

Simonstone Parish Council
Parish Council Meeting
to be held on 8th March 2018
in the Old School, School Lane, Simonstone
at 7.00 pm
Agenda

- 18/ 41 Apologies.**
- 18/ 42 Minutes of the meeting held on the 11th January to be approved.**
- 18/ 43 Declaration of interests**
- 18/ 44 Public Participation.** (Open forum on any village matter to last no more than 15 mins. 3mins per speaker).
- 18/ 45 Decision items;**
- 18/ 46 Matters raised from previous meetings**
- 18/ 47 URC development –**
- a. Meeting with Village Hall Committee 23/2/18 Coun. Greera Norse to report.
 - b. Clerk’s meeting with the Trustees 24/2/18. Clerk to report.
 - c. Chairman and Clerk’s Meeting with the URC Elders Chairman and Clerk meeting abandoned due th advers whether and has been rearranged to report.
- 18/ 48 Spot On arrangements for the performance of Sam Brady on the 23rd of March in St Peters Church.** ticket and posters have been deliver to RSVH committee and are being distributed,
- 18/ 49 Matters requested by members**
- 18/ 50 Joint Civic Sunday with Read Parish Council on 3rd June to be held at St Peter’s Church followed by a reception at Read Cricket Club. CC to respond**
- 18/ 51 Meeting of Read Parish Council, Couns. Barker and Hargreaves to report.**
- 18/ 52 Planning Application No: 3/2018/0106 Proposal: Installation of 25 containerised battery units for the storage of electricity and ancillary infrastructure. Location Burnley Road Simonstone**
- 18/ 53 Martholme Greenway.**The Clerk has requested that the safety signs be as requested via “report it” and Councillor Meloy to report on progress.
- 18/ 54 RVBC – Parish Liaison Meeting.**
- a. The Parish Council has been notified that the concurrent function grant, including the Lengthsman Scheme, has been approved and is now included in a grant of £285 and based on the Parish Council’s eligible expenditure.
- 18/ 55 The Parish Council has requested that the Committee gives an update on the new Data Protection act.**that comes into force on 1st March.
- 18/ 56 Correspondence –**
- a. Senior Road Users workshop
 - b. Dog Fouling Fountains Ave
- 18/ 57 LALC-**
- a. A copy of the new Data Protection Act has been received.

b. Grant funding for Printer Scanner to add to the Scanner Fund from the Transparency Fund.

18/ 58 Ribble Valley Village Hall Committee Clerk to report

18/ 59 Finance

a. Payment of Accounts.

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|---------------------|---------|
| i | Coun Hodbod/Huntroyde | garden comp prizes. | £50 |
| ii | I R Hirst | Salary | £502.61 |
| iii | I R Hirst | Expenses | £ |
| iv | HMRC | Tax | £125.60 |

18/ 60 Borough Councillor's report.

18/ 61 Items for reporting to other Authorities.

18/ 62 The next Parish Council meeting is on the 12th April 2018 at 7pm.

I Roger Hirst
Parish Clerk

Cathy Ryder From: Siriol Hogg [<mailto:siriolhogg@googlemail.com>]

Sent: 14 February 2018 08:17

To: townclerk@stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk

Subject: Injustice to Lancashire Communities Vulnerable to Flooding

We intend to send the following email/ letter to our 15 Lancashire MPs and the relevant Government Ministers . If you as a Flood Group agree with the content and would like to add your Flood Action/ Community's Group/ Parish Councils voice to the letter/ email please return to me ASAP

Thankyou Siriol Hogg Vice Chairman of Churchtown Flood Action Group.

hoggontheweb@hotmail.co.uk

We ask that the 15 Lancashire MPs convene and discuss the flooding situation in Lancashire and publish conclusions to the flood groups ASAP.

