



MEDLAR-WITH-WESHAM  
**PARISH PLAN**

Chairman: Trevor Jago  
Tel: 01772 681332  
Secretary: John Westmoreland  
Tel: 01772 685415  
[john.westmoreland@btinternet.com](mailto:john.westmoreland@btinternet.com)  
Treasurer/Assistant Secretary  
Webmaster: Alan Clayton  
Tel: 01772 683712  
[alan.clayton1@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:alan.clayton1@blueyonder.co.uk)

## **STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

### **MINUTES**

Meeting: Steering Committee / 4-2007  
Date: Thursday, 19<sup>th</sup> July 2007  
Venue: Wesham Community Centre

#### **Steering Committee:**

Elaine Bradley	*	Brenda Leil	*
Nigel Bradley	*	Sheena Miller	*
Lyn Cardwell	*	Linda Nulty	*
Malcolm Carr	*	Dave Ogden	*
Alan Clayton	*	Marion Rose	*
Geoff Dixon	*	Steph Turner	*
Elaine Hartley	*	Mick Turner	*
Trevor Jago	*	John Westmoreland	*

#### **Supporters:**

Jennifer Bilsborrow	*
Peter Huett	*
Theresa McGardle	
Margaret Rawcliffe	
Ron Stamper	
Ann Whitby	

\* Attended this meeting

#### **Agenda**

1. Apologies for absence
2. Confirmation of the minutes of the previous meeting (4<sup>th</sup> July)
3. Ratification of committee officers: Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer
4. Commence preparation of a Questionnaire
5. Set the date for the next meeting

#### **Introduction**

Trevor Jago introduced himself as having volunteered at the last meeting to be chairman of the committee. He had been a town and district councillor in Cornwall before moving to Wesham.

Alan asked that John take notes in advance of Agenda Item 3.

#### **1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies had been received from Ann Whitby, and Linda Nulty and Mick Turner.

## 2 Confirmation of the minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the first Steering Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> July 2007, were proposed and agreed as a correct record.

## 3 Ratification of Committee Officers

The following had already volunteered to be officers:

- Trevor Jago – Chairman
- John Westmoreland – Secretary
- Alan Clayton – Treasurer/Assistant Secretary/Webmaster

John introduced himself. He had not been able to attend any of the previous parish plan meetings. He has been secretary of the Wesham Community Pride Trust for two years. He is also secretary of the Fylde District Group of CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England) and consequently is involved in reviewing local plans including the new Fylde Borough Local Development Framework (LDF). John was also involved in the Kirkham & Rural Fylde Partnership in 2004. This did produce an Action Plan for Kirkham, and to some extent Wesham. But this was abandoned because the rural partnership was dropped in favour of the Fylde Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). So Kirkham is again currently pushing for development/regeneration funds.

All these officers were proposed and seconded.

Alan suggested that before we began looking at the questionnaire we should discuss:

- our objectives in producing a Parish Plan, to be clear what we are intending to do
- A Constitution for our organisation

### 3.1 Objectives

Alan quoted the following objectives from a Parish Plan for Mawdesley as an example of the sort of objectives which we should adopt:

- To identify local concerns and opportunities
- To set out an achievable and long-term vision for the future, based on residents' views and opinions
- To prepare an Action Plan to achieve the vision, together with recommendations for its implementation

The objectives would appear in a Constitution and ultimately in our Parish Plan. These objectives were thought to be suitable by those present.

Steph queried the Action Plan, eg. how long would it last? She was conscious of John's comments about the failure of the Kirkham & Rural Fylde Partnership Action Plan. John said they got as far as a plan with actions, who would do them, and timescales.

John related his knowledge of the Claughton-on-Brock Parish Plan. He has a friend who has been involved in preparation of this Plan over several months, and in fact the actual Plan was issued last night! John had a copy for the committee to examine – it was agreed by Nigel and others to be an impressive professionally produced publication! John also submitted the Claughton Questionnaire as an example for us to look at.

