*MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SAMLESBURY & CUERDALE PARISH COUNCIL*

*HELD ON THURSDAY 24TH JULY 2025 AT SAMLESBURY MEMORIAL HALL*

*PRESENT*

Aimee Barton Parish Clerk, Stephen Fawcett as acting Chairman   
Parish Councillors Sue Redmayne, Stephen Fawcett, Glen Clayton, Ian Seed and George Whalley

Ten members of the public

Chairman Graham Young hoping to attend later in the meeting. Vice Chairman Stephen Fawcett to stand in for now.

*ITEM 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE*

Micheal Higginson and Clare Lewis

*ITEM 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST*

2.1 Register of Interests – Councillors were reminded of the need to update their register of interest.

2.2 No members disclosed any personal or prejudicial interests in any matter to be discussed at the meeting.

*ITEM 3 ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING*

3.1 Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 22nd May 2025 were accepted as a true record.

*ITEM 4 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES*

4.1 Chairman’s report – Due to the chairman unable to attend till later in the meeting hopefully there is no report to read out. Chairman to post his report in the Parish Newsletter.

4.2 10.16 from previous minutes - The corner at Fairview remains a significant road safety issue. Although progress was being made under the previous councillor, the transition in representation seems to have stalled any action. The concern has been re-submitted using the "lovecleanstreets" app, but so far, there’s been no response. It might be worthwhile to consider installing speed humps approximately 30 yards before the bend in both directions. Illuminated signs tend to draw drivers’ attention. Let’s strive to initiate some progress, keeping in mind the speed humps for improved safety.

4.3 At present, the Parish Council seems to be missing fewer issues, as matters are now being directed to Samlesbury and Cuerdale rather than Samlesbury and Walton.

4.4 Barrie and Graham walked the footways up the roadside at Mowcroft.

4.5 Referring to Samlesbury and Cuerdale cross, its appears on the old maps and is marked with gothic lettering.

4,6 Item 6.8 on previous minutes regarding the traffic island, is anything happening with it? Can we give them another nudge about it.

4.7 Regarding highways repairing the potholes, we asked them if they could hot seal around the repairs, have we had anything back from that? Not sure need to check with the Chairman.

6.8 Regarding item 10.2 from the previous minutes It’s called the Garder hotel.

6.9 Have the PC heard anything back regarding the bus shelter that was put on the wrong side of the road, opposite Potter Lane?

6.10 Have we heard anything about the litter bin at the layby near Five Bar Gate?

6.11 There is a pile of soil near Lower Huntley Woods, and two gate posts have been put in. Something to look into.

CIL money.

*ITEM 5 L.C.C*

Not had a report from Cllr Fred Cottom.

*ITEM 6 S.R.N*

No representatives.

*ITEM 7* Parish Election *MATTERS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC*

*7.1 Nomination papers must be delivered to the Returning Officer at South Ribble Borough Council, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland, Lancashire, PR25 1DH, by prior appointment, between 9.30 am and 4.00 pm on any working day from the date of publication of this notice (excluding bank holidays) but no later than* ***4pm on Friday, 18th July 2025.***

*If the election is contested the poll will take place on* ***Thursday, 14th August 2025****. The indicative costings for the by election are as follows:*

*1 station – 4 books of 100 papers and 1 tendered of 10 papers = £550*

*Postal packs – 250 packs which includes replacements = £1,050*

*Postage costs –  £475*

*Poll Cards –  £1000 ( if requested)*

*Staffing costs - £1773*

*Station costs – not available at this time*

*Total indicative charges - £4848*

*Please not that theses costings as for indicative purposes only and may be subject to change. The final costings will be shared with the parish once the election has been held. I have also been asked to advise you that the parish is able to make a payment arrangement of up to 4 years.*

The election has been publicised on both the Parish Council website and local notice boards. With two candidates standing, an election has been triggered. The decision was made not to issue poll cards, as the £1,000 cost could be better allocated to other parish needs, allowing candidates to promote themselves directly. The Parish Council retains discretion over the use of poll cards, unless they are specifically requested by SRBC, in which case their use would be required. However, poll cards are not mandatory. There is a perception among some that the Parish Council has not adhered to the proper procedures, but we are fully compliant with legal requirements.

In most elections, poll cards are required. In this instance, one candidate is already a councillor while the other is less familiar to the community, making this the only democratic council in recent memory not to use poll cards. There hasn’t been a Parish Council election in the last 15 years. The Parish Council has consulted SRBC, who advised that poll cards are not necessary. However, if there are requirements the Parish Council may have missed, these need to be clarified.

