

Minutes of Tattenhall & District Parish Council Meeting Held 4th October 2021 at the Barbour Institute.

PRESENT

Councillors

Chairman – I. Keeping

J. Bailey P. Black

S. Chapman

D. Haynes

L. Jones

P. Kerr J. Kershaw

N. Matthews

N. Sharp

Non-Parish Councillors

Public – 2

The Council observed a minute silence to remember Cllr Georgina Blackhurst who passed away and will be greatly missed.

APOLOGIES

The Council noted the resignation of Esther Sadler Williams.

A. Scarratt – Family Commitment

S. Hornby – Family Commitment

L. White – Family Commitment

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No interests were declared.

PARISH NEWS

Cllr Neil Matthews to produce Parish News report for September.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Burwardsley Road Speeding

A resident raised concerns regarding the number of vehicles speeding on Burwardsley Road before reaching the derestriction. He also raised the number of vehicles that drive round parked vehicles when the road is not clear to do so and refuse to give way to oncoming traffic.

It was agreed this would be raised with the PCSO to monitor and also that the Council was planning to undertake speed awareness training to allow use of the speed indicator device (SID) and speed gun in the village.

Tattenhall Road and Chester Road Junction

A resident raised the fact that vehicles are parking too close the junction of Tattenhall and Chester Roads, often on the white lines. It was confirmed this would be raised with the PCSO.

MINUTES

RESOLVED 21/46 - that the Chairman sign, as a correct record the circulated minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on the 6th September 2021.

ACTIONS LIST

The Council noted the actions list as circulated, from page 52 of the minutes.

It was noted the transfer of the website was now completed and councillors had all received their new email addresses and passwords.

PLANNING

1) Planning Register

Councillors noted the planning register, pages 86 to 88, including comments submitted since the last meeting and decisions received. It was noted no further updates had been received regarding planning enforcement matters.

2) Planning Applications

21/03634/FUL- Porch extension – 26 Castlefields, Tattenhall, CH3 9RD.

RESOLVED 21/47 – That the Council submit the following comment:

No objection.

Appeal - Certificate of Lawfulness of Existing Use or Development to confirm the current residential dwelling was not carried out pursuant to planning permission reference 6/12775 - Honeyend Farm, Carrs Lane, Tattenhall, Chester, Cheshire, CH3 9NT (20/03520/LDC). It was agreed to take no further action.

3) Lead Planning Councillors

Cllrs S. Chapman and L. White until November meeting.

CADENT

It was noted that Cadent had responded well to the recent gas supply issues in the village and had received thanks from many residents.

COMMUNITY ORCHARD

RESOLVED 21/48 – That the Council confirm that they wish to proceed with the project to create a community orchard at the land of Gorsefield and would undertake to mow the area once possibly twice a year and remove or compost the cuttings on site as well as coordinate volunteer pruning.

It was noted that CW&C will be supplying 40 trees of 4/5ft in height which will be a mix of tradition fruit species, the clerk had requested a list of the trees to be supplied and had requested some Cheshire varieties and nut trees.

Once a date has been agreed for the planting this will be advertised and volunteers notified to come and help under the guidance of CW&C officers.

WAR MEMORIAL

The Council noted the notes of the discussion which had taken place on 27th September, page 54 of the minutes, the actions from which were already in progress. Concern was noted that the Parish Council could face the same problems again in the future if the Memorial remains in the same location, it was noted that when the design work is undertaken the longevity of proposed solution can be assessed.

BEESTON & TARPORLEY RAILWAY STATION REOPENING GROUP

It was agreed the Council would not contribute funding towards the feasibility study as it was not one the Council's priorities.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN & DESIGN CODE UPDATE

The Council noted the notes of meetings which had taken place in August and September, from page 55 of the Minutes.

ACCOUNTS & PAYMENTS

1) Half Year Accounts

RESOLVED 21/49– that the Council approve the half year accounts and payments and bank reconciliation as circulated page 78 of the Cash Book including the following payments:

Shires	August Payroll	36.00
NatWest	Bank charges	10.00

2) Accounts & Payments

RESOLVED 21/50 – that the Council approve the accounts and payments as circulated page 79 of the Cash Book including the following payments:

A. Wright	Salary	935.16
Nest	Pension Contribution	55.99
HMRC	NI/PAYE	113.72
PJH Outdoor Solutions	Grounds Maintenance	1224.00

3) Additional Invoices

RESOLVED 21/51 – that the Council approve the following payments:

Elginhill	Transfer website hosting and set-up emails	250.00
-----------	--	--------

SPINNEY PROJECT

It was noted the Spinney Project works are proceeding.

