

**Minutes of  
Tattenhall & District Parish Council Meeting  
Held 7<sup>th</sup> March 2022 at the Barbour Institute.**

**PRESENT**

Councillors

Chairman – J. Kershaw

J. Bailey	P. Black	S. Chapman	C. Elliott	M. Foster
-----------	----------	------------	------------	-----------

D. Haynes	P. Kerr	N. Matthews	N. Sharp	L. White
-----------	---------	-------------	----------	----------

Clerk – Ann Wright

CW&C Cllr Mike Jones

Public – 20

**APOLOGIES**

The Council noted that Stephen Hornby and Lesley Jones had stood down from the Council.

Iain Keeping – Unwell

Andy Scarratt – Unwell

**DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

No interests declared.

**MINUTES**

**RESOLVED 22/75** – That the Council approves the minutes of the meeting held on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Gifford Lea Application

The following points were raised by residents:

Services & Infrastructure

The original 3 Phase development that had been proposed had been well structured, now before the third phase has been delivered, with additional developments at Newton-By-Tattenhall and Chester Road we are faced with fourth phase and the real threat that the services and infrastructure of Tattenhall will be overwhelmed.

Noise & Disturbance

Those living adjacent to the development are facing 5 years of distribution, noise and fumes from the building works, delivery lorries etc.

Concept

The concept originally had been to meet the need for homes for older people from Tattenhall, however this has not been the case and these are expensive properties. It was noted that the Developer having met with Councillors on the 12<sup>th</sup> December had not responded to questions raised until the day of this meeting, a resident highlighted he had submitted comments himself and had still not received a response.

Gifford Lea Services

A resident of Gifford Lea stated that the infrastructure for further development is not present within the Gifford Lea itself in addition to the wider village of Tattenhall.

It was noted that the facilities at Gifford Lea are already under pressure before phase 3 is occupied, particularly in relation to parking.

### Health Care

Great concern was emphasised regarding the ability of the Doctor's surgery to meet increasing demand, stating it was already difficult to get an appointment.

Residents of Gifford Lea reported that a large number of properties from Phases 1 and 2 are not yet occupied.

*Cllr White declared a pecuniary interest in this matter and left the meeting having taken no part in the discussions.*

It was asked if Phase 4 would be supplied by the existing energy centre and concerns were raised regarding the fumes that it produces and the fact it is an eyesore which impacts the residents of Gifford Lea, Gorsefield and Covert Rise.

Ed Harvey introduced himself as the Planning Agent for the application made the following comments:

### Services & Infrastructure

That he took the comments on board regarding services and infrastructure and stated Tattenhall was a suitable location for this development as a local service centre and has sufficient capacity.

### Health Care

The CW&C public health team will review the application regarding the impacts on health care and the doctor's and if deficiencies are identified the developer will be required to provide financial support.

### Settlement Boundary

The proposed Phase 4 development although outside the original development footprint is within the settlement boundary of Tattenhall and is not in open countryside. The ecological land lost will be replaced by a large area of land.

### Highways

The Highway Consultant's survey has demonstrated the roads can accommodate the further development and CW&C Highways Dept have raised no objections.

### Housing Need

There is an acute need for additional older people's homes in CW&C and the development will make an important contribution to satisfying this need.

### Energy Centre

Will Garner confirmed the energy centre has been constructed to accommodate a 4<sup>th</sup> phase and its construction will improve its efficiency, he stated the fumes are in fact water vapour and that he would be happy to work with residents of Gifford Lea to improve its appearance.

It was confirmed that further information is due to be submitted to CW&C regarding the energy centre which will be available on the CW&C planning pages.

### Extra Care

It was explained that the development is described as C2 due to the availability of communal facilities, it was confirmed that the planning application includes a planning statement explaining the C2 classification.

Residents explained that the development was originally proposed as providing graduated levels of care, but this has not been delivered.

### Parking & Ecology

It was reported that there is currently insufficient parking at Gifford Lea and that this will be worsened by further reductions in parking spaces with the development of Phase 4. Little consideration has been given to the real situation. It was stated parking will spread onto Frog Lane. It was stated the replacement of the ecological site with part of a field although creating a larger area was no real compensation for the loss of the ecology on the existing site.

Mr Harvey explained that surveys had not identified any speeding or congestion issues.

### Marketing Suite

It was stated that retaining the additional parking where the marketing suite was positioned could be considered.

Residents stated that they had been reassured on several occasions that Clough Lane would be closed.