It came to light that, as of 10th July 2025, legislation has made poll cards mandatory. If this is the case, SRBC should not have asked the Parish Council whether they wished to use poll cards or not. Currently, candidates’ names are only published on the Parish Council website and notice boards. This raises questions about the timeline for the election; although the process has not disadvantaged anyone, it’s now up to the candidates to campaign and make themselves known. Poll cards themselves do not inform residents about the candidates, their roles, or positions—candidates still need to reach out to residents directly. However, without poll cards, there is a risk residents may not even be aware that an election is taking place, potentially leading to communication issues within the community. The fact that the decision fell to a single individual highlights a lack of clear communication within the Parish Council. The chair acted on advice from SRBC, but it is essential to confirm with SRBC whether the Parish Council’s actions regarding poll cards are legally compliant.

Questions were also raised about the residency of the candidates, as eligibility allows for living within 3km of the parish. The reason there hasn’t been an election in previous years is simple: there were always nine candidates for the nine available positions, so no election was necessary. Elections only occur when more candidates stand than there are available seats. Previously, vacancies have been filled by co-option. The Parish Council would prefer representation from all areas of the Parish, rather than from a single locality. If ensuring legal compliance means postponing the election by a week or so, then that is acceptable. Stephen will take the lead on resolving this issue.

*ITEM 8 MATTERS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC*

8.1 In March, an objection was raised regarding a development on Bezza Lane, but SRBC disregarded these concerns and granted permission regardless. The chairman later confirmed in a meeting that the project was intended for a timber business—a fact already known and accepted by the council. However, a member of the public has continued to contest the development, believing they have sufficient evidence that the application should not have been approved. This individual has taken their concerns all the way to the chief executive and requested an extension on the deadline but now faces the threat of legal action from SRBC, who are seeking to recover their legal costs.

It appears a serious error may have occurred within SRBC, yet they remain unwilling to meet with the resident to discuss the matter. Questions have been raised about whether the Parish Council should seek advice from their own King's Counsel, and whether Jacki Copley might assist with the situation. The investigating officer has indicated that no further interviews are needed, as sufficient information has already been gathered, and SRBC has refused to revisit the planning application. The situation has escalated beyond the concerns of just one individual.

There is speculation as to whether SRBC has actually engaged a barrister or if this is a tactic to intimidate the objector. The resident feels unable to continue contesting the matter due to financial constraints. While planning decisions are typically final and cannot be reversed, exceptions can be made if fraud is proven. It has been discussed about the possibility of involving the police, particularly since the planning agent withdrew and resubmitted a statement under a different planning number for what is a substantial building in open countryside without electricity—potentially leading to around 1,000 HGVs transporting wood each year.

If the resident wants to pursue a fraud claim with the police, they are free to do so. However, for the Parish Council, the priority is to review all relevant documents, consult higher authorities, and request a thorough investigation. Seeking a letter from a criminal solicitor may prompt action. It may also be beneficial to consult Jacki Copley from CPRE. Ultimately, a meeting is needed where all information can be presented. The Parish Council intends to follow up with the planning committee, simply asking for an update and clarification on the decision-making process.

8.2 Update on Item 6.2: Speeding on Preston New Road. The Chairman has reached out to Altham Parish Council regarding the use of SPID cameras, and the acting Chairman will follow up to gather further information. Lancashire County Council has available funding for road safety initiatives, which could cover the cost of installing speed cameras. There is a clear need to lower the speed limit in this area, especially as there are around six entrances leading directly into the 50mph zone. Unfortunately, drivers are unlikely to reduce their speed unless cameras are actually in place. The Chairman is actively addressing this issue, but the process can be lengthy. Previously, Barrie mentioned that road markings and potholes in Samlesbury and Cuerdale would be addressed by the end of March; however, this has yet to happen. It would have been helpful if Barrie had provided a written update, but no such report has been received. He did, however, bring a document to one of the meetings outlining all the local signage and road markings, and it is believed that his plan has now been implemented.

The question was raised as to whether average speed cameras could be introduced, as these have proven effective elsewhere.

*ITEM 9 MATTERS RAISED BY THE COUNCIL*

9.1 The channel that is breaking up on Sir Fredrick Page Way, it has been repaired but hasn’t been hot sealed. Could this be done?

9.2 Not all the Mile Stones have been cleaned up. The motorway Mile Stone is particularly bad.

9.3 Ragwort is growing up the verges, can the council cut them down please?

9.4 A pothole has appeared on Nabs Lane, currently marked with a traffic cone. Has anyone reported this issue using the ‘lovecleanstreets’ app? This needs to be raised with the county councillor. Our only course of action is to write to the county council. Since Barrie is unavailable to follow up, please contact Fred Cottom regarding the potholes.

