

# WINWICK

*Best Kept Village  
in Cheshire – 2000*

C/o Winwick Leisure Centre  
Myddleton Lane  
Winwick  
Warrington  
WA2 8LQ



# PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk to the Council:  
Julian Joinson  
Tel: 07818 066549

Email: [jjoinson.winwickclerk@outlook.com](mailto:jjoinson.winwickclerk@outlook.com)  
Web site: [www.winwickparishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.winwickparishcouncil.org.uk)

20 March 2019

**To: All Members of Winwick Parish Council**

Dear Councillor

The next meeting of the Parish Council will be held at the Winwick Leisure Centre on Tuesday, 26 March 2019 at 7.30 pm.

Yours sincerely

Julian Joinson  
Clerk to the Parish Council

## AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- 2. Code of Conduct - Declarations of Interest**

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary or non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda no later than when the item is reached.

The Clerk is available prior to the meeting to give advice and/or to receive details of the interest and the item to which it relates.

Declarations are a personal matter for each Member to decide. The Clerk can advise on the Code and its interpretation, but the decision to declare, or not, is the responsibility of the individual Member based on the particular circumstances.

- 3. Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 26 February 2019.

- 4. Updates on Issues from Previous Meeting(s)**
- 5. Question Time for Electors**
- 6. Written Motions Received**

- 7. Police / Community Issues**
- 8. Summer Planting Scheme Request – Hermitage Green**
- 9. Correspondence**
- 10. Planning Matters**
- 11. Finance Report**
- 12. External Auditor’s Report for the Year Ended 31 March 2018**

The external auditor’s report and certificate attached detail those matters arising from the limited assurance review for the year ended 31 March 2018. The Council must consider these matters and decide what, if any, action is required.

**13. Sale/Lease of Land to Winwick CE Primary School**

To consider, in principle, the sale or lease of an area of land on Myddleton Lane Playing Fields (approximately 600m<sup>2</sup>) to Winwick CE Primary School, to facilitate the provision of a car park to replace the existing school car park which it is proposed to convert to an outdoor play area for the school.

**14. Reports from Parish Council Committees**

- Management Committee – 12 March 2019

**15. Reports from Approved Outside Body Appointments**

- Rights of Way Forum (Councillor Matthews)

**16. Ward Reports / Updates**

- Houghton Green Ward  
(Councillors D Friend, G Friend, Matthews and Purnell)
- Peel Hall Ward  
(Councillors Emery, Gosney and Vobe)
- Winwick Ward  
(Councillors Gordon, Iddon and Mitchell)

**17. Date and Time of Next Meeting – Tuesday, 23 April 2019 at 7.30pm**

**18. Chairman to move to Part 2**

**Part 2**

In accordance with Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, the Council may, by resolution, exclude the public (and press) from the following part of the meeting on the basis that publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted or for other special reasons stated in the resolution (including the need to receive or consider recommendations or advice from sources other than members, committees or sub-committees) and arising from the nature of that business or of the proceedings.

**Nil**

**Winwick Parish Council**  
**Minutes of a Meeting held on 26 February 2019**

**Present:** Councillors C Mitchell (Chair), G Friend, S Gordon, P Gosney, A Iddon, M Matthews and C Vobe.

**WPC.134 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors S Emery and D Friend.

**WPC.135 Code of Conduct - Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**WPC.136 Minutes**

Decision – That the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2019 be agreed and be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**WPC.137 Updates on Issues from Previous Meetings**

Members considered a schedule which outlined actions and referrals from previous meetings of the Council. A significant number of issues had been completed or were progressing well, although some recent actions had not yet been commenced due to the Interim Clerk's changing employment situation at Warrington Borough Council.

Decision – To note the position regarding updates from previous meetings.

**WPC.138 Question Time for Electors**

A large number of residents were present at the meeting and the following issues were raised:-

*Hermitage Green – Loss of the Public Telephone Facilities and Red Phone Box*

Several residents spoke on the issue of BT's cessation of the public telephone facilities and the removal of the red K6 telephone kiosk at Hermitage Green. A summary of the issues raised is as follows:-

- There was concern about the implication of the loss of the public telephone and the lack of traffic calming measures at Hermitage Green. It was acknowledged that the decision not to adopt the decommissioned red phone box had been taken by the Parish Council on 26 June 2018. However, the fact that the Hermitage Green phone box was at risk had been identified early on by the Parish Council. A letter about possible adoption had been sent to 17 houses in the vicinity of the phone box. Warrington Borough Council had undertaken the statutory consultation about the decommissioning of telephone facilities. The Parish Council had noted that the Hermitage Green

phone box was among a number due to be decommissioned but had not objected to that fact to the Borough Council. With a local veto it would have been possible for the Borough Council to prevent the phone box from being decommissioned. There was a concern that the loss of the phone box would increase the likelihood of fatalities at Hermitage Green in the event of a vehicular accident. The area was a known blackspot for mobile telephone transmissions. The resident concerned enquired if the risk to health and safety of road users had been assessed by the Parish Council or Warrington Borough Council. There was a need for both traffic calming and public telephone facilities at Hermitage Green, due to the increased risk of death. The community had supported the siting of an Automated External Defibrillator (AED) in the area, but the infrastructure for housing an AED had now been removed. The question was posed whether the Council would support a request to Warrington Borough Council and/or BT for the reinstatement of a public telephone service and, if necessary, an appeal to the Competition Appeals Tribunal.

*Response:* A reminder was provided that the consultation about the decommissioning of the public telephone line was undertaken by Warrington Borough Council on behalf of BT. The Parish Council was a consultee in that process. The Parish Council had initially considered adopting the red phone box, but that would never have included a public telephone.

- Why had the Council not sought to use the power of veto to preserve the public telephone facility.