### **PLANNING**

1) 22/00194/FUL - Full planning application for 27 Extra Care Units (Use Class C2), with associated access, parking, landscaping, ecological enhancements and other works - Gifford Lea Retirement Village Frog Lane Tattenhall.

**RESOLVED 22/76** – That the Council submit the following observations:

Tattenhall & District Parish Council strongly objects to this application for the following reasons:

The proposed development will create an unacceptably large-scale uniform development which is not in keeping with the character of the local area in terms of its scale or grain. As such the application is contrary to Policy 1 of the Tattenhall & District Neighbourhood Plan (TDNP). The Phase 4 application is against the spirit of the TDNP as identified by Mr Justice Supperstone in his findings of the judicial review with regard to adding additional phases of less than 30 properties to developments.

The proposed development will increase the pressure on the already overstretched services in Tattenhall including medical facilities and health as well as on infrastructure including roads. Given the nature and age of residents of the proposed development the pressure on these services will continue to increase over a number of years following the occupation of properties.

The application fails to provide adequate detail as to the tenure of the affordable properties to be provided.

The addition of more older person's housing threatens the vibrancy and vitality of Tattenhall village centre and its businesses by contributing to the population of Tattenhall being dominated by older generations and is therefore contrary to Policy 4 of TDNP.

The application does not maximise opportunities to increase walking and cycling and will create properties outside the walking distance to Tattenhall village centre increasing the reliance on vehicles and as such is contrary to Policy 5 of the TDNP.

The proposed development will contribute and extend the period of pollution, noise and disturbance suffered by adjacent residents and will have a lasting detrimental impact on their well-being.

Tattenhall has already reached its housing numbers and the application fails to justify the need for this development, particularly given the number of empty properties in Phases 1 and 2 of the Gifford Lea development.

As such the developer is called upon by the Parish Council to undertake an up-to-date housing needs survey in partnership with the Parish Council to establish the true need for older people's accommodation in Tattenhall. As such no application should be approved until an independent housing needs survey has been completed.

It was noted that CW&C Cllr Mike Jones has called the application in to be considered by the Planning Committee. It was agreed the Council will nominate a Councillor to speak on behalf of the Council at the Committee based on comments submitted.

*Cllr Lisa White re-joined the meeting.*

## 2) Planning Register

Councillors noted the planning register as circulated.

22/00472/CAT - Large leylandii at front of house – section fell and grind stump 300mm below ground level - The Rookery, Chester Road, Tattenhall, CH3 9AH.

**RESOLVED 22/78** – That the Council request clarification as to which tree is to be felled as there is no leylandii on the photograph provided.

22/00293/FUL - Construction of a veranda to the (south) side elevation over existing patio area - 2 Covert Rise, Tattenhall, CH3 9HA.

**RESOLVED 22/79** – That the Council submit no objection.

## 2) Further Planning Applications Received

21/04862/FUL – Single Storey rear extension – 47 Rean Meadow, Tattenhall, CH3 9PU.

**RESOLVED 22/80** – That council submit no objection.

22/00790/FUL & 22/00608/LBC - Partial demolition of lean to & erection of 2 storey extension - Henhull Cottage, Burwardsley Road, Tattenhall, CH3 9NS.

**RESOLVED 22/81** – That council submit no objection.

## 4) Lead Planning Councillors

Cllrs Keeping and Kerr lead on planning until April meeting.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

### Ukraine Crisis

The Parish Council was asked to help coordinate a group to collect funding for the Ukraine Crisis, it was agreed to try and do this noting the urgency of the situation.

It was agreed to fly the Ukraine flag in support of the nation.

### Orchard & Spinney

A resident thanked the Parish Council and CW&C for their work creating the new orchard off Gorsefield. He also congratulated the Parish Council on the continued success of the Spinney.

It was asked when a maintenance schedule would be agreed for The Spinney, it was confirmed this will be presented at the Council's April meeting.

### Glebe Meadow

Representatives TWiG<sup>1</sup> and Transition Tattenhall requested that the Council reconsider the recommendation to allow public access onto Glebe Meadow and that the Council enter a partnership with the groups to conserve and preserve this valuable village asset.

It was noted that climate change will bring with it some huge decisions and that this decision would allow for a collaborative approach in the future.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tattenhall Wildlife Group

The Council was asked how it will meet its duty to protect biodiversity if it opens up Glebe Meadow. It was agreed a written response will be provided.

