without a known and certain source, tipping would potentially have to be extended over a far longer time period than the Applicant suggests - with all harm magnified accordingly.

Section 2 Objection on Grounds of Inadequate Evidence

Water Accumulation and Leachate

Contrary to the Applicant's suggestion, there were no natural watercourses above ground on this, south-facing side of Parbold Hill. Watercourses (Alder Lane Brook and Sprodley Brook) run west and south-east respectively, rising from lower ground behind (north of) Parbold Hill summit. Before quarrying began in the south-facing rock, rainwater would have infiltrated the ground and travelled through the interstices of the rock (direction unknown).

Quarrying disrupted this pattern; and landfilling superimposed a mass of waste material into which rainwater ran and dispersed. Because such water became contaminated by the waste it had to be pumped and treated as leachate. The degree of contamination lessened with time after tipping ceased. The evidence does not make it clear whether or not/to what degree the 'leachate' is now contaminated. The mere fact that water is in some way accumulating within the full material does not necessarily mean that it is contaminated to a degree that now requires treatment. If not, (and after so long it is likely that any contamination is highly attenuated) the 'leachate' can be left to find its own way through the underlying rock strata as water has always done before past interference through quarrying and landfilling. Simply superimposing an additional mass of material upon the wet layers underlying the depressions would do nothing to enable existing saturation to disperse, nor to relieve any residual contamination if it exists. Because water used to disperse via infiltration through the rock (and via surface evaporation) rather than via surface watercourses, imposing a more effective clay cap would not necessarily achieve suitable drainage. The proposal is not needed in order to improve drainage. The existing situation simply acts as a perched water table.

The application does not suggest that the accumulation of water in or underlying the depressions might pose a risk or harm of any sort. No consequences have been suggested

other than a postulated need to continue pumping: and this only on the assumption that 'leachate' requires treatment (and this is not demonstrated). The evidence does not suggest that there might be any danger of flooding; nor of land slippage. Rather, the proposed imposition of surface fill above any existing saturated material might in itself result in a risk of slippage as water gradually accumulated within it.

The small area of deepest water penetration is apparently self-contained within a relative depression in the uppermost north-east corner of the site. Any residual contamination within this area could surely be dealt with by planting of reedbeds, within the depression and at the point of pumping, and allowing cleansed water to disperse through the underlying rock, and via the pond at the foot of the hill (on Wood Lane).

The application does not demonstrate a problem that might need to be solved by the proposed development, nor that the proposal would be effective in solving it, nor that other less intrusive and inappropriate means would be at least as effective, nor that the proposal would not itself create further problems.

Section 3 Objections on Grounds of Additional Harm: Highway Safety and Convenience

The A5209 is a busy road, serving as a link between Wigan and the M6 (north of J26) and Southport, and connecting villages and towns in between. In addition to commuter and business traffic (eg to Edge Hill University in Ormskirk) the A5209 bears a heavy load of HGVs running between the large agricultural distribution centres of West Lancashire and, via the M6, the rest of the country to north, east and south and overseas (particularly Spain).

To either side of the application site the A5209 is subject only to the national speed limit of 60mph. The steep west side of Parbold Hill reduces speed at first, but levels out somewhat towards the summit, so that from both directions traffic is able to move very fast on approach to the site: and it frequently does so.

At the summit of Parbold Hill there are two existing attractions which greatly complicate traffic movements and are potentially hazardous in themselves. The long layby offers a panoramic viewpoint out over the whole of West Lancashire as far as the coast. Traffic movements of all kinds are made into and out of the layby, including right turns from the west, reversing out into the carriageway, and complete turns within the carriageway. Opposite the layby is the Miller & Carter restaurant which has a large car park and attracts many customers from mid-morning onwards. Again, many right turn manoeuvres are made both into and out of the car park entrance. In addition, pedestrians (ramblers, or clients of Miller & Carter) often cross the road at the summit; and the ice cream van forms yet another attraction.

The proposal would bring an additional stream of HGV traffic, which would be slowing down and performing turning movements into and out of the site, right next to the layby and directly opposite the entrance to the Miller and Carter. These would interfere with the complex of turning movements from existing sources, creating significantly hazardous highway conditions. The potential for conflict in speeds and movements, and for surprise and interference to drivers of every class of vehicle, and pedestrians, would markedly increase the risk of accident.