*Response:* No evidence had been presented to the Council to indicate that there was anything special about that particular payphone. Three telephone boxes in Winwick had been identified as at risk during the consultation, based on very few calls being made in the preceding year. The decision not to object to decommissioning was based on those facts. Nothing was put to the Council to suggest that keeping a working telephone was worthwhile. BT had made it clear at that time that they were planning to remove the telephone kiosks. The Parish Council's response to the consultation was that due to lack of usage the two modern telephone kiosks could be removed, but that it wished to explore the possible adoption of the red phone box at Hermitage Green when decommissioned. Having made that decision, the Council consulted on possible uses for the red phone box. Ideas included a book exchange, local notice board or defibrillator station. However, information was provided from local residents that the door was in a poor state of repair and there were concerns about the potential costs of repairing and maintaining the phone box. At the meeting in June 2018 no-one attended to speak in favour of retaining the phone box and on the basis of the likely future costs and other concerns, the decision to adopt the phone box was reversed.

- In the light of the new information, would the Parish Council be prepared to work with the Borough Council to lobby BT so as to rectify the situation by seeking to reinstate the phone box with a defibrillator.

*Response:* The Council had already asked BT about the possible

reinstatement of the phone box in response to correspondence with residents. BT had replied that they would not reinstate the phone box.

- It was suggested that BT frequently used low usage to remove payphones. If the veto had been used BT would have had to retain the phone box in situ. Had the Parish Council carried out an impact assessment of the loss of the phone box? The road there was very dangerous. Often traffic leaving the traffic calming measures in Winwick village and travelling north hit 70mph at the point they arrived at Hermitage Green. In the case of a serious accident there would be no emergency phone access.

*Response:* It would not be this Council's role to carry out risk assessments of traffic accidents and emergency preparedness. It would not have been possible to justify the retention of the phone box on public safety grounds on the evidence available. It was accepted that there were some dangers presented by the configuration of the road at Hermitage Green, but this was not known as a blackspot for serious injuries or fatalities. Speeding was a police matter, outside of the control of the Council. Elected Members were prepared to meet with residents in the area to assess the level of mobile phone coverage. The telecommunications world had changed and most people now would have a mobile telephone. Residents were reminded that the Parish had only ever consulted on retaining the phone box as a heritage feature, not as a working payphone.

- Golborne Road at Hermitage Green was known to be dangerous. Why did the traffic calming measures end before the Green? The area was also prone to power cuts meaning that telephone land lines and mobile masts did not work.

*Response:* Members would be prepared to test out whether a mobile signal could normally be obtained in the area of the Green across a range of mobile networks. It would be difficult to put BT to the expense of providing a payphone if there was reasonable mobile coverage in the vicinity.

- OFCOM might have a different view to what was being suggested above. There were certain times of the day when mobile masts in the area were overloaded due to usage by passing traffic on the motorway network.

*Response:* Ordinarily, it was envisaged that 999 calls would receive priority.

- The Parish's consultation letter had only been sent to 17 houses, most of which were on the new estate, not to all of the properties in Hermitage Green. Some long term residents had not, therefore, been consulted.

*Response:* The consultation letter had been sent to those houses deemed closest to the telephone box, which largely comprised the new estate. It was understood that the telephone box had not housed a working telephone for some considerable time, but there had been no groundswell of complaints at the lack of payphone access during that time.

- Would the lack of a reliable working telephone have contributed to the low usage figures relied upon by BT?

*Response:* The Council could only base its decisions and act on the information provided to it, good or bad.

- One resident complained that she had not received the Parish's consultation letter and would have liked to have made a response.

*Response:* The Parish's consultation letter had focused on gaining ideas for the possible usage of an adopted telephone box. BT made the initial decision to remove the telephone infrastructure and had arranged for a consultation on that prior to making their decision. The Parish Council had a number of regular attendees from the Hermitage Green area at its monthly meetings. The cost of repairs was a factor given serious thought when considering adoption. There was no groundswell of support from the wider community at that time to retain the phone box.

- One resident indicated that she was completely unaware of the proposals to adopt the phone box. She felt that many residents had not been given the opportunity to comment on the matter. The minutes from the meeting in June stated that 'residents had been fully consulted', however it was disputed that all residents had been consulted. A further resident confirmed that several properties on Golborne Road did not receive the letter. The issue was particularly important because the traffic calming measures stopped before Hermitage Green.

*Response:* It would not have been possible for the Council to go out to consult every person potentially with an interest in the phone box. The Council and its partners consulted about many different issues. For example, the Council had recently consulted about traffic calming proposals in Winwick and was due consult further about one particular scheme. Many people were able to attend the meetings at which traffic calming was discussed previously. The properties to which the Council's letter about the phone box was sent comprised those properties on the new estate as well as a number of properties on Golborne Road in the immediate vicinity of the phone box. Warrington Borough Council had taken the view that the location of the s-bends and existing traffic signage and restrictions were adequate for road safety purposes at Hermitage Green.

- Parish councillors were elected in order to fight for the wishes of residents.

*Response:* Councillors could carry out certain local functions and coordinate a response on behalf of the public in respect of issues within the remit of other organisations. Traffic safety was the responsibility of Warrington Borough Council. The point that a wider circulation of the consultation letter could have taken place was accepted, but ultimately it would not have prevented the loss of the payphone service.

- A resident who had received the consultation letter suggested that there was

no hint of the possibility that the phone box might be removed. The letter was framed solely around the proposal to adopt the phone box. One resident had canvassed widely across the estate and had provided a written response on behalf of several residents, which indicated that there was overall support for the siting of a defibrillator.

*Response:* Only four written replies were received by the Council. “ Two were in favour of providing an AED, one provided a more mixed view saying that an AED would be useful, but that the cost of repairs and maintenance needed to be taken into account. The fourth letter was against retaining the phone box on the grounds of its poor state of repair, potential costs and other issues such as attracting anti-social behavior. The verbal evidence subsequently provided in person at the meeting, including photographs of disrepair, provided a compelling case against adoption of the box.

- The loss of an important piece on English heritage was disappointing and particularly as people did not realise that the phone box might be removed. The resident concerned did not normally read a local newspaper and would have found a notice board at Hermitage Green useful for issues such as this.