John commented that the Claughton Parish Plan does not have a detailed Action Plan within it. In fact it is titled: *Parish Plan – Results of the Public Consultation*. Their Action Plan details, ie. the who/what/how/funding etc, will continue to be worked on 'in due course'.

Steph suggested that we will (also) probably have to re-visit our Action Plan over time.

### 3.2 Constitution

Alan recommended that the committee had a formal Constitution. John offered to draft this, incorporating objectives, and based on a specimen constitution supplied by Community Futures, and also the Claughton-on-Brock Parish Plan Steering Committee Constitution - John has a copy.

The draft Constitution would be available for review by the committee prior to the next meeting.

### 4 Commence Preparation of a Questionnaire

A number of example questionnaires were available, including:

- Croston (between Chorley & Southport)
- Wrea Green
- Claughton-on-Brock (near Garstang - supplied by John)

There are also a number of compulsory questions supplied by Community Futures. Nigel queried the reason for this. Alan explained that this was to provide feedback to allow Community Futures to compare data from different questionnaires. The meeting did not see any problem with this, given that Community Futures are funding the production of Parish Plans!

John thought all the questionnaires were similar: it is a matter of choosing the best questions for our needs. Nigel recommended that we keep the questionnaire easy to read and understand.

Alan suggested using a ‘prize scheme’ as an incentive to completing the questionnaire. John said Claughton had a £50 Marks & Spencers gift voucher ‘draw’.

Lyn queried if the questionnaire would be addressed to specific people, eg. youth. Trevor commented that in the example questionnaires there is provision to address specific age groups.

Alan advised that the feedback we already have from the Public Meeting must be taken into account as we prepare the questionnaire. So effectively we have already done a ‘verbal questionnaire’! He circulated copies of the feedback (*See Addendum 1*). John advised that we should check that questionnaire questions actually cover all the issues raised!

### 4.1 Review of the Croston Questionnaire

Led by Trevor, we worked through all the questions on the Croston questionnaire, reviewing each one for its suitability and applicability for our own questionnaire.

Alan warned that we should not make our own judgements now, but rather decide the questions!

John pointed out that it is intended to have one questionnaire per household. But the Croston questionnaire assumes one member of the household fills it in, so some questions are specific for only one person to answer. We will need to think about how this could affect our questions.

Discussion about each question...

- Q1/2/3/4/5: Number in household, age ranges, etc.. Such questions relating to statistical data which could be obtained from the electoral register need not be included.
- These questions were seen as: “Information gathering/statistics for statistics sake”, and as such would not be useful or relevant. Examples - how many: in age groups, male/female, registered disabled. But we would want questions addressed to specific categories, eg. youth and senior citizens.
- Q6: How long have you lived here? – Include
- Q7: How did you come to live here? - Include

