

# WINSTER PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk & Financial Officer: Trisha Dale

Ivy Dene, Main Street, Birchover DE4 2BN

[clerk@winsterparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@winsterparishcouncil.gov.uk)

## MINUTES OF ORDINARY MEETING: 9<sup>th</sup> May 2022, 7pm in the Burton Institute, Winster.

*These minutes are hereby approved as a true and accurate record of the above meeting following Resolution of the Council at its monthly Parish Council meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2022*

*Signed ..... Chair of meeting*

In attendance: Cllr. Frederickson (Chair), Cllr. Cllr. Robinson, Cllr. Brown, Cllr. Wood, Cllr. Cooper, Cllr Hatfield, Cllr Geddes, Cllr Randles.

Also Present: Clerk/RFO Trisha Dale, Cllr. Spencer, 3 members of the public.

No.	Item
05/01/22	<b>Apologies</b> None
05/02/22	<b>Declaration of Interests</b> Cllr. Wood - item 05/08/22 F Cllr. Cooper - item 05/08/22 J
05/03/22	<b>Reports:</b> A: County Councillor's Report: Cllr Spencer greeted the council, saying how nice it was to be here. He explained that after twelve years at Highways department he is now a Cabinet Member - Corporate Services and Budget. He enjoyed his time at Highways and is still in a position to help and support. Prior to the meeting a document was provided, outlining the issue reported to Highways and the lack of progress. In response: i) The inability to agree the use of the mirror is not that the County Council is being awkward but is a health and safety issue and therefore contrary to Highways management plan. ii) Traffic speed when approaching the village past the school. With regards to the narrow pavement and speeding cars by the school, being an ongoing issue with no response in two years from the Highways department. It was explained that it had been a difficult period as due to the pandemic priorities were given elsewhere, such as the vaccination programme and that contact details will be provided to help with the situation. Cllr Spencer asked if the school had a travel plan, which is a requirement. The school and school governors need to work together and can gain assistance from the Derbyshire County Council travel team, they will help identify the issues and it will give more credence to the argument that it needs to be a joint effort. The plan will support the requests to Highways. iii) Further issues were raised at this point regarding A6, speed and signage, including that the 30mph signage was too close to the entrance of the village causing driver delays in reducing speed and that by moving them further away would prepare the drivers in readiness to slow down. Cllr Spencer explained that the location of signage is governed by legislation, it is complicated and not just a case of moving them. iv) Work on the A6; Derbyshire County Council sort advice from Highways that was

	<p>fed back to the Planning department who make the decision and authorise any work to be carried out. The Council explained they felt that there was no local consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v) Issues with the Common and parking; it was asked about the likelihood of being able to put down a hard surface, it would need planning permission plus the common is likely to have a charter.</li> <li>vi) Cllr Spencer was asked about the multiple recommendations/ideas provide on the paper and responded that not everything can be fixed, there are various dimensions to be taken into consideration, changing habits, Highway maintenance etc. To tackle one thing at a time, issues relating to the school the council needs to work with authorising bodies.</li> <li>vii) Cllr Spencer then provided a brief overview of the plans for public transport, following receipt of a paper prior to the meeting. Derbyshire County Council were awarded £47M to cover a three-year programme, which was a great achievement, some Counties received nothing.</li> <li>viii) Work is continuing with the expectation of a county deal programme to enhance public transport. The committee is chaired by an independent and includes eighteen Operators, the aim being a county roll out. Items being consider include a better integrated bus/train enhanced route, the use of buses over cars, additional signage, Hydrogen buses and infrastructure. Basic proposal has been submitted, removal of costs per head is higher in rural therefore cost of rural to go, not been included in costings.</li> <li>ix) The paper raised concerns of the use of a flexible service, where there is no timetable but individuals' request transport in advance, routes are then designed according. This is akin to a taxi service, whilst a benefit to some, and to others where advanced arrangement cannot be made due to circumstances changing, whereas a timetable service provides for a scheduled service, allowing arrangement/appointments to be arranged at short notice.</li> <li>x) It was felt that there was not enough data gathered following the trials to review the pros and cons of the flexible service. That the public need to see the evidence. It was asked what happens after the three years when funding ceases.</li> <li>xi) Cllr Spencer questioned what data was requested and not supplied. He also informed the council that this service was in addition and to run in conjunction with the traditional service. That there is a bus survey improvement plan. That the aim is for a system covering the whole of Derbyshire. And that it will not stop in three years if the County Council plan gets through.</li> </ul> <p><i>Annex A: Traffic and Road Safety Request</i>  <i>Annex B: Concerns about Bus Service Plans</i></p> <p>B: Borough Councillor's Report: None this month  C: Police Report: None this month  D: Chair's Report: None this month</p> <p><i>Cllr Spencer left the meeting</i></p>
05/04/22	<p><b>Public Speaking</b></p> <p>Resident 1. A member of the Village Jubilee Celebration group provided an update. All is going very well and is coming together. There will be lots of entertainment including singers and games including Tombola for everyone to enjoy. A specific decision was made to ensure all equipment, tables etc. are easily moved should the weather require movement indoors to the Burton Institute. A question was raised around arrangement of funding, Clerk agreed that if a list of all itemised expenses and receipts were produced, funding would be transferred to a nominated bank account.</p>