*Response:* Warrington Borough Council and BT had carried out a wide consultation about the future of a number of telephone boxes in the Borough. The Parish had a dilemma in that it saw some merit in retaining the red phone box, but the feel from the local consultation responses it received were that the costs would ultimately be too high. Often Council decisions were supported by ‘soft intelligence’ received from informal sources, but in this case there was nothing to suggest strong support for retaining the phone box.

- The Parish’s consultation letter did not mention the possibility of removal of the phone box.

*Response:* The BT/Warrington Borough Council consultation about removing payphone services and the potential loss of the phone kiosk, had been long over at that stage.

- Why was the response to the Parish’s consultation, on behalf of multiple residents seeking an AED, dismissed? What was the point of writing? Why did the Parish ultimately not wish to keep the phone box?

*Response:* The Parish had tried to gauge the feeling of residents about potential uses for the redundant phone box, as there was initial some support for retaining it, but this was not borne out at subsequent meetings. One alternative was for the Parish to simply have kept silent on the matter and to have referred all subsequent complaints to BT. The Council had done what it could to publicise the BT consultation, including the use of social media and discussions at Parish Council meetings. The matter had also been included on the Winwick Village Facebook page.

- What could be done to move the matter forward to find an acceptable solution. Would the Council be prepared to ask Warrington Borough Council

to fund an appeal?

*Response:* It was difficult to see what could now be done. The Council was responsible for spending its resources fairly across the whole of Winwick. It would not be proper to spend a disproportionate amount on a single issue. Members would need to understand the likely costs of an appeal.

- Could the original phone box be tracked down and reinstated?

*Response:* The Council had written directly to BT in response to residents recent concerns. BT had given a clear indication that they would not reinstate the original phone box. Upon removal the phone box went to their official suppliers, X2Connect Ltd, for refurbishment. Old style phone boxes were normally offered for sale and currently the purchase cost was £2,750, excluding VAT and delivery. In respect of maintenance costs, a new door would cost around £1,000 and a pack of door hinges was around £50. There would be additional labour costs for installation. On-going maintenance might then cost in the region of £200 per year, for which no budget provision was currently available. Members would need to determine if that represented value for money. A case could potentially have been made for that level of expenditure, but Members who made the decision not to adopt reached a different conclusion on the evidence provided. The Chair confirmed that no specific figure for repairs and maintenance had been considered at the meeting in June 2018, but photographic evidence had showed the poor state of repair of the kiosk. Residents were challenged to consider the last time that they looked inside the telephone box. Councillors noted that it had often been misused as a urinal.

- Although Warrington Borough Council carried out the initial consultation on behalf of BT. Many Parish councillors also served on the Borough Council and could have shared information between both organisations.

*Response:* Warrington Borough Council had undertaken its formal consultation, which included use of its website and articles in the Warrington Guardian and Warrington Worldwide. BT had provided a public notice inside the telephone box itself.

- Winwick Parish Council had been consulted by e-mail from Warrington Borough Council. What was the Parish Council's answer?

*Response:* The Council had flagged up possible adoption of the phone box. The subsequent 17 consultation letters had sought to gauge residents views about the future of the decommissioned phone box. However, the feedback received then was substantially different from what was being heard now. The message being put forward now was also not consistent with some residents talking about having a payphone reinstated and others discussing a heritage feature or defibrillator station. BT were always planning to remove the payphone as there was no support from the public to keep the telephone during the statutory consultation. That consultation was in the press, on Warrington Borough Council's website, on the Parish Council notice boards

and on the Winwick Village webpage.

- A resident expressed the view that the original consultation was not inclusive. The telephone could be reinstated if an appeal was lodged and was successful. An appeal would be to the Competition Appeals Tribunal. It was believed that there might be sufficient exceptional circumstances for the appeal to proceed.

*Response:* It was anticipated that the restoration of a payphone would be very costly for BT. The Council would be pleased to receive information on the authority for an appeal, details of the appeal process and any timescales from the resident concerned, in order to reach an informed view. The original consultation had taken place in 2016 and an appeal might now be out of time. If the appeal was successful it might lead to the siting of a modern payphone, not the original K6 style red phone box.

- Could a notice board for Hermitage Green be given serious consideration? A suitable site could be located away from the road to reduce the risk of collision. A notice board that was red in colour might be aesthetically pleasing.

*Response:* Members agreed, in principle, to the provision of a notice board at Hermitage Green. A suitable location would need to be identified. It would be helpful if a representative group of residents could discuss the matter with councillors. The provision of a notice board could be controversial as opposing views had been expressed previously. Its location was important as there would be safety considerations.

- Was the post box on Hermitage Green also at risk?

*Response:* The Council had no intelligence to suggest that the post box was a risk.

- Would the Council be prepared to co-opt a representative of Hermitage Green to serve on the Parish Council. Other councils were known to have co-optees.

*Response:* The legislation did not provide a mechanism for co-option under those circumstances. The number of councillors was determined by the Boundary Commission and the Parish had no powers to change that number. Parish councils could only co-opt if there was a vacancy, which could not be filled through the normal petition and election process. Recent vacancies had been filled by formal elections, at some cost to the Council. Any appointed co-optee or elected councillor was required to serve the whole of the ward for which they were appointed. However, all members of the public were entitled to and welcome to attend all meetings of the Council.

- At an earlier meeting members of the public had been prevented from speaking in relation to the development of the former Parkside Colliery site, although that had been a number of years ago.

*Response:* Parkside was currently a regular topic for discussion and members of the public had been able to speak on the matter on numerous occasions. The phone box issue had also been before the Council on 5 or 6 occasions and residents present had been allowed to speak. The Council's website gave details of upcoming meetings and the public were welcome to attend.

- Members were reminded that the mobile phone coverage at Hermitage Green was intermittent and depended on the time of day of usage.
- Was the Parish prepared to share the name of the BT contact with whom it had been corresponding?

*Response:* Contact details could be provided.

- One resident noted that community groups had been successful in raising funds for other local matters and that a similar group could be established to take this matter forward.