The Applicant suggests highway works to reduce such dangers: but these would occupy large areas of the summit and would be difficult for approaching drivers to 'read'. Even if provided with a refuge in the middle of the carriageway, pedestrians crossing the road would be vulnerable to drivers' mistakes. It would not be possible fully to separate the HGV traffic visiting the site from traffic accessing the proposed replacement viewing area.

Currently, HGVs often stop overnight in the existing layby. This is a matter of annoyance and inconvenience to local residents, which is understood. However, if the existing layby were closed as proposed, and HGVs prevented from accessing the proposed new car park and viewing area, the uncontrolled HGV parking would simply be transferred to other parts of the highway network or to private land (such as the car park to Christ Church less than half a mile away) or to the layby opposite Fairy Glen.

We recognise that some of the harmful impacts of the proposal on highway safety are likely to be temporary. But we consider that even the likelihood of short-term impacts would be of such severity and significance that they contribute substantial and even decisive weight against the proposal.

Moreover, given that the supply stream of inert waste has not been shown to be guaranteed over the deposition period suggested by the Applicant, the time period of maximum highway disruption would be much longer than the 2 years suggested by the Applicant. Furthermore, the Applicant has greatly underestimated and understated the amount of waste to be deposited, in two ways. Firstly, the stated quantities are given in cubic metres, which translate to a greater number of metric tonnes.

Secondly, where inert waste is deposited into wet ground or into lagoons overlying wet ground, a larger number of tonnes will be required to fill a space calculated in cubic metres. (Environment Agency conversion figures).

In all, we say that the proposal is completely unacceptable in highway terms and should be refused on those grounds alone.

Section 4 Objections on Grounds of Amenity

Noise, Dust and Landscape

Currently, the layby and adjacent seating area offer panoramic views: southwards across the Douglas Valley; south-eastwards, setting Wigan and its outskirts in green surroundings; westwards to the coast, the Formby Dunes, the docks at Bootle and on a clear day to the hills and mountains of North Wales. In between, local people can distinguish their own village or town, fields and features in the panorama. All this can be appreciated in peaceful enjoyment.

The proposal would disrupt this experience: through the noise of lorries arriving at the site, manoeuvring with piercing reversing alarms, tipping their loads of rubble and heavy soil, then grinding in low gear back uphill to the new junction with the A5209, then accelerating away from the site. Dust could not be adequately prevented, and would both further spoil the view, and irritate the viewers, and walkers approaching the summit via the public footpath which ascends directly alongside the site, from Wood Lane. The noise and dust might be intermittent rather than constant, but no less irritating for that, especially in windy conditions. The green foreground to the southward valley views would be literally turned to dust (or mud) - which would be the setting for site roads, lorries and site installations. The site would

present as a vision of destruction, replacing the beauty of the scene that so many people have travelled to see.

Lack of Restoration and Landscaping Scheme

The proposed tipping activity would continue, it is said, for around two years (though we say it could be considerably more). Afterwards, it would be expected that the site would be fully restored and landscaped. However, the application does not include such a scheme - instead making vague promises of 'wildflowers'. The proposal lacks adequate measures for aftercare and landscaping. Such as they may be (we do not know what they are), they are to be linked to, and dependent upon, the approval of a separate planning application for a holiday village (further inappropriate development in the Green Belt), to be made to a different local planning authority (West Lancashire Borough Council or WLBC). This is wholly improper. The proposal could only be satisfactorily completed if the disruption to the hillside were made good as an integral part of the application for the waste disposal. Any condition imposed on a planning permission which in any way sought to 'tie the hands' of another local planning authority would surely be 'ultra vires' (literally 'beyond the powers' of the authority imposing it) and could be struck off on appeal against that condition - leaving the area unfinished and unlandscaped. It is therefore essential that a full landscaping scheme be submitted as part of the application: so that it can be fully evaluated, amended if necessary, then properly and enforceable secured by condition or by legal agreement.

