

# Minutes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Committee

## Barbour Institute, Tattenhall

### 6<sup>th</sup> February 2020

#### **PRESENT**

Chairman: Iain Keeping

Pat Black, Adele Evans, Andy Freeman, Andrew Hull, Neil Matthews,  
Rebecca Robinson, Esther Sadler-Williams, Peter Weston.  
Ann Wright (Clerk)  
Public 1

#### **APOLOGIES**

Lisa Fearn (Inspire Villages)  
CW&C Cllr. Mike Jones

#### **DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

Pat Black noted her role as trustee of the Barbour Institute.

#### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

No matters raised.

#### **MINUTES**

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on the 28<sup>th</sup> November 2019 as a true and proper record and noted the minutes of the working group held 17<sup>th</sup> January 2020.

#### **MEMBERSHIP**

No change.

#### **MONITORING INDICATORS**

The Chairman took the Committee through the report which had been circulated with agenda, the following points were highlighted:

##### Aims

It was noted that as part of the review process the Committee needed to provide evidence if they wanted to make changes to the plan or to retain policies, as such there is need to review how effective the Plan's policies have been as well as review their compliance with CW&C Local Plan policies and the revised NPPF<sup>1</sup>.

It was noted any changes would need to be considered by CW&C.

It was also confirmed that the process was a means of monitoring CW&C's performance in following Plan policies.

##### Methodology

The performance of the Plan had been judged using the 8 Plan objectives against the indicators previously discussed using a framework based on the CW&C monitoring framework.

The policies had been reviewed against the decisions on almost all planning applications submitted for the Plan area from the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010 to the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019, but had not included applications which had been withdrawn.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Planning Policy Framework.

# **Minutes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Committee**

## **Barbour Institute, Tattenhall**

### **6<sup>th</sup> February 2020**

It was noted that there were discrepancies between housing numbers approved as the review had been based on decision dates rather than build completion dates.

This information is summarised at the end of the report.

As part of the review the length of time decisions took was also considered.

It was noted that two of the fastest decisions related to the Retirement Village, including the Phase 2 application which was decided in 33 days.

It was also noted that not all decision reports were available as such these could not be considered as part of the review.

#### Overview

It was noted that C2 refers to care institutions, which are not counted in the housing numbers, are not charged Council Tax and are not covered by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). C3 are residential properties which do count in the housing numbers, are charged Council Tax and are covered by the CIL.

It was noted the Designated Area is almost the same as the Parish Council area and includes Gatesheath, Newton etc, Tattenhall alone is identified as a Key Service Centre and has a housing allocation set by CW&C in the Local Plan 1.

#### Objective 1

Of five applications submitted for more than 30 homes during the review period two were approved before the Plan was made. It was noted that before the Plan there were 153 units applied per year, after the plan this reduced to 68 per year.

It was noted the policy of limiting developments to up to 30 homes was not intended to stop development and that this had been clarified by the judge at the time who had stated that it was a max. of 30 homes per site.

It was noted the Plan was made in 2014, and since then 84 applications made no reference to the Plan, and 172 made no reference to the VDS<sup>2</sup>, which is covered by Policy 2 of the Plan.

Both documents were regularly ignored by the Planning officers.

It was discussed that Paragraph 14 of the NPPF does not clarify whether the Neighbourhood Plan has precedence over the Local Plan. It is also not clear if CW&C does have a 5-year housing supply but Tattenhall itself has not met its housing number allocation whether the policies of both Plans are still overruled.

It is clear from the applications submitted before the Plan was made, that developers were pre-empting the Plan and that applications have been scaled back since the Plan was made.

---

<sup>2</sup> Village Design Statement

# **Minutes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Committee**

## **Barbour Institute, Tattenhall**

### **6<sup>th</sup> February 2020**

It was suggested some clarification of the wording of objective 1b was required which permitted 'smaller scale' development, it was suggested this was intended to be 'smaller scale' than 30 dwellings identified in objective 1a.

It was noted objective 1a describes development 'immediately adjacent to the built-up part of Tattenhall village' while the Local Plan uses the term 'settlement boundary'.

It was noted the Plan does not allocated any sites for development, but this should be considered as part of the review.

It was identified that two things needed to be considered:

- 1) The exact wording of the built-up edge or settlement boundary.
- 2) That although the housing target for Tattenhall has been met that does not stop future development.

It was noted policies had successfully limited the size of developments and would continue to do so and that it had been subject to rigorous assessment as part of the judicial review of the Plan.

The Committee considered the options identified 4.26 4) and 5) noting they could look at changing the settlement boundary, this could be based on the Keysbrook and Millbrook, the settlement boundary could exclude the Retirement Village.

Committee members were asked to consider these and other options for discussion at the next meeting as well as options relating to objective 1b. It was noted that any comments made before the meeting should be emailed to the Clerk.

The lack of infrastructure including the services, (gas, drainage and electricity), and amenities were noted, it was suggested the village was coming close to being saturated in new housing.

#### **MODIFICATION OF PLAN**

No further discussion.

#### **CW&C PLANNING QUESTIONS**

The Committee reviewed the questions previously submitted to CW&C and agreed to raise the following questions again:

- 1) Do CW&C now accept that Tattenhall now has no outstanding land requirement?
- 2) If the Council decides that land requirement has been met, what will be the process to cancel Policy R2 and prevent its use to override strategic policies?
- 3) Why was there no inclusion of an affordable element when application 17/02888/S73, Gifford Lea, was considered and how will the Council address this failure?

#### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was confirmed the new footpath between Tattenhall and Newton by Tattenhall is expected to be completed by May 2020, and it is hoped properties can be released mid-May. It was noted

**Minutes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Committee  
Barbour Institute, Tattenhall  
6<sup>th</sup> February 2020**

Highways had insisted that the services are not put in at the same time as such there will be four separate batches of road works and disruption. It was noted the site includes 19 affordable houses of mixed tenure.

**FUTURE MEETING DATES**

**NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020 at 7.30pm  
Boys Room, Barbour Institute.

Ann Wright 07/02/2020