Discussions are taking place with CW&C regarding the reinstatement of the pond on the grassed triangle next to the Spinney and the funding received by the Parish Council had also allowed additional works to be include in the project including the implementation of an addition footway across that area and wildflower seeding to take place.

The Clerk reported that she has applied for a small grant of £300 to undertake an arts workshop linked to the Spinney, it has been suggested by the Youth Council and others this might be a project which could be undertake with Transition Tattenhall, it was greed to raise this with the group.

YOUTH COUNCIL

1) Update

The Council noted the minutes of the Youth Council meeting held 28th September 2021, from page 62 of the minutes. It had been agreed to hold a number of pop-up youth clubs to gauge young people's interest in attending as well as volunteers who would help run the Club.

2) Art Workshop

Concern was voiced regarding the Youth Council's lack of enthusiasm at their meeting on this topic although a possible artist had now been identified who could run the workshop, it was agreed to obtain the price to run the workshop and then review whether to proceed with the project following the next Youth Council meeting. It was asked if a grant could be obtained to cover the cost of the workshop.

3) Next Meeting

It was agreed Cllr. Keeping would attend the next Youth Council meeting on the 19th October.

The meeting closed at 8.20pm.

Signed

Dated

Ann Wright 05/10/2021

FUTURE PARISH COUNCIL MEETINGS

Scheduled Parish Council Meeting

Monday 1st November 2021
Billiard Room, Barbour Institute

Actions – September 2021

Action	Date	Comments	
<u>Bunting</u>	03 10 21	Bunting to be removed.	
<u>Canal Towpath</u>		Responses	
<u>Christmas Lights</u>	19 01 21	Emailed GNM for help & advice obtain price roofline lights inc 9 Houses Price for lights over High Street Create Lights plan	
<u>Church Bank & Rosemary Road</u>			
<u>CIL – School Payment</u>		Resolved payment made March 2020	Complete
<u>Community Room Meeting</u>	29 09 21	Next meeting.	
<u>CW&C Local Plan Conversation</u>		Comments submitted	Complete
<u>Dog Fouling Signs</u>			
<u>Drop Kerbs</u>			
<u>Emails – Council</u>	31 08 21	Confirmed contractor to move website & create emails.	On-Going
<u>Emergency Plan</u>		Bags in Locations	
<u>Flood – Section 19</u>			On-Going
<u>Flood - Seepage</u>	31 08 21	Requested update	On-Going
<u>Friends of (PB, PK, LW)</u>		Meeting scheduled 06 10 21	
<u>Glebe & Barnfields (IK, JK, NM +)</u>		Meeting scheduled 06 10 21	
<u>High Viz</u>		Order	
<u>Jubilee Meeting</u>			
<u>Memorial</u>			On-Going
<u>Memorial Policy</u>		Policy published on-line & includes in policy list.	Complete
<u>Maintenance</u>		Walks Programme developed	
<u>Microphones</u>			
<u>Millennium Mile</u>	07 09 21	Works agreed with contractor	
<u>Neighbourhood Plan Review</u>			On-Going
<u>Risk Management</u>		Face to face Meetings RA – Litter Picking to TH	On-Going
<u>Speed Indicator Device - SID</u>	09 09 21 16 09 21	Contacted IR speed gun training Resent email to IR	

		Advertise for volunteers Set date for Training set dates for using SID	
<u>Speed Limit Review</u>	20 04 21 26 04 21	Request Review – spoke SB will be done but delayed due impacts of COVID on staff and traffic. Emailed DR confirm speed assessment Newton-by Tattenhall due to new homes. Consider extending speed limit – await outcome of review.	
<u>Spinney Project</u>			On-Going
<u>Welly Walk</u>			On-Going
<u>Youth Council</u>		28 09 21 – Jonny Kershaw	
<u>Youth Council – Youth Club</u>		FUNDING	
<u>Youth Council –Shelter</u>		ART HUB	
	17 11 20 09 12 20 07 04 21	Reported missing Newton Lane junction sign HW272322188 Checked reported – stated works scheduled to fix. Requested update Due with Edgecroft sign installation.	
	17 11 20	Reported 6x street lights Barbour Square – assume they are BE - HW273228949 Confirmed BE.	
	08 12 20	Chester footway reported – H281353336 08 12 20 – confirmation job raised with streetscene	
	10 12 20 14 12 20	Gully reported Newton Lane/Chester Road at Gatesheath. HW282431930 Highways confirmed job has been raised and raised with managers to prioritise.	
	25 01 21	Overflow blocked reported online plus email sent HW300008839	
	28 01 21	Reported blocked culvert Tattenhall Road (Groveswood CH3 9QQ) Ref HW301609752	
	22 03 21 14 04 21 26 04 21 18 05 21	Reported footway opposite Park Avenue HW318592206 Requested update - MB Requested update – MB Reported again - HW335918770	