## MEDLAR-WITH-WESHAM PARISH PLAN – MEETING MINUTES

- Q8: Features of the area you value? – Include
- Q9: Need to carry out a project to record the history of the area? – doubtful
- Q10: Keep the parish clean & tidy? – Yes! Include: make applicable
- Q11: Areas that could be improved visually? – Include: make applicable
- Q12: Improvements to the parish? – Include: make applicable. This topic should be broken down into separate questions, eg. better policing needed? Toilets needed? – Rewrite.
- Q13: Benefits to the children’s recreation ground? – Include: make applicable
- Q14: Current status, eg. employment, in training, retired? Not needed
- Q15: where do you work? May be useful, eg. for traffic/public transport impact, but it has to cover all members of the household.
- Q16: Nature of work/business? Not relevant
- Q17: Barriers to employment? – Include
- Q18: Where do you get information about local events? – Include: make applicable, eg. do you know about www.wesham.org? An improved town notice board needed!
- Q19: Aware of churches, sports, etc.? – Include: make applicable
- Q20: Views on local facilities? Include: but breakdown for social facilities and categories of people
- Q21: Opinions on arts/entertainment facilities for people with disabilities? Not suitable, but it was agreed that we should have some question(s) covering disability discrimination
- Q22: Wish to participate in activities if they were available, eg. sports, keep fit, skateboard, dance, etc.? Include but rewrite.
- Q23: Rating of educational services - excellent, good, satisfactory...?
  - There was much debate, eg. is it asking whether we need new schools? – a ‘demographic’ question?
  - John and Steph were concerned that the questionnaire should not allow judging the quality of teaching. This is not relevant to the future of the parish.
  - The topic of education should be included, but needs review, eg. future provision: primary/secondary, location, travelling distance, etc.
  - John suggested it should simply ask: ‘Are the educational facilities adequate?’ & ‘Do you have any suggestions to improve them?’
- Q24: Adult education? Include as an important topic.
- Q25: housing category: private, rented, owner-occupied...? Include
- Q26: Flooding risk? Trevor commented that there are flood risk maps available. But Peter thought it important to ask if the householder actually knows! Include, but re-write.
- Q27: What do you think about the number of houses built in the last 10 years?
- Q28: are you seeking alternative accommodation?
- Q29: What sort of housing is needed?
- Q30: What type of accommodation is needed?
- Q31: What type of development would you support? Including new business/industry.
- All housing questions should be linked together. Questions should cover the future: eg. Do you think more houses are needed? Protection of greenfield areas? Need for affordable housing for local residents?

## MEDLAR-WITH-WESHAM PARISH PLAN – MEETING MINUTES

- Local Employment should also be covered.
- Q32: ‘Measures’ needed, eg. police presence, neighbourhood watch, improved street lighting?
- Q33: Concern over crimes/anti-social behaviour?
- Such questions should come under appropriate headings, eg. John recommended ‘Law and Order’ to cover policing, crime, etc..
- Q34: Ratings of services used? eg. medical, home help, counselling, disability, etc. Include, but under appropriate heading(s): social services?
- Q35: Standard of ‘services’? eg. water, electricity, gas, refuse collection, street lighting, street cleaning etc.. Include, but under appropriate headings. John said these are some of the compulsory questions – they are about ‘Services and Facilities’.
- Q36: State of roads, pavements, verges, street lighting? Include, and extend to cover off-street parking.
- Q37: Improvements for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchairs, etc? Include, eg. Elaine mentioned footpaths blocked for pushchairs by parked cars.
- Q38: Improvements to paths & streetlights, eg. safer pavements, pedestrian crossings, dropped kerbs etc.? Include.
- Q39: Reasons for shopping out of the town? Include.
- Q40: Support for a Good Neighbour Scheme? Not really relevant to the future of the parish.
- Q41: Number of roadworthy vehicles?
- Q42: Parking problems at your home?
- Q43: Enough parking spaces for disabled?
- Q44: Traffic problems?
- Q47: More parking facilities needed?
- Questions are relevant and should be linked. The density of vehicles could be an important factor for the present and future, eg. re parking/traffic/transport. Off-road parking provision for new housing developments, businesses and shopping’ hospital/medical facilities is relevant. John advised that government planning guidance gives this. Elaine suggested a simple question: ‘Are you happy with the parking facilities for your household?’
- Q45: Speeding control measures?
- Q46: Support for road safety improvements at specific ‘danger-spots’?
- Q48: Means of transport to work or education?
- Q49: Preferred method?
- Q50: How often do you use buses, trains, dial-a-ride, taxi?
- Q51/52/53/54/55: Rating of transport services: bus/train/dial-a-ride/community bus/taxi?
- Q56: Would you use a Community Car Scheme?
- All questions should be combined. John advised a heading: ‘Transport & Highways’. Elaine and others thought the condition of the station needs including to cover, eg. disabled access - the lack of a lift. Alan advised that there are proposals for a ‘friend’s of the station’ group to improve it’s appearance, but Network Rail will not do much other than maintaining the waiting room facilities.
- Q57: Elected representatives: their awareness of local concerns and effectiveness? Include the question.
- Q58: How would you like the town/parish/community to develop? eg. as a working community, retirement community, commuter community, tourist centre. Not relevant – it will develop as needed.