	<p>Resident 2. Raised concerns over a number of road, parking and footpath issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Damage caused by parking, to the kerb and land at the triangle by the Miners Standard. The Council stated they were aware and will be addressing the situation. (ref 05/08/22 D).</li> <li>2. The footpath and edge of road towards the Mere, there is no distinction between the road and path, that it is dangerous to walk there with the speeding traffic, that something needs to be done. (ref 05/03/22).</li> <li>3. Problems with visitors and residents parking on the common eroding the verges, it is also causing problems with drains. Cllr Frederickson explained the council has been looking into the problem, and although it is realised people need to park, solutions are being investigated. Current looking at the option, possibly grasscrete, or others to enhance the area but not damage. Whatever is done needs to comply with the Town and Country Act. It is not going to be a quick fix.</li> <li>4. Speeding coming into the village, sixty zone near a play area is an issue. (ref 05/03/22).</li> </ol> <p>Resident 2 also advised the Council that someone has moved a large rock on Griffin side which will cause problems with lawnmowers used on the area. And that someone has vandalised/thrown red paint over what is deemed an area of scientific interest at Tor Fields. Council is not sure if they can do anything about this, it may need a specialist to treat, as normal solvents could cause unrepairable damage and the land does not belong to the council.</p> <p>Resident 3. Mention looking forward to see the annual accounts. Reiterated Resident 2 comments regarding the Common, not being able to walk on the edge and being harassed by drivers when doing so and they are trying to park. What has happened, why do cars take priority over people. Council agreed, this is unacceptable behaviour.</p> <p>Cllr Randles commented that looking at the bigger picture, there is nowhere else people can park. It was thought that a holiday home had been granted a licence if they adhere to no parking in the area, that people holidaying there should be parking in Harthill and getting a shuttle bus. Council to investigate and clerk to write to owners. The Council also mentioned other options for the common such as kerbing, wooden blocks, rocks but this need investigating and funding. Also need to consider the consequences taking into consideration that the parking slows traffic down by making the road a single lane.</p> <p>Cllr Frederickson suggested a meeting at the common to be arranged to view the area and issues.</p>
05/05/22	<p><b>Members Questions to the Chair</b></p> <p>The Chair was asked if he was aware of an issue with the bin opposite Market House being used by a Holiday cottage. The resident who made the complaint will be monitoring the situation and provide evidence of the misuse. The Chair was not aware, on evidence received Clerk will write to the proprietor of the Holiday Cottage. It was asked if Parish Council emergency plan exists, and if so the whereabouts. It is believed historically there was a plan, Clerk to search old records for the plan's existence. and Councillors to determine whether it warrants revising.</p>
04/06/22	<p><b>Minutes of Last Meeting and Matters Relating Thereto</b></p> <p>A: The minutes of the previous Parish Council meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> March and 4<sup>th</sup> April 2022 were considered, a minor error on a lane name identified by a resident in attendance noted with minutes adjusted. The minutes were then approved. (prop DF. 2<sup>nd</sup> MR, unan)</p> <p>B: There were no matters to discuss relating to the minutes of the previous meeting.</p>
05/07/22	<p><b>Finance</b></p> <p>A: To note the Council's monetary assets: Bank of Scotland, and for the Chair of the meeting to examine, approve and arrange to sign the bank reconciliation and latest current account statements. (prop DF 2<sup>nd</sup> SW, unan)</p>