1. Ensure priorities and 3-year plan are finalised by April 2021

This will include:

Neighbourhood plan and Climate Change personal priorities

Business Participation: involve CW&C for advice

Climate Change to be addressed after May 2021 in light of HM Gvt initiative

2. Create an up to date listing of items and required activities around Christmas by Jan 21 in order that future years can be properly organised
3. Derive management plan by March 2021 in order that maintenance is managed tighter
4. Prepare council to apply for Local Council Award Scheme with aim to achieve Quality Gold standard by Dec 2021

Tattenhall & District Parish Council Informal Meeting – War Memorial 27th September 2021 via Zoom.

PRESENT

John Bailey, Iain Keeping, Jonny Kershaw, Neil Matthews, Norman Sharp, Ann Wright (Clerk).

Purpose of Meeting: To discuss repair of War Memorial.

It was noted that the Memorial would need to be dismantled and rebuilt on a suitable base the cost of which was likely to be up to £30k.

Memorial Location

It was discussed that the existing location of the memorial is always going to be wet and whether there will always be an issue with the memorial moving in the future.

It was noted that the location was agreed by a public ballot in the 1920s.

It was discussed that siting the Memorial nearer to the church, possibly where the youth shelter is would have a number of advantages including earlier access for the Act of Remembrance given the increasing difficulty of organising road closures, the land is also drier. It was not believed there would be financial savings be relocating the memorial.

Memorial Appearance

It was discussed which parts of the current structure make up the memorial. It was agreed the Cross, plinth, plaques and 3 steps are key parts of the memorial, however the sandstone paving, and wall were perhaps not essential to the memorial.

It was noted that the sandstone wall had been pile driven when repaired, however it was noted there is movement in the wall recognised by the Tier report.

Funding

It was noted that as, yet funding had not been identified for the project and that the available founding would in fact determine the works to be undertaken.

It was noted several approaches had been made to the War Memorials Trust but not response had been received.

The Clerk had also contacted Historic England who had advise that funding for memorial can be obtained from the War Memorials Trust.

It was greed to also approach:

Heritage Lottery fund

Commonwealth & War Graves Commission

David Bish agreed to contact the Royal British Legion for help and advice.

The Clerk reported she had been contacted by CBS Conservation. It was agreed the Clerk should contact them regarding obtaining a 1st phase design and access to funding.

Bolesworth Estate

It was agreed to write the Nina Barbour to update her on the situation and seek the Estate's support for the project.

Ann Wright
28th September 2021

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

Notes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Working Group

Held virtually via ZOOM

14th September 2021

PRESENT

Chairman: Iain Keeping,

Stephen Hornby

Caryl Roberts

Esther Sadler-Williams

Peter Weston

Ann Wright (Clerk).

Lucy Hughes (LH) – Cheshire Community Action (CCA)

Public 2

Purpose of Meeting – To have discussion with Lucy Hughes, CCA on next steps for the Neighbourhood Plan Review including consultation.

It was reported there had been one successful review completed in Marton¹ in Cheshire East.

Catherine Morgetroyd's (CM) comments were forward to LH for consideration, the comments suggested that a referendum would be required to implement the proposed changes to the Plan.

It was suggested that if the changes are to bring the Plan into conformity with the CW&C Local Plans a referendum should not be required, and that the approval process would include the Reg. 14 consultation.

If a Plan is to go to referendum the consultation process would need to go back further than Reg. 14.

It was noted that any consultation would take place before the Plan would be submitted to the Examiner and that it is the Examiner who ultimately decides if a referendum is required.

Concern was raised that if the revised Plan went to a vote, it would not attract the same turnout as in October 2013, as residents are not under the same pressure from developers as they were then and are not as aware of the Plan, particularly as the community has grown considerably since 2013.

It was discussed that it was debatable if the proposed changes are significant or not as they bring the Plan into conformity with the Local Plan.

It was noted the Plan does not include a settlement boundary and instead refers to the built edge of the village. It was thought if a settlement Boundary was included in the revised Plan, it would be the same as that identified by CW&C, otherwise it would not be in conformity with the Local Plan.

It was noted the Plan includes green gaps policies between Tattenhall and Newton by Tattenhall and Gatesheath, CW&C overrode this policy in the Local Plan Part 2 when it identified land for development on Chester Road. This has been raised in the Council's response to the CW&C Local Plan conversation.