## MEDLAR-WITH-WESHAM PARISH PLAN – MEETING MINUTES

- Q59: If suggestions raised by the Parish Plan require money, where should it come from? eg. council tax increase, sponsorship, fundraising, grant applications. etc? Alan thought this was a contentious issue re the town council's local precept: part of the council tax. But the question should be included if only to see if residents would support an increase.

### 4.2 Do questions cover the Public Meeting feedback?

Alan went through the list of all issues raised at the Public Meeting (*see Addendum 1*) so that we could assess if they are covered by our review of possible questionnaire questions. This includes comments written on 'post-it' notes at the end of the Public Meeting.

- *Improve community cohesion* – we are probably doing this through the Parish Plan work!
- *Control of local by-laws: litter, dog fouling, etc.* – covered
- *Are grants available to cleanup scruffy properties on Station Road?* – This is rather specific! John said it is effectively identifying the overall need for regeneration funding - like Kirkham are lobbying for at present, and St Annes has achieved. we need similar action for Wesham, eg. new pavements. Dave suggested encouraging residents to take pride in their property. Alan related this as an aim of the Wesham Community Pride Trust - so we should ask residents if they are aware of the aims of the Trust. Alan proposed the topic of regeneration is included, eg. ask if residents want town regeneration?
- *Remember to support the Post Office / Save the Post Office* – covered. Marion reported that Royal Mail representatives will be coming in October to seek views of the local community and then a decision will be made. John thought some form of local campaign is needed.
- *Weight restrictions throughout Wesham! HGV access* – covered.
- *More use of speed cameras* – covered
- *Effective local policing* – covered
- *Traffic calming* – covered
- *No public toilets* – covered
- *Lack of litter bins* – covered
- *Concern over retirement & replacement of the road sweeper* – covered
- *Improvements for the disabled, eg. pavements* – covered
- *Impact on Wesham if the Casino develops ?*
- *Further education* – covered (Adult Education)
- *Sustainability* – covered implicitly by other questions?
- *Have a vision for 20 years ahead* – covered
- *Allotments* - need to include
- *Litter* - covered
- *Lack of shops* - covered
- *Churches* – must make sure the issues are included.
- Safety fencing at the playgrounds - a very important issue, as explained by Elaine! Alan related the efforts of the TC
- *Development control constraints to protect green areas* – covered
- *Need for speed indicators/20 mph control* – covered

## MEDLAR-WITH-WESHAM PARISH PLAN – MEETING MINUTES

- *population predictions and impact on schools* – hopefully covered by data we collect and publish in the final Parish Plan. (Annex?)
- *Wesham health facilities* – need for covered?
- *Youth/ASBOs* – covered, but we should have special questions addressed to youth.

Prioritised issues (from ‘Stick a start’ chart):

- *safer roads for all users* - covered
- *Facilities for young people* - covered
- *More/some shops* - covered
- *Easy access to health care facilities* - covered
- *Reduce our impact on the environment/protect wildlife & nature* – questions relating to Environment are needed!
- *Better public transport* – covered
- *Reduction in crime* – covered
- *More affordable housing* – covered
- *Local employment opportunities* – covered
- *Improved recreation & leisure facilities* – covered

### **Wesham Schools Travel Plan**

Alan reported that a lot of the issues about road safety and traffic are covered in the *Wesham Schools Travel Plan* which had been published earlier this year. This has been accepted by Lancashire County Council, and funding of £5,000 awarded through the education budget. So Alan hoped that some of the issues would be addressed by this funding.