	Current Account
Balance brought forward 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2022	£28,747.95
Total Income	£80.00
Total Expenditure	£2,914.27
Balance	£25,913.68
Last Statement Balance 13 <sup>th</sup> April 2022	£26,973.15
Less un-presented cheques	£1059.47
Add uncleared deposits	£300.00
Available Balance 1 <sup>st</sup> May 2022	£26,213.68

B: To approve and instruct the payment by cheque, of presented invoiced items, including the following:

- i) T. Dale – Salary and expenses- £379.00
- ii) F. Purslow – Salary and expenses- £114.40 + £6.42 = £120.82
- iii) E. Smith – Cleaning - £75.00
- iv) NetWise – Transfer to Domain - £72.00
- v) ICCM – Annual Membership - £95.00
- vi) PWLB – Loan Repayment - £328.45 (DD)

Plus, Late invoice received from SSE - £57.51

*To Note: SSE confirmed contact details have been updated*

In addition, as per last months agreement the following payments were processed:

- i) WaterPlus Ltd - £392.57
- ii) Donation – D. Mitchell - £200.00

All payments endorsed. (prop DF, 2<sup>nd</sup> DR, unan)

C: To note the income and receipts of the Council:

- i) Derbyshire Memorials - £80.00
- ii) L. Forster – Allotment - £120.00
- iii) G. Baldwin – Allotment - £120.00
- iv) C. Lewzey – Allotment - £60.00

05/08/22

**Council Matters:**

A: A brief overview of how the village consultation event held on the 7<sup>th</sup> April went. It was a good meeting with c30 residents in attendance covering three main topics, Wildlife Meadows, Dog fouling and housing Ukrainian refugees.

Ukrainian refugees – four individuals have now arrived and are homed, there are expected to be eleven refugees homed in total. Fund raising continued with the Bowling Green proprietor raising £2000.00 to support the refugees. A WhatsApp group is being set up to help and support, if anyone would like to be added please let Cllr Randles know.

Dog fouling and Wildlife Meadows– feedback obtained from questionnaire has been collated and circulated to the council members. The responses and suggestion will be the basis for an article in the village magazine. The council was asked if they wish this to appear on the council website and noticeboards, all responded with a yes, and that it was a good idea.

B: Following feedback from the questionnaires at the village consultation event, a number of possible options were given to combat the problem. Including signage,

new bins, letters etc.

*Annex C: Option of Responses for Dog Fouling*

It is proposed that we offer support to residents that are not physically capable of bending to retrieve the dog mess, that they could contact the clerk who would alert the councillors to help clear the dog mess. Concerns were raised against the idea of an in-person request as this could cause a confrontation.

Cllr Randles, would welcome any further suggestions.

Cllr Frederickson to email supplier and confirm delivery and cost of additional bins.

C: An update on the upcoming Winster Parish Forum being held on the 14<sup>th</sup> May was given. The event will give the opportunity for residents to chat with representatives from village groups, parish council and the Wildlife Trust. Village groups included in the event are, Twinning, Village Magazine, Church & Choir, Café in the Church, Village Shop, Lunch Club, Playing Fields, Defib/Telephone Tree, Jubilee, Wakes, Morris Dancers. Refreshments will be available and provided by the Café in the Church.

Currently underway is the advertising of the event, Cllr Randles requested all to share, asked Cllr Hatfield to share on Facebook, and looking at the possibilities of advertising in the village shop and noticeboard.