*Response:* It seemed unlikely that the Council would support the re-installation of a phone box on the land at Hermitage Green. A previous attempt to install a notice board on site had also proved controversial. The future of the post box was a matter for Royal Mail. It might be the case that it was simply too late to do anything about the phone box. In general, it was not realistic for residents to rely on everyone else to keep them informed about every single matter beyond the usual communication channels.

- A resident asked whether the Council had a risk register for the area.

*Response:* Warrington Borough Council was the emergency planning authority for the area.

- One resident asked about the role of Winwick Parish Council.

*Response:* The Council ran the Leisure Centre, provided litter picking services, maintained two bus shelters and maintained Radley Common, John Parr Meadow and the village greens (except Hermitage Green, which was highways authority/Warrington Borough Council land). The Council also had a role in negotiating with partner public bodies on local matters, for example regarding footpath issues or potholes. The Council endeavoured to speak up for residents and was consulted on many issues. The main Council meetings were held on the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of the month and a Management Committee met on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday of the month. Councillors always tried to do their best for the local community

Decision –

- (1) To note the questions and issues raised by residents.
- (2) To authorise Members to meet with residents of Hermitage Green to test

the mobile phone coverage in the area, which might be necessary to contact emergency services in the case of a road traffic accident.

- (3) To agree, in principle, to the provision of a notice board at Hermitage Green, subject to further consultation with a representative group of residents on the siting and design of the board.
- (4) To invite the resident who raised the matter of a possible appeal regarding a payphone, to submit further information to the Council about the appeal process, to enable the matter to be discussed further at the next meeting.

**WPC.139     Written Motions Received**

There were no written motions received on this occasion

**WPC.140     Police / Community Issues**

A bulletin had been received from PCSO Jordan Burke, PC Paul Hancock and Police Sergeant Paul Caswell in relation to activity within the Peel Hall area from 26 January to 26 February 2019.

In total there had been 323 incidents recorded over the Borough's Poplars and Hume ward, with repeat areas for the parished area being Grasmere Avenue and Greenwood Crescent.

There were no repeating crime or anti-social behavior trends for the month.

Incidents of note included:-

- Burglary – Dundee Close; and
- Suspicious Activity – Kinross Close.

Following increased reports of arson to wheelie bins on the Grasmere Estate, a Twitterfeed, #OPscattered, had been set up and officers were providing high visibility foot patrols in the area.

PCSO Burke had carried out speed enforcement on Blackbrook Avenue heading towards Mill Lane. On each occasion, speeds in excess of 52mph had been recorded. That would continue to be a priority area for deployment of the Tru Cam.

The Chair and Councillor Iddon reported that in respect of Winwick ward, PCSO Neil Borwn had recently posted on Facebook that he was looking into parking issues on Golborne Road and Hornby Lane.

Decision – To note the update in relation to police and community issues.

**WPC.141     Correspondence**

The following items were reported:-

### Agenda Item 3

1. E-mails from Warrington Voluntary Action (WVA) about the availability of grants to community groups and other news, training and local events – 17/01/19, 22/01/19, 23/01/19, 24/01/19, 30/01/19, 31/01/19, 01/02/19, 07/02/19, 12/02/19, 14/02/19 and 22/02/19
2. E-mail from Dave Rayner on behalf of Scope about possible sites for textile recycling banks – 21/01/19
3. E-mail from Elaine Marsden-Ormson, Community Centre Engagement Support Worker, Warrington Borough Council, about craft sessions taking place across Warrington over the February half term week – 22/01/19
4. E-mails from West Warrington Highways Team, about Traffic Management proposals for the work taking place at Burtonwood Road, week commencing 28 January and 4 February 2019 – 23/01/19, 30/01/19, 31/01/19, 04/02/19 and 08/02/19
5. E-mails from Rebecca Lee, Legal Support Officer, Warrington Borough Council, regarding various Traffic Notices due to be advertised in the Warrington Guardian on Thursdays 24 January, 7 February 2019, together with an emergency traffic notice regarding Green Lane, which was to be effective from 14 February 2019 – 23/01/19, 06/02/19 and 14/02/19
6. E-mail from local resident, JT, enquiring about the possibility of identifying a parking spot for a Luton van – 23/01/19
7. E-mail from Infrastructure Delivery Service Team, Environment & Transport Directorate, Warrington Borough Council, about enclosing notification and plan for a traffic signal upgrade at M62 Junction 9/ A49 Newton Road due to commence on 11 February 2019 – 30/01/19
8. Various e-mails from residents in the vicinity of Heritage Green about the removal of the red telephone box from the Green – 31/01/19 – 12/02/19
9. E-mail from local resident, GS, about the Council's voting arrangements – 07/02/19
10. E-mail from Adam Kellock, Democratic Services Officer, Warrington Borough Council, about the next meeting of the Parish Council Liaison Meeting scheduled for Monday 1 April at 6pm at the Town Hall and an update session on Wednesday 3 April 2019 from the Council's Monitoring Officer on the Code of Conduct and its requirements with emphasis on how to deal with gifts and hospitalities – 07/02/19
11. E-mail from Keep Britain Tidy about their Great British Spring Clean campaign scheduled to be held between 22 March - 23 April 2019 – 08/02/19
12. E-mail from Hazel Catt, Branch Secretary, Cheshire Branch, Society of Local Council Clerks (SLCC), informing members of the date of the next SLCC Cheshire Branch meeting on Wednesday 13 March at Lymm Village Hall

starting at 11am – 08/02/19

13. E-mail from Mike Bull, SMP Lead Sponsor, North West, Highways England, regarding the latest update on the M56 J6-J8/M6 J21a-J26 Smart motorways schemes – 14/02/19
14. Various promotional e-mails and mailshots for goods or services linked to typical parish activities or community services from the following organisations:-
  - Arien Designs Ltd – town, parish and countryside signs
  - Broxap – litter and recycling bins
  - Creative Play – children’s outdoor play equipment
  - Imagesbyhand – Parish maps
  - Kompan – children’s play equipment and new catalogue
  - Playforce - Playground safety inspections
  - Primary Care Supplies – Defibrillators
  - RoSPA – Playground safety inspections
  - Sunshine Gym – Outdoor fitness equipment
  - Sutcliffe Play Limited – play equipment
  - TWM Traffic Systems – Illuminated road signs
  - Wicksteed – Outdoor play equipment

Decision – To note the correspondence submitted to the Parish Council.