¹ <https://www.martonparishcouncil.org.uk/martons-neighbourhood-plan/>

LH confirmed she would have a conversation with CM to get a better understanding of why she thinks the possible changes would result in a referendum.

It was noted the Plan does not include policies relating to climate change.

It was noted until it becomes clearer if the revised Plan would need to go to Referendum it is not clear how much work needs to be done, and that this will shape the consultation carried out.

It was noted that CW&C are responsible for paying for a referendum, but they would receive the funding from central government.

A letter will be sent to the examiner with the submission explaining why the Group feels the Plan does not need to go to Referendum, it is not clear if the local authority could oppose this position in their submission to the examiner.

The examiner is chosen by CW&C in consultation with the group.

It was understood that inclusion of Design Code into Neighbourhood Plan does not require a referendum to be held.

It was agreed that if the re-designation of the Plan Boundary would result in a referendum it was not worth pursuing.

It was agreed to meet again to discuss next steps following LH review of CM comments.

FUTURE MEETINGS

- 16th September 2021 Aecom to discuss Design Code

Ann Wright
16/09/2021.

Notes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Working Group

Held virtually via ZOOM

16th September 2021

PRESENT

Chairman: Iain Keeping,

Sheila Chapman

Adele Evans

Stephen Hornby

Caryl Roberts

Ann Wright (Clerk).

Elliott Joddrell (EJ) – Aecom

Public 1

Purpose of Meeting – To have discussion with Elliot Joddrell, Aecom Baseline Section of Design Code.

Elliot Joddrell introduced himself as an urban designer who works for Aecom, based in Manchester and has worked on large number of Design Codes in the north of England.

It was noted that the model design code is urban dominated making it hard to translate to a rural setting.

It was noted that Tattenhall has a long existing Village Design Statement (VDS) which is held in high regard, and it was hoped that this could be updated into a Design Code retaining the relevant policies.

Character Areas

It was noted in the model Design Code there are a limited number of design codes which relate to a rural village, they tend to reflect more urban areas.

EJ confirmed that lots of rural villages tend to have a historic core, often a conservation area, as one character area, and around that, later developments which fall into a second character area, and the outlying rural area which falls into a third character area.

It was asked how important character areas are to a design code. Noting that Tattenhall has the historic core and conservation area and since the 1970s has experienced significant expansion.

It was noted not all the development which has taken place has enhanced the village for example developments with 3-storey properties are more urban in character.

EJ confirmed it makes sense to learn lessons from past development and that it would be helpful to expand the information included in the baseline study.

Design Codes

It was explained that the following can be addressed by Design Codes:

- Landscape – views into and out of the area. Preventing hard edges to settlements and retaining space within developments to retain views.
- Sustainability – codes to address rainwater runoff, and encourage renewable energy sources e.g., solar panels to be installed with low visual impact.
- Build Design – building heights, materials to be used e.g., Cheshire brick, material palette and scale
- Parking – parking of vehicles on a development can impact the quality, look and feel of a development, codes can set parking space and the position possibly behind the property's frontages.

- Gardens & Boundary Treatments – size of gardens, including back gardens.

It was noted that design codes can be applied to a specific area and can also be more general covering the whole area.

It was discussed if a design code could be included which would protect the frontages of the Oaklands and Greenlands area from becoming enclosed – it was suggested a code could be included to protect the open aspect of this area, noting that codes generally apply to new developments.

Codes when looking at boundary treatments which usually identify typical examples in an area.

It was highlighted that the VDS includes a range of policies which are still valid which it was hoped could be transferred into the design code including extensive information of views and vistas.

EJ confirmed he would revisit the VDS.

Concern was raised that it would be difficult to create sympathetic and detailed design codes for Tattenhall without being in the area. It was noted that EJ as a qualified urban designer will continue to work with the group as community representatives to create the design codes.

Concern was raised regarding the level of complexity for the design code and the resulting resources which had been allocated to Tattenhall which were seen as inadequate.

It was agreed to write to Aecom to highlight this concern and the lack of resources allocated to the project which allow for one meeting plus one site visit as the complexity had been identified as 'simple'.

It was noted the complexity level of a Design Codes in based on several factors including whether sites have been identified for future development, what housing numbers are still to be developed, and the size of the area.

It was recognised on paper villages appear to require simple design codes but that this is not always the case, and it is not clear what level of development they will face in the next 10 years.

It was agreed that EJ would review the list of areas identified by the Group in their June notes using google streetscene and would supply a list of areas where additional photographs were required for inclusion in the baseline study.

It was suggested that some photographers in the village might be asked to take the photographs.

It was noted that every area does not need to be included in the document.

It was discussed that areas outside the Tattenhall settlement may not require many design codes as development is limited in those areas to specific types by the CW&C Local Plan.

