

Notes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Working Group

Held virtually via ZOOM

4th August 2021

PRESENT

Chairman: Iain Keeping,

Pat Black

Steve Densley

Adele Evans

Doug Hynes

Caryl Roberts

Peter Weston

Ann Wright (Clerk).

Public 1

APOLOGIES

Esther Saddler Williams.

DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None declared.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No matters raised.

DESIGN CODE

The Group considered the Guidance Notes for Design Codes particularly a matrix showing character types.

It was suggested that the Design Code document prepared by Aecom had identified two-character areas, the conservation area/High Street and the rest of the village, and that the document had attempted to identify the two area types and put them into context.

The document had also attempted to identify 'movement' through transport networks, as well as identifying the street networks and street hierarchy.

It was discussed whether Design Codes are fit for purpose when looking at semi-rural and rural settings as there is little guidance for these areas compared to more urban ones.

Concerns were voiced that planning is becoming more remote and planning decision and influence is being taken away from communities.

It was agreed the Design Code must cover the whole Neighbourhood Plan area.

It was agreed good development in Tattenhall needed to be identified e.g., Grakle Croft in contrast to the Redrow development.

It was suggested that the Codes needed to note that Tattenhall is a Cheshire village and that developments need to include Cheshire bricks and slate roofs.

It was discussed that Design Codes are guidance not legislation.

It was felt much of the wording in the Village Design Statement (VDS) is better than that presented to date in the Design Code.

It was discussed that an additional rural character area needs to be included to reflect the rural areas which make up part of the Neighbourhood Plan area.

It was asked if detailed analysis of the conservation area is necessary as the Code is influencing future development. Instead, it was suggested the Group needs to consider what design features need to be taken forward.

It was agreed a meeting needed to be arranged with the representative from Aecom, so members could understand the parameters of character areas and that CW&C spatial planning officers should also be invited.

It was confirmed 2-character areas is not adequate.

It was agreed the Clerk should prepare an agenda based on the notes from this and the previous meeting and circulate it to councillors for approval.

It was agreed the Clerk write to Edward Timpson MP highlighting concerns that communities influence in the planning system is being undermined and eroded.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW NEXT STEPS

It was confirmed the grant had now been received to fund CCA to support the plan review process including consultation. It was agreed a meeting should be arranged with Lucy Hughes from CCA to move the review forward.

CW&C LOCAL PLAN CONVERSATION

It was noted CW&C are consulting on the Local Plans (deadline to comment 15th September 2021). It was agreed that members of the group should review both documents and policies relating to Tattenhall and consider which we agree or object to. The Group was also asked to consider what additional policies should be included to the Local Plans.

It was suggested that the group should strongly object to Policies R2A and B of the Local Plan which stated Tattenhall had not met its housing target and allocated additional land for development.

It was hoped comments could be agreed by email.

FUTURE MEETINGS

- Aecom & CW&C to discuss Design Code
- CCA to progress Neighbourhood Plan
Dates TBC

Ann Wright 03/06/2021