**WPC.142    Planning Matters**

*General Correspondence*

1. E-mail dated 28 January 2019 on behalf of Banastre Drive Residents, Newton-le-Willows, comprising the following information:-

“Don’t know if you’re aware but St Helens Council have re submitted a planning application for major development at Parkside at Newton-le-Willows. The previous application was rejected by Warrington Council.

Also they have been loaned £6 million from the government to build link road from M6 Junc 22 to Parkside. This will have massive damage, grid lock to our roads inc A49 Winwick to Newton, Hermitage Green, air pollution and the green belt. Please can you let Warrington Council know comments should be submitted to the council on or before 6th February.

We hope you support the people of Newton and oppose this application.”

*Domestic Planning Applications*

2. Application reference: 2019/34250  
Location: 15, Myddleton Lane, Winwick, Warrington, WA2 8LG  
Description of development: Full Planning - Proposed single storey rear extension with internal changes to main property.

3. Application reference: 2019/34292  
Location: 35, Ballater Drive, Winwick, Warrington, WA2 0LX  
Description of development: Householder - Proposed new brick garden wall, piers and gates
4. Location: 104, Myddleton Lane, Winwick, Warrington, WA2 8NA  
Description of development: Householder - Proposed two storey side extension to provide reception room, bedroom and bathroom at ground floor, with additional bedroom and en-suite at first floor. Part section of rear to be extended also to create additional living space at first floor. Property to have new roof with 4 No dormer windows in total to front and rear, to provide additional headroom within loft space, which will be used for storage and new boundary wall
5. Application reference: 2019/34450  
Location: 12, Rectory Close, Winwick, Warrington, WA2 8LD  
Description of development : Householder - Proposed single storey ground floor rear extension.

*Non-Domestic Planning Applications*

6. Application reference: 2019/34271  
Location: Winwick Quay, Woburn Road, Winwick, Warrington, WA2 8RN  
Description of development: Full Planning (Minor) Proposed extension and minor external alterations to the existing hotel together with the installation of solar panels and associated alterations to the car park
7. Application reference: 2019/34370  
Location: The Millhouse, Ballater Drive, Winwick, Warrington, WA2 0LX  
Description of development: Full Planning - Proposed demolition of detached single storey toilet block & the construction of a single storey extension to the existing kitchen & dining facilities; insertion of a new sliding folding external door system to the existing dining area; provision of external cladding and also rendered panels adjacent to the main entrance; and refurbishment of the rear beer garden including decked seating area with new pergola, external play area, landscaping and replacement fencing.
8. Application reference: 2019/34336  
Location: 81, Kinross Close, Winwick, Warrington, WA2 0UT  
Description of development: Lawful development certificate - Proposed demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a timber framed structure to the rear to be used as a Pet Grooming Salon

In respect of Item 1 – Former Parkside Colliery, Councillor Gosney commented that the previous application had been rejected by Warrington Borough Council. The Chairman indicated that this application referred to the proposed new units close to the Parish boundary. Councillor G Friend added that there would also be a link road provided which would cross into the Warrington area. The matter had not yet been considered by Warrington Borough Council.

*Land at Peel Hall*

In respect of the issue raised at the last meeting under Minute WPC.123(2) – Land at Peel Hall, Councillor Matthews indicated that a meeting had taken place between councillors and the Chief Executive of Warrington Borough Council on 4 February 2019 to discuss the future of the site. The Council would now need to consider whether it was comfortable with the proposed way forward that had been presented.

The meeting had been an informal gathering at which councillors had been informed that the developers, Satnam, had made an application for a Judicial Review of the Planning Inspector's recommendations. Satnam had a history of litigiousness and care should be taken since that company might search for supporting evidence using the Freedom of Information Act. Members had been informed that Warrington's planning officers would stand behind the Planning Inspectorate's decision.

An emerging issue was whether the land should be viewed as 'deliverable' or 'developable' within the draft Local Plan. 'Deliverable' broadly meant that a site had to be capable of being delivered within five years, but need be no more certain than having a realistic prospect. 'Developable' meant land that was suitable as a location for structures and that could be developed free of significant impact on natural resource areas. The Parish's response to the Preferred Development Option Consultation on the Local Plan, was that it wanted more development in the town centre, thereby removing the need for the development of greenfield sites such as Peel Hall.

Councillor G Friend indicated that Warrington Borough Council had asked for a second Counsel's Opinion in respect of the possibility of removing Peel Hall as development land from the Local Plan. The advice had clarified that the Council could not defend the position of removal of Peel Hall and it would lose any resultant legal challenge. The Chair noted that Peel Hall was a greenfield site, not Green Belt land. The implications were that if Green Belt land was required to meet the strategic planning needs, it would not be possible to exclude greenfield land from consideration.

Councillor Matthews stressed the importance of having a Local Plan which delivered an urban core with cityscape housing densities. It was suggested that unless Warrington Borough Council accepted that view, it would continue to allow the building of lower density housing in Green Belt areas. However, that was not his personal vision for the future of Warrington.

The Chair commented that unless Satnam provided a more robust traffic plan it would still not be able to develop the Peel Hall site.

Councillor Vobe recalled that Warrington's officers had been instructed to ask Counsel's Opinion on the question of taking Peel Hall out of development land within the Local Plan in very specific terms. However, it was unusual to receive a reply from Counsel, which was so certain about the likely outcome. He wondered whether the answer as represented by the Council had been oversimplified. The Chair indicated that she had had sight of the Counsel's Opinion and that it had provided a

high degree of certainty. Essentially, it had confirmed that the Borough Council could defend a position of categorising the land as developable, but not its removal as development land.