Incidentally, the Applicant's vague reference to 'wildflowers' shows a misunderstanding. If wildflower meadows are to be successful over time, they need appropriate (poor) soils and management, including mowing at particular times of year, and prevention of invasion by other species, principally trees and scrub. The suggested topsoil would be too rich, and would not result in the intended landscape.

Amenity - The Proposed Viewpoint Car Park

The application does not make clear who is to be responsible for the car park after its completion. The Parish Council would emphatically not wish to take on responsibility for this car park in addition to those it already manages. In particular, the problems raised by anti-social and criminal behaviour at the Bramble Way car park are extremely difficult, time-consuming and expensive to deal with: and this is in an area largely overlooked by residents. Whereas the layby is completely visible from the highway (A5209), the proposed new car park would be at a significant distance from it. In our opinion, the burden of management would be too great for our small parish council which already has many heavy responsibilities.

Conclusions

The proposal represents a wholly inappropriate, damaging and unjustified development. It would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which requires under Government and local statutory planning policy to be justified by very special circumstances. It is not. There are no very special circumstances. The collective weight of harm, in terms of Green Belt Policy and the many additional ways in which the proposal would be harmful, far outweighs the potential advantages of the scheme, which are largely advantages to the Applicant, not to the public or to the environment. Those advantages do not amount to Very Special Circumstances sufficient to outweigh the collective weight of harm.

Our representations have necessarily been made without sight of any consultation response to the application from the Environment Agency. The Agency has access to professional technical input which is capable of providing full and reliable and unbiased evidence in relation to matters of waste and water engineering. The Agency also has potential control of the situation through its Permitting regime (system of permits) and access to stringent methods and remedies. We ask that the Agency should make full and proper use of its powers.

It is to be hoped that the opportunity of the Applicant is met by a force capable of achieving a satisfactory situation without recourse to this highly unsatisfactory proposal.

We ask that the application be refused.

Postscript

The Applicant alleges that Parbold Parish Council has expressed support for the scheme. That is not the case. At the Applicant's request, the Parish Council met him and his Agent's representative to be shown some details of the proposal in advance of its submission as an application to the local planning authority (in this case Lancashire County Council).

Just because the Parish Council did not immediately jump in against the proposal before we had heard what the Applicant's side had to say, and before we had had the opportunity to see what the formal planning application itself contained, should NOT be taken as a suggestion of support for it on our part. We simply acted politely, asked many questions and gave the Applicant a fair hearing. Had we done otherwise, we could have been rightly criticised for blind negativity.

Having considered the formal planning application in all its aspects, we now submit our considered statement which roundly criticises the scheme. This in no way implies an 'about turn' on the part of the Council, but simply results from doing things properly and according to normal planning procedures.

Ref. No: 2019/0561/FUL

Single storey rear and side extension. Front porch dormer alterations including pitched roof and new cladding. New windows and doors.

Granville Lodge The Common Parbold Wigan Lancashire WN8 7EB

Parish Council Response: N objection to this proposal

Ref. No: 2019/0536/FUL

Proposed rear extension to include Family/Kitchen/Dining space & rear dormer to Bedroom 3
2 Alderbrook Drive Parbold Wigan Lancashire WN8 7HF

Parish Council Response: No objection to this proposal.

12. Councillors' agenda items for future meetings

Cllr Blake: Lancashire County Council Matter needs to be yellow lines along Beacon crossing, Tan House Lane and Brandreth Drive; at the junction of Our Lady's and Parbold Douglas where it is not manned by lollypop lady.

Cllr Quirk: Will organise a meeting with Wigan Waste Water Treatment Centre.

13. Resolution: Pursuant to section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 it is resolved that, because of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted (contracts for services and terms & conditions of employment), the public and the press leave the meeting during consideration of the remaining items on the agenda

14. To discuss further any issues regarding the Parbold Hill application

The Applicant has offered to take Councillors on a guided tour of the site and this will be arranged during the summer recess,

15. To decide which gate to use for Bramble Way car park security

There are still a number of issues to consider, particularly the exact location for the gates, whether a turning circles is provided, so without exact measurements like-for-like quotes can't be obtained. The area will be measured over the summer recess.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 9:30pm.

Cllr Brian Arnold
Chairman

6th September 2019