*Cllr Hatfield left the meeting*

D: The installation of bollards was discussed. Parking and the damage caused on the triangle by the Miners Standard is increasing. It was agreed that as the bollards have already been purchased, being stored in the woodyard, that the council should commence with the installation. A previous quote for installing c50 posts plus large corner post has increased in cost by 20%. Revised cost £1,122.00. It was agreed to go ahead. (prop DF 2<sup>nd</sup> SW, unan)

E: The council were updated on the allotment allocation; eight plots have now been allocated, and there are eight still available. It was proposed for the council to authorise advertising the vacant allotments beyond the village. This was agreed. (prop SW, 2<sup>nd</sup> DF, unan)

*Councillor Wood left the meeting*

F: Environment Working Group:

Following on from last months update, regarding the costs and the requirement to therefore revisit the plan, have received a quote from S. Wood, Garden Services, of £120.00 per cut, there will be six cuts, in three weekly intervals and £100.00 for scarification bring the total to £820.00.

The council were requested to endorse the quote, this was agreed. (prop DF 2<sup>nd</sup> MR, unan)

It was asked when volunteers from the village would be required to help, a session to suppress the key weeds on the 11<sup>th</sup> June therefore likely to be September. All volunteers to be kept informed with an email sent updating them.

The council were informed, when possible, the environment group would like to produce an interpretation board, explaining what the group is doing and where they are going.

	<p><i>Councillor Wood returned to the meeting</i></p> <p>G: Traffic Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The widening and erecting of rails by the school, and erection of a traffic mirror at the junction with Main Street discussed earlier. (ref 05/03/22 A)</li> <li>ii) Parking issues on the Common edge. (ref 05/04/22 Residents 1 and 2)</li> <li>iii) Footpath and edge of road maintenance towards the Mere. (ref 05/03/22 A)</li> <li>iv) A discussion regarding the Secret Gardens banners to the Triangle and Bus Shelter took place. The council raised no issues.</li> </ul> <p>H: The councils Facebook page was discussed, the need to make it an information tool only and not a discussion site. Authority was asked to turn the comments facility off with a generic statement that correspondences should be directed to the Parish Council Website were there is a facility to email the council via the Clerk. It was agreed. (Prop DB 2<sup>nd</sup> JG, unan)</p> <p>I: Update given earlier regarding Village Jubilee Celebration. (ref 05/04/22 Resident 2).</p> <p><i>Councillor Cooper left the meeting</i></p> <p>J: Council noted that the kerb damage at the top of East Bank had almost been repaired, Highways completed one section but left the other. Clerk to chase to request they complete the repairs.</p> <p>Clerk reported to the Council a quote has been received from AR Cooper of £396.00 for the repair to both the middle and damaged corner of the wall at the carpark. It was discussed and agreed to proceed with the quote with Clerk informing AR Cooper to commence the work. (prop DF, 2<sup>nd</sup> DR, unan)</p> <p><i>Councillor Cooper returned to the meeting</i></p> <p>K: A date for the Annual Parish meeting was discussed and arrange it should be held on the 30<sup>th</sup> May, 7:00 pm at the Burton Institute.</p> <p>L: As per process in accordance with the finance regulations all sealed tenders for expression of interest for Ashmore Pringle and Westhill were opened at the meeting. Ashmore Pringle – highest bidder – Andrew Cooper. Westhill – highest bidder – G N Glossop and Son. (prop DF, 2<sup>nd</sup> SW, unan)</p> <p>Clerk to email the outcome to all who tendered.</p> <p>M: Clerk informed the council that a concern had been raised by a resident regarding the appointment of the internal auditor, due to potential conflict of interest. And that the resident would likely raise a formal objection to the internal auditor appointment at the Notice of Public Right stage of the audit. Due to the tight timescales of producing the accounts and going through the internal audit, any objections raised would be time consuming, as would likely require investigation and external audit, which would incur a cost to the council and residents of Winster. The Clerk requested permission to engage a registered independent auditor. The Council considered and gave agreement. (prop JG, 2<sup>nd</sup> AC, unan)</p>
05/09/22	<p><b>Planning:</b></p> <p>A: The following was discussed, considered and instruction given to the clerk to report the Council's views:</p>