It was also reported that housing densities in the town centre were already higher than the figures as recommended by Mr Black, Winwick Council's Planning Consultant. It was not believed that high rise housing in the outlying settlements would receive public support. She reiterated that as soon as Green Belt land was required, it would not be possible to remove greenfield sites from the Local Plan. Pressure had been applied to strategic planning offices about housing densities, but they had confirmed that the densities desired by Mr Black had already been exceeded. The emerging draft Local Plan would show less need for land than previous iterations, but would not go so far as to plan for high rise accommodation across the Borough. The Chair had been assured that the overall message about housing densities had been taken up by strategic planning officers.

Councillor Matthews reminded Members about the Planning Inspector's finding that there had been no meaningful consultation with residents about the future of the Peel Hall site. The Chair responded that the criticism was understood to have been levelled at Satnam, rather than the Borough Council. However, one option might be for the Parish Council to develop a formal Neighbourhood Plan. Councillor G Friend indicated that Satnam would still need to satisfy planning requirements in relation to traffic, noise and pollution, to gain planning consent. However, there was a concern that they might try to 'salami slice' the site, so as to develop the land in small parcels of say 10 houses.

Councillor Matthews commented that future plans might include a new road to the junction at B&Q in Winwick, with a new bridge across the motorway to the Peel Hall site. That scenario could open up further land, such that the gaps to the north of the M62 were also filled in with housing.

Councillor Vobe suggested that the Council might wish to recognise that the Peel Hall site was likely to be downgraded to 'developable' and to prepare for the possibility that residents might not be entirely happy with that outcome. The Peel Hall issue remained the single biggest campaign in the North of the Borough and residents would probably not be satisfied with the result. The Chair indicated that there would be a meeting for residents in March 2019. It was noted that residents had asked for parish councillors to support them at that meeting and Members would be happy to undertake that role. The meeting would take place on 5 March 2019.

Councillor Matthews commented that Helen Jones MP was currently organising a petition for Peel Hall to be removed from the Local Plan as development land. However, the Parish Council might be in a good position to guide residents towards the likely conclusion, based upon what was known so far. The Chair concurred that it would not be fair for the Parish Council to promise something to residents which was unachievable. The Planning Inspector had identified the land as 'developable'. There would be no merit in the Parish Council requesting Warrington Borough Council to adopt an indefensible position within the Local Plan.

Councillor Vobe enquired whether, if it was not possible to remove Peel Hall as 'developable' land, whether might be possible to have it re-categorised a Green Belt land. Members acknowledged the importance of supporting the local MP, but accepted that the Council might need to embark on a staged approach to its overall strategy about Peel Hall.

Decision –

- (1) To note the planning matters submitted to the Parish Council.
- (2) To continue to develop, in a staged approach, the Council's strategic response to the future of Peel Hall and the emerging draft Local Plan.

**WPC.143 Finance Report**

Members considered a report of the Interim Finance Officer, on a number of financial issues. The report set out the financial position for January 2019 and latest payments information. Ms Jones was in attendance to highlight key elements of the report

**Budget Review 2018/19**

Members considered a detailed breakdown of profit and loss against the Council's Budget for the year to date. Overall the Leisure Centre had run at a profit of £0.5k in January 2019 and was running at an overall loss of £27.7k on the year to date. There had been £1.9k of other expenditure against the Parish Precept monies in January 2019.

In respect of the Leisure Centre, despite a small dip in bar takings in the post-Christmas period, it had continued to receive a steady stream of bookings for parties that would help to bring income levels back up for the end of the financial year.

Pension figures were low as they included the reduction in fees for staff had who since opted out of the scheme.

The Centre Manager and Interim Finance Officer had been meeting to review cost saving ideas and options, which would be submitted to the Management Committee as they were finalised and would then be reported back to future Parish Council meetings. Staffing options would be included in the discussions and would be reported under Part 2 of the relevant Agendas.

With regards to the lettings side of the business, room bookings looked to be on the increase. Members of the Team were continuing their efforts to make improvements to the booking process and to increase lettings.

**Issues of Note**

Arrangements were being made to identify a suitable date for the proposed public consultation evening regarding the Myddleton Lane Traffic Management Scheme.

The Harry Potter Quiz Night, planned for 22 February 2019, had been postponed due to unforeseen circumstances involving key staff and cover staff, including a domestic break-in and family illness. The date would be rearranged, although some refunds for tickets might be necessary.

Councillor Iddon asked where the '2 for 1' coffee offer was being advertised, as there was nothing outside of the Leisure Centre which drew attention to the promotion. Ms Jones and Councillor Matthews indicated that the matter would be drawn to the attention of the Centre Manager, that a newsletter was also being drafted and that it might be possible to carry out a leaflet drop via Winwick CE Primary School. Councillor Iddon considered that a visible promotion on the notice board would be useful as children sometimes played on the field for an hour or so after school and their parents would often scan the notice boards during this period. Councillor Matthews indicated that the Management Committee would consider this further at its next meeting.

Payments made since Management Committee Report presented on 12 February 2019

A list of payments since 12 February 2019 was presented, as follows:-

<b>Payee</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Sum</b>
<b>Direct Debits</b>		
B&M	-	£255.86
Payzone	-	£21.60
Lloyds	-	£207.90
<b>Bank Payments</b>		
Bliss	-	£1,194.70
B Muflihi	-	£90.00
Drum BSS	-	£26.40
P Harden	-	£135.00
Service Care	-	£864.48
Styles	-	£240.00
System Hygiene	-	£179.71
Cheshire Pensions	-	£1,544.16
Cheshire West	-	£100.00
D Forshaw	DJ	£160.00
DL Hannon	Greens maintenance	£60.00
KC's Kitchen	-	£409.00
P Healey	-	£98.90
P Harden	-	£120.00
Warrington BC	Election fees	£4,601.74
Zurich	Insurance	£2,374.74

Budget 2019/20

A summary was provided of the approved Budget for 2019/20, following the Council's decision at the meeting on 22 January 2019, which took account of the lower Precept agreed, in the sum of £112,150.00

Councillor Matthews commented that the Leisure Centre position at year to date of -£27.7k was some £5.4k worse than the forecast position for the year to date of -£22.3k. He asked whether the Financial Plan and Budget for next year envisaged a better or worse position. Ms Jones indicated that the Budget for 2019/20 was more cautious and had made provision for an overall loss of -£37.9k. The provision made for 2018/19 was -£26.7k, although it was now estimated that the final outturn position would be around -£32.0k. The Budget for 2019/20 had estimated a figure which was considered to be prudent, although there was optimism that with good management there could be a surplus, which might then provide some Reserves.