A resident stated she had undertaken a survey of the ecology on Glebe Meadow as part of her studies in 2017 and had had an opportunity to really appreciate the bio-diversity on the site, particularly the insects which are an important part of the ecosystems. She stated that grassland of this nature is very rare locally and nationally and they crucial to the continuation of these ecosystems. She stated the site is a fantastic resource for both the school and adults.

#### War Memorial

It was asked if consideration could be given to relocating the benches to allow their use while the memorial is fenced off and being worked on.

#### **PRESENTATION KLOUD9**

Tom Henaghen, Operations Manager for Kloud 9 explained that Kloud which was founded in 2006 is working to connect both businesses and residential properties to superfast fibre broadband in rural areas where Openreach do not provide this service.

They are working with the government gigabit voucher scheme which provide £1500 per property to connect to fibre broadband where it is not readily available.

It was confirmed they had distributed fliers around the village and were looking for expressions of interest to join the scheme and require 40% properties to express and interest to proceed.

They confirmed they would share more information on the project and how it is proceeding in the future.

#### **GLEBE MEADOW**

Councillors noted the notes of the meeting held the 15<sup>th</sup> February with Roger Goulding head of CW&C green infrastructure, from page 128 of the Minutes. It was noted that there was very little difference in the way the Parish Council proposed to maintain Glebe Meadow from how TWiG had maintained it, the difference of opinion is over allowing public access.

It was recognised that despite its rural location Tattenhall has a significant short fall in accessibly green spaces which it is widely recognised contribute to people's health and well-being.

**RESOLVED 22/82** – That the Council agree the recommendation from the meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> February:

- That the field be cut and baled twice yearly as recommended, first cut early July, second cut September – strips/islands to be retained and moved annually.
- Council looks to undertake Hedge laying as a community project.
- Path (meandering) to be mown through field and moved annually.
- Open up accesses to path.
- Allow dogs on leads.
- Appropriate signage including possible interpretation boards.
- Develop communication strategy around value of site, guided walks, possible inclusion in revised Millennium Mile Guide.
- Consider stopping up of water supply.
- Remove central fence.
- Consider locating benches to enjoy vistas and relocation or introduction of additional bins.

## WAR MEMORIAL

Councillors noted the notes of the meeting held the 11<sup>th</sup> February, from page 131 of the Minutes. It was noted given the construction of the Memorial it has been suggested it is not dismantled but held in place while works are carried out underneath.

A brief is now being developed for the project on this basis which will be used to appoint a consultant to carry out the repairs.

It was agreed to look at the feasibility of relocating the benches to allow for their use.

## PLATINUM JUBILEE CELEBRATIONS

It was noted that an event to celebrate the Queen's Jubilee is being organised for Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> June from 3pm at the Flacca, the event will include activities, food stalls with the sports club running the event in the evening. A marquee has been booked.

A grant application has been submitted to fund the majority of the event including further art workshops the outcome of this will be known at the beginning of April.

**RESOLVED 22/83** – That the Council earmark up to £4K to cover costs if the grant application is declined, and the Council apply for a £1k from CW&C Cllr Mike Jones for the event.

## ACCOUNTS & PAYMENTS

### 1) Accounts & Payments

**RESOLVED 22/84** – That the council approve the accounts and payments and bank reconciliation as circulated, page 83 of the Cash Book:

A. Wright	Salary	1097.31
HMRC	NI/PAYE	229.67
Shires	Payroll - Sept, Oct & Nov	54.00
PJH Outdoor Solutions	Xmas & MM Posts	750.00
Amenity Tree Care	Tree Works	510.00
Horticon Ltd	Spinney Works Invoice 2	18490.45
Ensign Flag Co. Ltd	Flags x2 & rope	265.20
Shires	Payroll - DEC	18.00
Tarporley Parish Council	Nalc Event Contribution	17.92
A. Wright	REIM. SLCC Subs (44%)	102.96
Nest	Pension Contribution	55.99
A. Wright	Salary	935.36
HMRC	NI/AYE	113.52
Horticon Ltd	Spinney Works Invoice 3	7891.20
SSE	Memorial Power	26.84
Water+	Allotments Water	24.81
T. Pugh Artist	Spinney Workshop	250.00
Barbour Institute	Room Hire - Workshops	195.50
SSE	Xmas Lights Power	60.51
Creative Lives Charity	Youth Shelter Grant Return	500.00
Alison's Country Kitchen	Orchard Refreshments	30.00
Sarah Gallagher	Willow workshop	250.00
Edsential	Spinney Arts Project	720.00
Shires	Payroll - JAN	18.00
Barbour Institute	Room Hire - Jan	9.75
PJH Outdoor Solutions	Glebe Hedge Cut & Sandbags	174.00
Cumbria Clock Company	Church Clock Service	186.00