### **Categories of Question in the Questionnaire**

In the review of questions we identified a number of overall categories. Also, John referred several times to the categories used in the Cloughton-on-Brock Questionnaire. These are:

- COMMUNITY
- ENVIRONMENT
- SERVICES & FACILITIES
- TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS
- LAW & ORDER
- HOUSING & DEVELOPMENTS
- COMMUNICATIONS
- YOUTH QUESTIONNAIRE

(Note. One obvious omission is ‘Employment’).

#### **4.3 Production of a First Draft Questionnaire**

It was suggested and agreed that a first draft of our Parish Plan Questionnaire should be produced for review by the full Steering Committee at the next meeting.

A small ‘sub-committee/working group’ volunteered to produce the draft, comprising:

- Nigel Bradley
- Trevor Jago
- John Westmoreland
- Alan Clayton

#### **5 Date of the Next Meeting**

This would be sometime in September, subject to other commitments of the officers.

Dave recommended that once a draft Questionnaire is available a specific date should be announced.

#### **6 Any Other Business**

##### **Use of e-mail addresses**

Steph, and also Nigel and Elaine, questioned how e-mail addresses given for Parish Plan communications had come to be used for other purposes. Specifically, Cllr Simon Renwick had used their e-mail addresses for his own communications. They wished this to be minuted.

Alan explained that he had compiled an e-mail distribution list of committee members and supporters/helpers from their responses, and had used this to circulate information. All town councillors were also included in this list since the Parish Plan project is supported by the council. Consequently everyone’s e-mail address is visible to all on that list.

John advised that individuals should contact the person concerned to ask to be removed from their e-mail distribution lists, as is the standard practice on the Internet.

---

Minutes approved by the Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## MEDLAR-WITH-WESHAM PARISH PLAN – MEETING MINUTES

### **Addendum 1: POINTS RAISED AT THE FIRST PUBLIC MEETING (24-May-07)**

#### Source: From Post It Notes (Verbatim) - NO PRIORITY ORDER

- Improved Community Cohesion
- Control of Local Byelaws i.e Litter and Dog Fouling
- Are grants available to clean up some of the scruffy properties on Station Road?
- Remember to support the Post Office
- Weight restrictions throughout Wesham! HGV's access only from the by-pass to end of railway bridge
- More use of speed cameras on roads through Wesham, not just on entering!
- Effective local Policing
- Action to save Post Office
- Traffic Calming
- No to public toilets ---the last ones were used for recreation not sanitation
- Save Post Office (X 2)
- Concern for lack of litter bins in Wesham particularly free standing ones for larger litter
- Concern that the road sweeper retires in July and is not being replaced
- Consideration/amendments to make life easier for disabled/elderly facilities pavements
- Facilities for elderly

#### Source: From Comments Forms - NO PRIORITY ORDER

- Use Parish Plan as a strategic enabling plan  
Maintenance of semi – rural pavements with overgrown vegetation
- More Police presence
- Traffic calming is paramount
- Impact of new developments onto infrastructure/a forward vision is needed and must be focussed on

#### Source: Points raised during open debate(as 'bullet points') - NO PRIORITY ORDER

- Possible impact on Wesham if the Casino develops
- Further education needed
- Sustainability
- Have a vision for 20 + years ahead
- Environment issues relating to drainage
- Allotments
- Litter
- Lack of Shops
- Benches (for the elderly)
- Churches
- Public Toilets (Need for)
- Bus shelter locations
- Traffic Issues - Lollipop Lady
- Safety fencing at playgrounds
- Development control constraints to protect green areas
- Need for speed indicators
- 20mph speed control
- Population predictions and impact on schools
- Wesham Health Care .....Drs, Dentists, Chemist
- Youth> ASBOs
- Retention of Post Office

#### Source: 'Stick a Star Chart' - IN PRIORITY ORDER

- Safer Roads For All Users
- Facilities For Young People
- More/Some Shops
- Easy Access to Health Care Services
- Reduce Our Impact On The Environment
- Protect Local Wildlife and Nature
- Better Public Transport
- A Reduction in Crime
- More Affordable Housing
- Local Employment Opportunities
- Improved Recreation and Leisure Facilities