Decision – To note the Finance Officer’s report, including the Budget Review 2018/19.

**WPC.144     Council Tax Support Allowance**

Members considered a response, dated 22 January 2019, from Mark Dennett, Senior Accountant (Capital and Closure), Warrington Borough Council, on the operation of the Council Tax Support Allowance (CTSA) and its implications for the calculation of the Council Tax Base.

Councillor Matthews indicated that he had asked for the item to be put to the Council, but would need time to carry out further investigations.

Decision – To defer consideration of the Council Tax Support Allowance issue to a later date.

**WPC.145     Reports from Parish Council Committees**

The Minutes of the Management Committee of 12 February 2019 were presented.

Decision – That the Minutes of the Management Committee of 12 February 2019 be noted.

**WPC.146     Reports from Approved Outside Bodies**

Rights of Way Forum

Councillor Matthews reported that the next meeting of the Rights of Way Forum would take place in April 2019.

**WPC.147     Ward Reports / Updates**

Houghton Green Ward

There were no updates in connection with Houghton Green Ward on this occasion.

Peel Hall Ward

Councillor Vobe indicated that a date for a site visit to Birch Avenue had been

arranged. Residents were looking into the possibility of obtaining adverse possession of a section of land which was used for off-street parking, but for which access was currently disputed. He sought the Council's permission to liaise with the Clerk about the possibility of writing to Warrington Borough Council, to encourage that authority to engage with the residents on this matter.

Winwick Ward

Councillor Iddon enquired if the Clerk had yet written to Winwick CE Primary School to request that the potholes on the access road to the Leisure Centre be repaired. The Clerk confirmed that this had not yet been carried out due to his focus on finishing of outstanding tasks in connection with his fulltime post at Warrington Borough Council. The Chair commented that she was due to meet with representatives of the school on Thursday 28 February 2019 and would raise the matter with them.

Councillor Matthews reported that he had received some correspondence from Warrington Borough Council about the drainage works proposed regarding the Leisure Centre Car Park. The Council had previously authorised the works being carried out by the Borough Council. He would forward the information to the Clerk to enable the matter to be progressed.

Decision –

- (1) To note the ward reports/updates provided.
- (2) To authorise Councillor Vobe to liaise with the Clerk about the possibility of writing to Warrington Borough Council, to encourage that authority to engage with residents on the matter of parking on Birch Avenue.

**WPC.148     Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Decision – To note that the next meeting of the Council will take place on Tuesday 26 March 2019 at 7.30pm.

## Section 3 – External Auditor Report and Certificate 2017/18

In respect of

WINWICK PARISH COUNCIL (CH0219)

### 1 Respective responsibilities of the body and the auditor

This authority is responsible for ensuring that its financial management is adequate and effective and that it has a sound system of internal control. The authority prepares an Annual Governance and Accountability Return in accordance with *Proper Practices* which:

- summarises the accounting records for the year ended 31 March 2018; and
- confirms and provides assurance on those matters that are relevant to our duties and responsibilities as external auditors.

Our responsibility is to review Sections 1 and 2 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return in accordance with guidance issued by the National Audit Office (NAO) on behalf of the Comptroller and Auditor General (see note below). Our work **does not** constitute an audit carried out in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK & Ireland) and **does not** provide the same level of assurance that such an audit would do.

### 2 External auditor report 2017/18

Except for the matters reported below, on the basis of our review of Sections 1 and 2 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR), in our opinion the information in Sections 1 and 2 of the AGAR is in accordance with Proper Practices and no other matters have come to our attention giving cause for concern that relevant legislation and regulatory requirements have not been met.

The smaller authority has failed to provide a year end bank reconciliation and an adequate explanation for the difference between Section 2, Boxes 7 and 8. A balance sheet has been provided which shows there is a 'Historic Adjustments Account' within liabilities of £30,478 which has been used to cover conversion figures for the opening balance on bank accounts and also a 'Cash Carried Forwards from 31/12' within assets of £28,341 which includes cash balances as at 31/12 and is also a suspense account for payments received against invoices issued previously. Based on this information, we have no confidence in the figures within the AGAR.

The smaller authority failed to approve the AGAR in time to publish it before 2 July 2018, the date required by the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, and did not disclose this by answering 'No' to Section 1, Box 1.

The AGAR was not accurately completed before submission for review. Please ensure that amendments are corrected in the prior year comparatives when completing next year's AGAR:

- Section 2, Box 2, the annual precept, does not agree to the figure published by the precepting authority. The figures in Boxes 2 and 3 should read £102,212 and £178,164 respectively. All grants, including Council Tax Support Grant, should be shown in Box 3, as per the guidance notes on the AGAR.
- Section 2, Box 10 is inconsistent with the balance published by the Public Works Loan Board. The figure in Box 10 should read £91,392.

The smaller authority failed to publish the final signed AGAR by 30 September 2018, the date required by the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, and did not disclose this by answering 'No' to Section 1, Box 1. This is as a result of the AGAR and additional documentation not being submitted for review until 4 January 2019 and the appointed auditor therefore not being able to then complete the review by this date.

Other matters not affecting our opinion which we draw to the attention of the authority:

The smaller authority has not provided:

- an adequate explanation as to why the internal auditor has responded 'No' to internal control objectives A and J.
- year end bank statements to support the bank reconciliation to Section 2, Box 8. These were requested as part of our intermediate review procedures.

We note that the smaller authority did not comply with Regulation 15 of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 as it failed to make proper provision during the year 2018/19 for the exercise of public rights, since the approval date was after the start of the period for the exercise of public rights. As a result, the smaller authority must answer 'No' to Assertion 4 of the Annual Governance Statement for 2018/19 and ensure that it makes proper provision for the exercise of public rights during 2019/20.