	<p>NP/DDD/0322/0442 - The Manor, Underwood House, Main Street, Winster. Proposed roof-mounted solar panels to rear elevation. <b>-No objection</b></p> <p>B: To note any planning decisions as notified by the Peak District National Park Authority: None this month</p>
05/10/22	<p><b>Correspondence &amp; Circulars:</b> To note and discuss, if necessary, correspondence received and pre-circulated to Members by email, unless otherwise indicated, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) DDDC – Colin Swindell – Energy Rebate Scheme</li> <li>ii) DDDC – Make A Difference, Temporary Road Closure, Waste Bin update</li> <li>iii) PDNP – Parish Bulletin, Conversion of Historic Buildings</li> <li>iv) DALC – Newsletter</li> <li>v) DDC – Community News</li> <li>vi) PDNPF – News</li> <li>vii) Rural Services Network, Bulletins, RSN Rural Funding Digest</li> <li>viii) Public Sector Executive – Net Zero Government</li> </ul>
05/11/22	<p><b>Items for the Village Magazine:</b> Chair report being produced.</p>
	<p><b>Next Parish Council Meeting</b> <b>The next Parish Council Meeting will take place at 7.00pm on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> June 2022, at the Burton Institute, Winster.</b></p> <p><b>Meeting closed at 9.15pm</b></p>

**Note: Annexes A-C can be found on the Parish Council Website**

## **Winster Parish Council Meeting 09.05.22**

The Parish Council requests help with the following issues that we would like constructive dialogue with Highways to address:

1. The issue coming into the village next to the school. The school is situated just into the 30mph zone just after the end of a 60mph zone on a country road. The pavement on the corner outside the school is narrow and slopes down to the road. The Parish Council has discussed with Highways the moving of the street lamp so the pavement sloping towards the road can be widened on the corner, this was over 2 years ago. The Parish Council has also requested dialogue about the erection of a railing (which is normal outside schools) for this corner and also onto land the Parish Council owns, so as to provide protection and to slow incoming vehicles. This is an urgent issue but Highways do not respond to emails and are not engaging in dialogue.
2. A review of Highways' reluctance to install a traffic mirror at the bottom of East Bank opposite the Market House. They have refused, citing a lack of previous accidents, but there have been several, so far luckily minor, and near misses. We would like this reviewed again and discussed but have had no response.
3. A wider discussion/dialogue about traffic issues for the village that have been greatly increased by building and other works along the A6 corridor, where no consideration has been taken on the effects these will, and have had, on outlining village road systems. We would like a constructive discussion on options available based on the traffic report compiled by the Parish Council coupled with Highways' expertise.

## Clouds on the horizon for buses in rural Derbyshire

### Why does it matter?

Bus services in Winster don't just matter to today's users. They matter to anyone who is planning to spend their later years in Winster who isn't confident that they could afford to pay for taxis for every trip, as and when they could no longer drive.

Bus services are often treated as a "use it or lose it" service. But we don't apply that logic to ambulances or fire engines. Both are accepted as services where their presence allows people to live confidently in the knowledge that the service is there as and when they need it.

We need to think of bus services in that same light. Although I currently only use the bus once every couple of years, I am benefitting from the service being there. I can plan my later years in Winster because I know that there is tolerable transport available as and when I no longer can use a car.

### What is the threat?

Derbyshire County Council (DCC) made a bid for part of £1.1bn of government funding, for what is supposed to be a one-time investment to transform bus services. In April 2022, DCC were awarded £47m for a three-year programme – just under half of what they had asked for (which is still a pretty good outcome – many counties got nothing).

It isn't yet clear which bits of the plan will go ahead, given that the funding is so far short of the cost of the plan that was submitted. But I am concerned that a core part of the submitted plan would be bad news for those in rural villages in Derbyshire – the move to "Demand Responsive Transport" (DRT).