We would also like these MPs and the Government to consider the following important issues:-

- The present Government Planning Guidelines to be investigated as to whether they are 'fit for purpose'. Currently, it appears that the same Flood Risk Assessment criteria are used throughout the country regardless of the wide variation in annual rainfall. Thus, for example, they are the same in Kent as in much wetter Lancashire and Cumbria. The calculations used by developers to determine Flood Risk set out in the Government Planning Guidelines are not robust enough to protect the vulnerable from flooding in higher rainfall areas
- The 1:100 6 hour rule applying countrywide. Rainfall in the north west is very substantially higher than the south east.
- Re-instatement of Schedule 3(SuDS) (Sustainable urban Drainage systems) of the FWMA (Flood and Water Management Act 2010) and machinery being established to supervise the standard of SuDS design, implementation of the system, maintenance and inspection. This must involved house builders having a continuing liability or paying for a statutory authority to take it over. The present system leaves new house owners with no proper machinery for enforcing the collection of money to carry out maintenance and repair and exposes those downstream to the effects of the installed SuDS not working or working insufficiently. We would ask that this lack of responsibility changes.
- House-builders and developers should be held accountable for both establishment and ongoing maintenance of attenuation on their building sites. It may be a condition of planning approval that attenuation tanks or ponds be installed but when the builders leave the the responsibility for maintenance is not always clearly established or enforced. There is no statutory obligation for any agency to inspect and enforce maintenance, indeed Planning Authorities do not routinely inspect for compliance with conditions imposed on grant of permission. This system is insufficiently robust to protect either the new builds or others made vulnerable to flooding downstream of the development. There is evidence to suggest that once permission has been received no inspection of the attenuation takes place.
- There should be consideration of the required notice period for planning applications and the time allowed in hearings for local opinions to be represented in order to create a more even playing field. Local people need time to make a considered assessment as they are not usually professionals in the area of planning. They have to debate the suitability of applications with people whose job it is on a daily basis to obtain Planning Permission. Those most affected by the development have to build a case in a very short time and are often required to present it in as little as a 3 minute slot at the

Planning Committee Meeting and/or appeal. This does not create a fair and just situation.

- During the recent November 2017 floods, the flooding victims of Lancashire were denied the opportunity to apply for funds to help them over the crisis or install flood resilience into their homes. After Storm Desmond, the Bellwin scheme was applied and the victims did receive Resilience grants. Clearly the pain and devastation suffered by each individual flood victim is similar and not modified by the number of others simultaneously affected. It makes economic sense to help flood victims make their homes more flood proof for the future. Therefore, we ask Lancashire MPs and others to press for a scheme to be set up, similar to other government schemes (renewal of boilers etc) but specifically for all flood victims.
- The Flood and Water Management Act 2010. The recent EFRA Committee report confirms that many of the provisions of the Pitt Committee Report of 2007 were not fully implemented. It is particularly important that the situation is revisited in the following respects:-
- All flood resilience equipment is subject to VAT. This adds to the burden on the Flood victim and discourages them from installing it. We ask that Flood Resilience equipment e.g. Flood doors, etc to be zero rated.
- Many Lancashire towns and villages have combined drains (surface water and sewage in the same system) despite the systems only being designed to cope with sewage. United Utilities state that their responsibility is only for the sewage component and that any contribution of surface water resulting in flooding or discharge of untreated sewer content into the rivers at times of high precipitation is not their responsibility. United Utilities have no responsibility for any redress and according to OFWAT ‘ they are more concerned for their shareholders than their customers’ (2014/15 Annual Report of the Water Services Regulation Authority). There needs to be a clear designation of responsibility for every type of drain nationally and in particular in vulnerable communities.
- It has been reported to local flood action groups that despite Flood Re and the recent (Oct 2016) Government Flood Resilience Action Plan, insurance companies are taking the opportunity to increase the premiums of flood victims. Sometimes by as much as 50%. It has been stated that they are in some instances refusing to insure previous flood victims at all. “Insurance buy-in – it is not clear that the insurance industry value property level resilience or are incentivising people to have it.”
(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/551615/flood-resilience-bonfield-action-plan-2016.pdf) At present, insurance companies have no responsibility for resilience or betterment, merely restoration to the situation before flooding. It is in the national interest for there to be resilience support for vulnerable populations.

End of document.

Signed by the Lancashire Flood Groups. (which will be listed)

Churchtown Flood Action Group

Galgate Flood Action Group.

Lancaster CLOUD

Garstang Flood Action Group

St Micheals Flood Action Group

Thornton Flood Action Group

Thurnham Flood Action Group

Sent from my iPad

Development Control

Email: cryder@burnley.gov.uk