9.5 A letter of resignation has been submitted by the clerk. The vacancy will need to be advertised on the Parish website. The Clerk has agreed to remain in the role until the September meeting, after which she will step down.

*ITEM 10 ACCOUNTS*

10.1 Expenditure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24/07/2025 | Cheque 712 | Office | £5.50 |
| 24/07/2025 | Cheque 713 | Office (Ink) | £42.49 |
| 24/07/2025 | Cheque 714 | Karl Baldwin (Audit) | £150 |
| 24/07/2025 | Cheque 715 | Clerk June/July Wage | £346.60 |
| 24/07/2025 | DD | July Website Fee | £55.44 |
| 24/07/2025 | DD | August Website Fee | £55.44 |
| 24/07/2025 | Cheque 716 | HMRC | £53.40 |
| 24/07/2025 | Cheque 717 | Insurance | £133.30 |
| 24/07/2025 |  | Parish Election | £4848? |

Proposed and second.

10.1 The bank statements, bank reconciliation and the cashflow were agreed and signed.

10.2 The final year of the 3-year deal Insurance renewal was agreed and signed.

*ITEMS 11 PLANNING APPLICATIONS*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 07/2025/00332/NOT | 2 Hawthorne Cottage Myerscough Smithy Lane Balderstone Blackburn  Lancashire  BB2 7LB | Install fixed line broadband electronic communications apparatus. install 1 x 10m light telephone pole | Permitted Development  4th June 2025 |
| 07/2025/00369/NOT | Stanley Mount  Gib Lane Samlesbury  Preston  Lancashire  PR5 0RS | Install 1 new 11m light wooden pole | Permitted Development 1  7th June 2025 |
| 07/2025/00406/FUL | Land South Of Myerscough Smithy Road/West Of Branch Road  Mellor Brook Lancashire | Full planning application for phased residential development (Three phases - Use Class C3) of 121 dwellings with associated landscaping, access/ egress, car parking, drainage, and other necessary supporting infrastructure |  |
| 07/2025/00409/DIS | The Hollins  Roach Road Samlesbury  Preston  Lancashire  PR5 0RB | Discharge of conditions 2 (materials), 3 (levels), 5 (construction method statement), 7 (surface water drainage), 8 (drainage), 10 (access), 15 (bird nesting), 17 (protected species) and 20 (self-build) of planning permission 07/2024/00076/FU | Part Discharged  16th July 2025 |
| 07/2025/00410/NMA | The Hollins  Roach Road Samlesbury  Preston  Lancashire  PR5 0RB | Non material amendment to planning permission 07/2024/00076/FUL (changes to elevational details) |  |
| 07/2025/00420/NOT | Walmsley Fold Farm  Cuerdale Lane Samlesbury  Preston  Lancashire  PR5 0XA | Calf feed and agricultural machinery shed | No Further Details  8th July 2025 |
| 07/2025/00381/FUL | Oakdene  Preston New Road Mellor Brook Blackburn  Lancashire  BB2 7PU | Application for erection of replacement selfbuild/custom build dwellinghouse, outbuilding, changes to driveway access and associated works (part retrospective with original dwellinghouse demolished). | Was mentioned a few meetings ago. Application for a new build, bigger footprint. Shouldn’t go outside the footprint. And volume of the previous property. |
| 07/2025/00500/FUL | 10 Intack Lane Mellor Brook Blackburn Lancashire  BB2 7PT | Erection of 2no. detached dwellings, with associated infrastructure and landscaping together with the erection of replacement store building following demolition of existing store building | The land is not in Greenbelt. If we are objecting what planning laws are we objecting on? Its not greenbelt and cant be street scene. Highways would be looking at it surely. Can we ask for it to go to full planning. Regarding concerns of access. |