### What is Demand Responsive Transport?

As envisaged by DCC, DRT is a flexible service, "based around passenger demand or particular needs rather than a specific route or timetable".

The typical DRT service breaks the area into a series of geographic zones, generally with one minibus (perhaps 15 seats) delivering transport within that area. There is no fixed timetable – passengers make their requests for travel within the zone (via an app, or by phoning a call centre) in advance (generally 7 days ahead) and a schedule is built up on a first-come, first-served basis.

DRT can be a cost-effective solution in urban areas where there are lots of passengers

For those who succeed in getting their needs built into the schedule, it is brilliant: the convenience of a taxi (going where you want, when you want) at the price of a bus (which, for many users, will be zero).

But the snag is that not many people are going to be that lucky. DRT is an extremely expensive service when measured per passenger. So, unless DCC's spending is going to increase (no chance), that will mean the brilliant service is not going to be available for a large number of people.

Data from DCCs existing *Derbyshire Connect* DRT trial around Ashbourne suggests that outside school runs, the vehicles are travelling about 6 miles for every passenger trip. That is the same as if the 172 bus service from Matlock to Bakewell averaged two passengers per run. It is pretty close to the capacity that could be achieved by a taxi, but the cost of a DRT vehicle is vastly greater than for a taxi.

Contrast between timetabled services and DRT <b>Timetabled bus</b>		<b>DRT</b>
How concentrated is demand?	Fairly good. A bus timetable encourages compromise – you may not want to go where and when the bus goes, but you understand that you need to adapt to fit in with it.	Less Good. The “anywhere, anytime” model has no provision for compromise – it invites people to bid for the time and end points that suits them.
Potential Demand	Moderate – the need to compromise means that those with use of a car will tend to opt for the car instead	High – DRT will attract not just those already using the bus. Car users attracted by the higher convenience of DRT, who want to drink, or save petrol, will become additional potential customers for DRT
Impact on “passengers per trip”	Positive - a 0930 bus from Winster to Matlock might carry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Person A who ideally wants to travel Winster-Matlock at 0830</li> <li>• Person B who ideally wants to travel Winster-Matlock at 1030</li> </ul>	Negative - DRT will meet requests from Person A and Person B as two separate demands, meeting the needs of just one person (or group travelling together) at a time.
Trips per day	High – the timetable is designed to make efficient use of the bus	Low – the schedule is built randomly, as requests are made. So there will be dead miles as the vehicle repositions (from a setdown in Winster to a pickup in Bonsall, perhaps), and dead time when the gap between trips is too short to add extra trips.
Chances of travelling	High – unless the bus is too full at your stop	Low – many requests will be turned down because of increased demand and reduced capacity
How far ahead you can be sure of a journey?	At least six weeks, and in practice usually much more	Maximum of seven days

## Option of Responses for Dog Mess Based on Village Feedback

1. Put signage on or near litter bins reminding people they can be used for bagged dog mess.
2. Look to site a couple of new bins, decide where these should be and how would they be emptied.
3. Sweep the streets before jubilee – less likely to foul if street looks spotless!
4. Door drop a letter with a couple of free poo bags to all Winster dog owners reminding them of their responsibilities.
5. Ask the shop to prominently display poo bags including single purchase at front of shop (like face masks) with a sign reminding people this is a poo free village.
6. Make a map of where all the bins are and supply on an A5 laminate in the shop
7. Write a letter to all holiday cottage owners asking them to kindly inform their guests that this is a poo free village and supply the A5 laminate of bin locations.
8. Make or buy some signs to display near grassed areas eg Leacroft & wild flower meadows.



9. Communicate this strategy in Village Mag. Put notices on all village boards along with poster of bin locations.
10. Elevation pitch on how to deal with people who continue to allow their dog to foul:
  - a. Polite request letter from Clerk
  - b. In-person request from Councillor
  - c. Report to Community Police
  - d. Implementing fine process