

Notes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Working Group

Held virtually via ZOOM 15th November 2021

PRESENT

Chairman: Iain Keeping,

Pat Black

Adele Evans

Caryl Roberts

Stephen Hornby

Peter Weston

Ann Wright (Clerk).

Purpose of Meeting – To review Design Code (DC) draft document.

General comments

It was noted the document contains a number of grammatical errors which need to be corrected.

Action - Pat Black agree to review the document and highlight these errors.

It was noted the Barbour Institute is still not mentioned despite being a striking Victorian building in a prominent position on the High Street.

It was noted there are inconsistencies in the document in how the same areas are defined or described for example Burwardsley Road.

It was highlighted that the document notes inappropriate single dwelling developments but ignores large inappropriate developments.

It was agreed to go through the document and highlight areas of concern:

Cover & Title

The document should be the Tattenhall and District Design Code, not Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan, this requires correction on all page headers through the document.

It was asked if the AECOM and Locality logos could be put at the bottom of the cover.

Page 6

Last point under methodology requires date including.

Page 7

It was agreed to check if the boundary shown is the NP area or the Parish Council boundary, it was suggested that possibly both boundaries should be shown.

It was agreed it would be helpful to include a map showing the settlement boundary which also needs to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan (NP).

Page 11

Calypso Office to be identified as The White House.

Page 14

Route Hierarchy needs to reflect hierarchy of usage of the roads in the DC area.

Primary Routes in Tattenhall:

- Rocky Lane
- Chester Road
- Tattenhall Lane

All other roads could be described as tertiary.

It was noted the A41 does not go through the DC area.

It was thought the national cycle way routes should be included, routes 43 and 50.

Page 15

Frog Lane picture replaced with Rocky Lane in conjunction to changes to page 14.

Chester Road photo to be taken at Gatesheath or near Doctor's surgery.

Tattenhall Road photo only highlights rural stretch.

Page 16

Need to acknowledge Bolesworth Estate ownership of majority of properties and land.

The Barbour Institute is not marked on the map.

Butchers no longer open.

It was noted the key is hard to see and should be moved onto the opposite side of the page as on page 12.

It was discussed that the NP included a number of open spaces, but it was not clear if these are officially designated Open Spaces or not.

It was agreed The Spinney needs highlighting following the works which have taken place.

Page 17

Spring Farm Mews is not in Tattenhall.

Inclusion of photos of The Spinney in place of Jubilee Wood.

Page 18

Refer to Butchers rather than Pig & Co.

Replace Sportsman's Arms and Newsagents photo.

Page 19

It is not clear that the bottom map is Newton by Tattenhall.

It was considered if examples of the development should be included from Gatesheath.

Action – Iain Keeping to identify boundaries shown.

Page 20

First paragraph refers to views 1 to 5, only 3 views identified.

It was suggested view 1 should be replaced with a view from the footpath across the cricket pitch towards Bolesworth Castle.

It was noted a lot more views are identified in the NP and that these should be include in the DC.

Page 21

View 1 – replace with photo from footpath.

View 2 – Church is hidden in photo.

View 3 – large picture of little value – replace or reduce and include further views listed in NP, possibly towards Beeston Castle from the Redrow estate or from Keysbrook.

Page 22

Update Covert Rise photo.

Page 23

It was noted a large number of photos are duplicated throughout the document e.g., The Laurels. It was agreed that the group would review the document and review photographs taken by Iain Keeping and identify alternative photos to be used, including one of Church Bank showing Tudor Cottage etc.

It was agreed the description of Tattenhall Road was poor.

Page 25

Replace photo 27.

It was noted there are a large number of photographs of Newton by Tattenhall and hardly any of Gatesheath.

Page 26

Replace Oaklands photo.

Page 29

It was noted that this had been taken from the Village Design Statement and did not include the latest developments including Gifford Lea.

Page 31

Fails to show the DC area is made up of the village of Tattenhall and the separate settlements of Gatesheath and Newton by Tattenhall.

Page 32, Code 1

It was noted that Passive Homes are German designed homes with high levels of insulation and are highly energy efficient.

Page 35, Code 3

It was not clear what was meant by conversion of historic agricultural buildings. It was discussed if this referred to conversion of traditional buildings, maintaining their character.

Page 36, Code 4

It was agreed parking needs to be compared to the new published CW&C SPD.

Page 39

It was raised whether this section would be included in the finished DC.

Next Meeting

It was noted that an email would be sent round to the group with a table containing the NP policies and the relevant CW&C Local Plan Policies. The Group were asked to study the table and wording options for policy 1 and consider if any further changes to the NP are required or whether CW&C Plan Policies are adequate for discussion at the next meeting.

It was noted that the NP should seek to enhance CW&C Policy as such if the CW&C policy is adequate there is no necessity to take further action.

FUTURE MEETING

Wednesday **8th** December 7pm via Zoom
Neighbourhood Plan Policies Review

Ann Wright
16/11/21