### 3 External auditor certificate 2017/18

We certify that we have completed our review of Sections 1 and 2 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return, and discharged our responsibilities under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014, for the year ended 31 March 2018.

External Auditor Name

PKF LITTLEJOHN LLP

External Auditor Signature

 Date

19/02/2019

\* Note: the NAO issued guidance applicable to external auditors' work on limited assurance reviews for 2017/18 in Auditor Guidance Note AGN/02. The AGN is available from the NAO website ([www.nao.org.uk](http://www.nao.org.uk))

**THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY**

## Section 1 – Annual Governance Statement 2017/18

We acknowledge as the members of:

### WINWICK PARISH COUNCIL

our responsibility for ensuring that there is a sound system of internal control, including arrangements for the preparation of the Accounting Statements. We confirm, to the best of our knowledge and belief, with respect to the Accounting Statements for the year ended 31 March 2018, that:

	Agreed		Yes* means that this authority:
	Yes	No*	
1. We have put in place arrangements for effective financial management during the year, and for the preparation of the accounting statements.	✓		prepared its accounting statements in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations.
2. We maintained an adequate system of internal control including measures designed to prevent and detect fraud and corruption and reviewed its effectiveness.	✓		made proper arrangements and accepted responsibility for safeguarding the public money and resources in its charge.
3. We took all reasonable steps to assure ourselves that there are no matters of actual or potential non-compliance with laws, regulations and Proper Practices that could have a significant financial effect on the ability of this authority to conduct its business or manage its finances.	✓		has only done what it has the legal power to do and has complied with Proper Practices in doing so.
4. We provided proper opportunity during the year for the exercise of electors' rights in accordance with the requirements of the Accounts and Audit Regulations.	✓		during the year gave all persons interested the opportunity to inspect and ask questions about this authority's accounts.
5. We carried out an assessment of the risks facing this authority and took appropriate steps to manage those risks, including the introduction of internal controls and/or external insurance cover where required.	✓		considered and documented the financial and other risks it faces and dealt with them properly.
6. We maintained throughout the year an adequate and effective system of internal audit of the accounting records and control systems.	✓		arranged for a competent person, independent of the financial controls and procedures, to give an objective view on whether internal controls meet the needs of this smaller authority.
7. We took appropriate action on all matters raised in reports from internal and external audit.	✓		responded to matters brought to its attention by internal and external audit.
8. We considered whether any litigation, liabilities or commitments, events or transactions, occurring either during or after the year-end, have a financial impact on this authority and, where appropriate, have included them in the accounting statements.	✓		disclosed everything it should have about its business activity during the year including events taking place after the year end if relevant.
9. (For local councils only) Trust funds including charitable. In our capacity as the sole managing trustee we discharged our accountability responsibilities for the fund(s)/assets, including financial reporting and, if required, independent examination or audit.	Yes	No	N/A
	✓		
			has met all of its responsibilities where it is a sole managing trustee of a local trust or trusts.

\*Please provide explanations to the external auditor on a separate sheet for each 'No' response. Describe how the authority will address the weaknesses identified.

This Annual Governance Statement is approved by this authority and recorded as minute reference:

Signed by the Chairman and Clerk of the meeting where approval is given:

MINUTE WPC.86  
dated 23/10/2018

Chairman   
Clerk 

Other information required by the Transparency Codes (not part of Annual Governance Statement)  
Authority web address

<http://winwickparishcouncil.org.uk>

## Section 2 – Accounting Statements 2017/18 for

### WINWICK PARISH COUNCIL

	Year ending		Notes and guidance
	31 March 2017 £	31 March 2018 £	
1. Balances brought forward	-17,350	3,055	Total balances and reserves at the beginning of the year as recorded in the financial records. Value must agree to Box 7 of previous year.
2. (+) Precept or Rates and Levies	111,850	114,110	Total amount of precept (or for IDBs rates and levies) received or receivable in the year. Exclude any grants received.
3. (+) Total other receipts	180,564	166,266	Total income or receipts as recorded in the cashbook less the precept or rates/levies received (line 2). Include any grants received.
4. (-) Staff costs	103,908	98,151	Total expenditure or payments made to and on behalf of all employees. Include salaries and wages, PAYE and NI (employees and employers), pension contributions and employment expenses.
5. (-) Loan interest/capital repayments	9,695	9,695	Total expenditure or payments of capital and interest made during the year on the authority's borrowings (if any).
6. (-) All other payments	158,405	166,390	Total expenditure or payments as recorded in the cashbook less staff costs (line 4) and loan interest/capital repayments (line 5).
7. (=) Balances carried forward	3,055	9,195	Total balances and reserves at the end of the year. Must equal (1+2+3) - (4+5+6).
8. Total value of cash and short term investments	16,795	18,775	The sum of all current and deposit bank accounts, cash holdings and short term investments held as at 31 March – <b>To agree with bank reconciliation.</b>
9. Total fixed assets plus long term investments and assets	953,122	956,348	The value of all the property the authority owns – it is made up of all its fixed assets and long term investments as at 31 March.
10. Total borrowings	96,587	88,125	The outstanding capital balance as at 31 March of all loans from third parties (including PWLB).
11. (For Local Councils Only) Disclosure note re Trust funds (including charitable)	Yes	No	The Council acts as sole trustee for and is responsible for managing Trust funds or assets.
	✓		N.B. The figures in the accounting statements above do not include any Trust transactions.

I certify that for the year ended 31 March 2018 the Accounting Statements in this Annual Governance and Accountability Return present fairly the financial position of this authority and its income and expenditure, or properly present receipts and payments, as the case may be.

Signed by Responsible Financial Officer



Date 23/10/2018

I confirm that these Accounting Statements were approved by this authority on this date:

23/10/2018

and recorded as minute reference:

WPC.87

Signed by Chairman of the meeting where approval of the Accounting Statements is given