Y. Keeping	Reim. Jubilee- Crown Crafting	32.11
A. Wright	Reim. Workshop materials & Zoom	61.16
Windmill Farm	Christmas Trees 2021	345.00
A. Wright	Salary	935.36
HMRC	NI-PAYE	113.52
Nest	Pension Contribution	55.99

## 2) Community Grants

**RESOLVED 22/85** –That the council advertise for small community grant application for consideration at the Council's April meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.10pm.

Ann Wright 08/03/2022

### **Next scheduled Parish Council Meeting**

Monday 4<sup>th</sup> April 2022

Billiards Room, Barbour Institute.



**Tattenhall & District Parish Council  
Informal Meeting – Glebe Meadow  
15<sup>th</sup> February 2022**

**PRESENT**

CW&C – Roger Goulding

Tattenhall & District Parish Council – Iain Keeping (chair), Jonny Kershaw, Neil Matthews.  
Ann Wright (Clerk).

Transition Tattenhall – Nick Benefield, Jenn Benefield.

TWiG – Terri Hull.

**Purpose of Meeting: To discuss management of Glebe Meadow**

Roger Goulding introduced himself as the CW&C lead for Green Infrastructure and biodiversity for the Borough.

**Maintenance**

Mr Goulding confirmed that the field was a fantastic asset for the village. He recommended managing the field as a hay meadow where the cutting of the grass and its removal would prevent the nutrients returning to the soil which would allow sward species to grow.

He recommended leaving strips or Islands uncut to provide shelter for species and that these could be rotated each year.

He recommended two cuts one in summer when farmers are hay cutting and a second cut in September. The September cut should be as close to the ground as possible as this will open up the sward.

It was noted that livestock on the field would result in a greater variation of the sward however the movement of the tractor will contribute to this in the absence of livestock.

It was noted the majority of flowers will have flowered by the time of the first cut or will continue to flower and seed during the year. It was reported that seed can lay dormant for 7 or 8 years.

It was noted that if there are particularly valuable plants it is possible to leave that patch unmown and to collect seeds by hand.

It was noted that where the use of livestock to graze the land is not practical, as in the case of Glebe Meadow, that mowing is the only viable solution.

Mr Goulding confirmed he was undertaking other soil sampling and could take a soil sample of Glebe Meadow which he suggested would have low levels of nutrients and would have patches of neutral soil, with others areas on the acidic side of neutral.

It was noted that there are thistles, docks and nettles at the boundary of the field but these were not encroaching onto the field and provide a valuable habitat for some species.

It was noted that every growing season will be different but that the first cut would normally be around the second week in July when farmers will be mowing for hay.

It was suggested that it would be possible to do two mows per year for two or three years then have a year with one cut before reverting to two cuts.

Mr Goulding highlighted the best option is to get a local farmer to mow and bale the field rather than using specialist environmental or conservation companies who can charge up to 12x the cost of a local contractor.

It was agreed that it would be easier to mow the field if the fencing across the middle of the field was removed.

A query was raised about the size of tractor used on the field. Mr Goulding confirmed was not normally an issue as it won't be a large combine carrying out the work. It was also noted larger tractors with larger tyres do less damage due to the weight distribution. The works will also be undertaken when it is dry.



Mr Goulding noted the management of the field in this way far outweighed any harm. It was noted that most of the sugars/nutrients will return to the soil in August.

### Access

Mr Goulding was asked to comment on possible public access to the site noting that is not currently to the public.

Mr Goulding confirmed that the access was a matter for the community, but there is need to spark the enthusiasm and interest of future generations in our environment and they need to be access sites such as this. He suggested the mowing of path through the site providing access from one side to the other of the field and that the path could be moved annually.

He confirmed that installing the correct signage was important, the signage should:

- Highlight the site is special and why it is special.
- Avoid lists things that can't be done – take a positive approach.
- *"Lots of people love this site we hope you will love it too...."*

It was discussed if dogs should be permitted in the field. It was suggested the fact the field is fenced may encourage people to let their dogs off leads. As such it was suggested that rather than installing gates the accesses should be left open. It was also discussed that access could be removed if the site is abused and that initially dogs should only be permitted on leads and confined to the mown path. As with all open spaces dog fouling is an offence.

