

# **Notes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Working Group Held virtually via ZOOM 13<sup>th</sup> July 2022.**

## **PRESENT**

Chairman: Iain Keeping,

Adele Evans

Dough Haynes

Caryl Roberts

Ann Wright (Clerk).

Public – 1

## Apologies

Pat Black, Sheila Chapman, Lucy Hughes (CCA), Ian Waddington, Peter Weston.

## Declaration of Interests

None declared.

## Notes of Previous Meetings

The group agreed the notes of the meeting held on the 4<sup>th</sup> May 2022.

## Public Participation

It was noted the public could comment during the meeting.

## Design Code

The Group reviewed the updated Design Code which had been circulated, it was discussed that it still lacked detail and therefore was not obviously about Tattenhall.

It was noted the document identifies 3 Character Areas:

1 – Historic Character Area

2 – Modern Character Area

3 – Surrounding Landscape Character Area

It was agreed codes need to be identified with one or more of the character areas and that this could be done in a table as had been done on the Bewdley Design Code. It was agreed this would be the easiest approach given the overlap of codes into different character areas.

The following comments were made during a review of the document:

Page 17 – Picture of Gorsefield to be replaced with Orchard now on Gorsefield.

Page 22 – Development at Newton-by-Tattenhall should be identified as a modern character area.

Page 24 – Historic Character Area

A discussion took place regarding whether codes identified for the historic centre could be used in other character areas. It was suggested that only the codes for the historic centre should apply in that character area but that there could be more flexibility in other character areas.

Page 25 – Cookes Court

It was noted that the Cookes Court development had some features of the historic centre but that the design of the development was weakened by the brick colour, roof pitches and amount of hard standing.

It was discussed the Design Code should highlight poor design in the area so that it is not replicated. It was highlighted that Old Mill Place was poor design in that it should never have been built on a site which floods.

It was agreed that good design should also be highlighted including Flacca Court.

It was noted that flat roof extensions should be avoided and that this was covered by the CW&C Supplementary Planning Document on extensions, however this document does not discuss boundary treatments.

Page 31 – Modern Character Area

Page 34 - Surrounding Landscape Character Area

It was noted this section includes photographs from the Newton-by-Tattenhall which should be included in the modern character area.

This was also true of pages 35 and 36.

Page 37 – Brick paved road at Newton-by-Tattenhall is not characteristic of the rural area and needs to be included in the modern character area.

Page 39 – 4 B, C, and D appear to be blank.

Pages 46 & 47 – Appears to be generic information with Tattenhall pictures added.

#### **Actions Identified:**

- Codes to be included in a table identifying areas they apply to.
- Development at Newton-by-Tattenhall to be included on modern character area.
- Iain to revise comparison table between amended Design Code and Village Design Statement and identify sections which need to be made less generic.

#### **Neighbourhood Plan Review**

It was discussed whether the Neighbourhood Plan boundary should be updated to match the Council boundary. It was noted that CW&C had indicated this would trigger a referendum, Concern was voiced that without significant publicity the referendum could have a low turnout especially compared to 2013 when residents were very aware of the Plan being developed and there was pressure on the village from developers.

It was agreed to meet with CW&C & Lucy Hugest go discuss the position and whether CW&C would recommend the Plan went to referendum if the boundary was updated and with the proposed policy changes.

Policy 1 – awaiting additional comments.

Policy 2 – it was suggested the word ‘unacceptably’ be retained, it was agreed this was vague and alternative wording was considered stating an exception would be made for development within a property’s curtilage and that any development should be subservient to the main property.

It was agreed to review environmental policies contained in the Upton Neighbourhood Plan.

It was suggested the Keysbrook should be identified along with the Millbrook.

#### **Actions Identified:**

Iain to review table and include comments for easier reading and where appropriate suggest amendments for consideration by the working group.

#### **Neighbourhood Plan Area**

Discussed under previous agenda item.

### **FUTURE MEETING**

Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2022 7.00pm via Zoom (TBC)

Ann Wright  
14/07/2022