Member’s Decisions.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 07/2025/00240/VAR | Ab Inbev UK Limited,  Cuerdale Lane, Samlesbury, Preston | Variation of condition 2 for permission 07/2023/00565/FUL for erection of wastewater treatment plant comprising technical building, methane reactor, storage and processing tanks, flare stack, associated plant and enabling works. | Approval with Conditions  22nd May 2025 |
| 07/2025/00260/FUL | Ab Inbev UK Limited,  Cuerdale Lane, Samlesbury, Preston | Proposed installation of 1no. storage tank and associated works | Approval with Conditions  23rd May 2025 |
| 07/2025/00311/ADE | Green Lane Farm, Green Lane, Samlesbury, Preston | Agricultural Determination for a building over existing open silage clamp | No Further Details  21st May 2025 |
| 07/2025/00329/NEI | BAE Samlesbury Aerodrome, Whalley Road, Samlesbury, Blackburn | Erection of 8 non-illuminated signs of differing sizes positioned in five locations around the site, including 4 on roundabout. | No Further Details  22nd May 2025 |
| 07/2025/00319/VAR | The Hollins, Roach Road, Samlesbury, Preston | Application Reference Number: 07/2024/00076/FUL Date of Decision: 23/07/2024 Condition Number(s): 2,3,5,7,8,10,15,17,20,22 Conditions(s) Removal: Please referee to 24064(12) 2025 04 07 Planning Condition Discharge Application - Commentary Document v1.0 Please referee to 24064(12) 2025 04 07 Planning Condition Discharge Application - Commentary Document v1.0 | Application Withdrawn  3rd June 2025 |
| 07/2025/00332/NOT | 2 Hawthorne Cottage, Myerscough Smithy Lane, Balderstone, Blackburn | Install fixed line broadband electronic communications apparatus. install 1 x 10m light telephone pole | Permitted Development  4th June 2025 |
| 07/2025/00369/NOT | Stanley Mount, Gib Lane, Samlesbury, Preston | Install 1 new 11m light wooden pole | Permitted Development  17th June 2025 |
| 07/2025/00410/NMA | The Hollins, Roach Road, Samlesbury, Preston | Non material amendment to planning permission 07/2024/00076/FUL (changes to elevational details) | Approval  2nd July 2025 |
| 07/2025/00420/NOT | Walmsley Fold Farm,  Cuerdale Lane, Samlesbury, Preston | Calf feed and agricultural machinery shed | No Further Details  8th July 2025 |
| 07/2025/00409/DIS | The Hollins, Roach Road, Samlesbury, Preston | Discharge of conditions 2 (materials), 3 (levels), 5 (construction method statement), 7 (surface water drainage), 8 (drainage), 10 (access), 15 (bird nesting), 17 (protected species) and 20 (self-build) of planning permission 07/2024/00076/FUL | Part Discharged  16th July 2025 |

*ITEM 12 BRANCH ROAD DEVELOPMENT*

We acknowledge that the planning application has already been submitted, and the deadline has passed. However, if necessary, the Parish Council (PC) still retains the option to raise objections. Back in March’s meeting, it was suggested that we engage residents directly, perhaps through a public meeting and a leaflet drop. There is a desire to rebuild trust and reconnect with the community on this issue.

The PC recently received notification from Prospect Homes about their intention to meet with the PC. Approximately four years ago, a similar meeting was held where public suggestions about the development were gathered. Residents from Branch Road were asked for their input on what they would like included in the project. Many objections reflected a general opposition to the development, but it's important to articulate the reasons behind these concerns. What, specifically, do residents expect from the PC? If there is no identified need for more housing, why does this development pose an issue? SRBC has stated that the local housing demand has been met, and currently, there is little evidence to suggest an additional need. The proposed development represents a significant transformation for the village. The land in question was approved for development 25 years ago—it was designated as suitable for housing on planning maps, and at the time, there were no grounds for objection. Since then, it’s been included in targets for future housing. Currently, there is no identified housing need in Mellor Brook. The Central Lancs Local Plan has earmarked this area for development for the next 15 years to meet village needs.

Such a development would likely exacerbate issues on PNR and the A59. While there would be some Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding as a result, RVBC’s assertion that the site is pedestrian-friendly is not accurate.

The Parish Council needs to decide whether to support the project, and, more importantly, to listen to local concerns. We should look into booking the Memorial Hall for a public meeting, and possibly ask for the September 2nd date to be deferred. Updates will be posted on the website once arrangements are made. Thus far, only 67 residents have been informed. It is essential to engage the developer, hear what residents would find acceptable, and then reconvene with the developer within the available timeframe.

Given the number of objections and feedback, would it not be more efficient for the PC to compile a summary letter reflecting residents’ views and submit it? We could review all online comments and consolidate them into one document—perhaps with input from Jacki Copley. The prevailing view in the local community is that there is neither a need nor a desire for this development, and it would place additional strain on existing infrastructure.

*ITEM 13 POLICIES*

The Communications and Complaints policies were agreed and signed.

*ITEM 14 CGV REPORT*

No repetitive.

*ITEM 15 AGREE THE DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING.*

Thursday 25th September 2025 at Samlesbury Memorial Hall.

Thank you all for coming to tonight’s meeting. We want to do the right thing for the Parish Council, thank you to Stephen for taking on the role as chairman.

Meeting closed at 21.45.