Mr Goulding expressed his belief that there is a need to invest in wildlife areas where they can be seen and heard and contribute to the quality of life.

Mrs Hull highlighted this approach supports the important principle of green prescribing. It was recognised the site is a great resource for the school and uniformed groups who have historically had supervised access to it.

### Chester Road hedge

It was agreed the Chester Road hedge requires cutting at least the height of the gate to open up the view. The clerk contacted the Council's contractor who confirmed it can be cut back from the roadside and lowered before the start of the nesting season.

It was agreed it would be an excellent project to lay the hedge in the winter. Mrs Hull and Mr Goulding agreed to contact people regarding this.

Mrs Hull suggested that wooden benches should be provided.

### Trees

Mr Goulding confirmed if trees do not present a health and safety risk, he would allow them to decay and naturally fragment, noting to a certain extent trees will self-pollard. He would leave branches piled next the tree trunk.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations will be put to the Parish Council for consideration:

- That the field be cut and baled twice yearly as recommended, first cut early July, second cut September – strips/islands to be retained and moved annually.
- Council looks to undertake Hedge laying as a community project.
- Path (meandering) to be mown through field and moved annually.
- Open up accesses to path.
- Allow dogs on leads.
- Appropriate signage including possible interpretation boards.
- Develop communication strategy around value of site, guided walks, possible inclusion in revised Millennium Mile Guide.

- Consider stopping up of water supply.
- Remove central fence.
- Consider locating benches to enjoy vistas and relocation or introduction of addition bins.

Ann Wright  
16<sup>th</sup> February 2022

## **Informal War Memorial Site Meeting**

### **11<sup>th</sup> February 2022**

#### **PRESENT**

Parish Councillors – John Bailey, Iain Keeping, Jonny Kershaw, Norman Sharp, Ann Wright (Clerk).

Chester Cathedral – Ted Comer (Clerk of Works), Tom Livingston (Stonemason), Naomi Watts-Kitto (Conservator),

#### **Purpose of Meeting: To discuss repair of War Memorial.**

It was highlighted that the area around the Memorial is frequently flooded and that the Millfield and land around the Memorial is to be used as an area to hold the water during flooding.

It was noted that the priority is to retain the Memorial, which is in 3 sections, the base of 4 steps, the shaft and cross. It was discussed the rest of the area should be levelled for accessibility and possibly surfaced with grasscrete allowing it to be grassed.

It was explained that the Cathedral has not had its own team for the last 3 or 4 decades and the current team has only been in place for the last 3 years and as such has limited resources and would not be able to take over the project but could offer a range of help and support.

It was suggested the project needs to be managed by a conservation architect.

It was discussed if the project could be phased:

Phase 1 – Dismantling and storage of Memorial.

Phase 2 – Construction of base for Memorial.

It was thought the stone could be stored on the Millfield.

It was discussed that reducing the size of the base would reduce the weight to be supported but that needs to be balanced against a larger surface area spreading the weight of the Memorial.

It was noted the Memorial is made of Cheshire Red Sandstone which was most likely quarried locally on the Bolesworth Estate, although it was thought there are two modern posts at the front of the wall.

It was suggested the plaques could be restored during the works.

It was discussed that the Memorial will have been pinned using an iron dowel and that when the Memorial is being dismantled there is a risk that the pressure on the dowel could split the memorial. As such any company undertaking the works will require adequate insurance.

It was noted these works would require a road closure and a large crane.

It was noted that planning permission is not required to undertake emergency works for safety reasons.

It was noted that dismantling the Memorial, given its construction, will be very challenging. As such it was suggested a better option would be to leave the Memorial in place and support it while undertaking works to support the base. It was suggested it might help to install some drains below the Memorial to help remove water.

#### **Next Steps:**

It was noted the Clerk is still waiting for prices from companies for the project.

Create brief (John Bailey) to ask structural engineers to quote for works which will be forwarded to the cathedral team to comment on.

Update CW&C Conservation Officer of situation.

Representatives from the Cathedral confirmed they would be happy to meet structural engineers on site to discuss the project and also to attend the site when works are taking place to monitor the protection of the Memorial.

The Cathedral might be able to help identify sources of funding noting that it is difficult to obtain funding through the War Memorial Trust.

It was suggested that funding could be raised by people buying paving stones similar to the Church path or by asking construction companies building in Tattenhall to provide support.

Ann Wright  
11<sup>th</sup> February 2022.