Developer Compliance

It was asked what weight design codes have in the planning process as a number of developers in the past have taken no notice of the VDS.

It was noted the Design Code is an evidence-based document which sits below the Neighbourhood Plan and is cross reference in Neighbourhood Plan policies and is therefore a material consideration in the planning process.

It was asked if inclusion of a Design Code into a made Neighbourhood Plan would trigger a referendum. EJ agreed to confirm to investigate this.

Next Steps

EJ to revise base line section of the Design Code based on information and photographs supplied by the Group and will start to draft design codes for consideration.

The chairman thanked all for attending the meeting including Elliott Joddrell.

FUTURE MEETINGS

TBC

Ann Wright
17/09/2021.

Minutes of Tattenhall & District Youth Council Meeting Virtual, 28th September 2021

PRESENT

Youth Councillors

Amelia Anna Beth Carys Frankie

Parish Councillors

Jonny Kershaw Lisa White

Clerk – Ann Wright

Chairman

Amelia agreed to chair the meeting.

Welcome

Parish Councillor Jonny Kershaw introduced himself and confirmed he'd been a councillor for over 18 years and lived in the centre of the village.

Apologies

None received.

Notes

The Council agreed the notes of the last meeting on the 13th July 2021.

Funding Arrangements

It was reported that the Parish Council had agreed a budget of up to £100 for the Council to purchase miscellaneous items, and that projects that cost more than £100 would need to go back to the Parish Council for discussion and approval.

Transition Request

The Council considered the request to speak at the Transition Engagement Day on the 11th October, they agreed they did not want to speak at the event but would consider attending the event. It was agreed the Clerk would obtain more details about the engagement day to circulate to the youth councillors.

Art Workshop

The Clerk reported that she had made contact with an artist² who could run a workshop to decorate the shelter and was going to forward the details of workshops including cost. It was agreed to email the details to councillors for consideration in advance of the October meeting.

The Clerk reported she had applied for grant funding to run an environmental art workshop³ possibly linked to the Spinney which the Youth Council might like to get involved with. It was suggested that this might be something which could be done in partnership with Transition Tattenhall.

Youth Club

It was noted that to date there had been 16 responses to the online youth club survey all of which supported the creation of youth club.

² [\(5\) dime one northwales graffiti art murals | Facebook](#)

³ <https://www.timpugh.co.uk/>

It was agreed that it would be a good idea to hold a number of pop-up youth clubs to see if young people were interested in attending and find out what they wanted the Youth Club to look like.

It was suggested that the Flacca would be a good location for a youth club due to the outside facilities.

It was agreed the first pop-up would be held on Friday evening and the second on a Monday.

New Membership

It was discussed that Youth Council needs new members to make it sustainable. It was agreed to include information in the next Parish News and to use the pop-up youth club sessions to attract new members.

It was also agreed to ask the Primary School and Bishop Heber to highlight the youth club survey and advertise for new members.

Future Meetings

Youth Club Update & Pop-up Session

Art Workshop Update

Next Meeting:

The next scheduled YOUTH COUNCIL MEETING
is on **Tuesday 19th October 2021**,
5.30pm Virtual (Zoom) Meeting.

Tattenhall Youth Club Survey

16 Responses 01:03 Average time to complete Active Status


1. Would you like to see Youth Club in Tattenhall?

Yes	15
No	0




2. How old are you?

0-7	0
8-11	4
12-15	6
16-18	5



3. Which school do you attend?

Tattenhall Park Primary School	4
Bickerton Primary School	0
Huxley Primary School	0
Bishop Heber High School	6
Christleton High School	4
Other	1




4. If Other, please state school attended.

1
Responses

Latest Responses

5. What would you like to be able to do at the youth club?

Gaming - computer, Play Stati...	4
Sport - football, basket ball	6
Art & Crafts	9
Cookery	4
Relax and chat	7
Buy refreshments - drinks and...	8
Listen to music	8
Combination of the above	7
Other	1





6. If Other, please list.



1
Responses

Latest Responses

7. Which day of the week would like to Youth Club to be held?



8. What time do you think the Youth Club should be held?



9. How long should a session of the Youth Club Last?

1 hour	0
2 hrs	13
3 hours	2
Other	0



10. If Other, please state how long a Session should last.

0
Responses

Latest Responses

11. Would you be happy to pay to attend the Youth Club

No	3
Yes up to £1	4
Yes up to £2	6
Yes up to £3	2



12. Is there anything else you want to mention?

0
Responses

Latest Responses

28 September 2021

Tattenhall & District Parish Council
This page has been left blank intentionally.