

**Minutes of Tattenhall & District
Parish Council Meeting
Held virtually via Zoom, 5th October 2020**

PRESENT

Councillors

Chairman – I. Keeping

P. Black	G. Blackhurst	S. Chapman	D. Haynes	L. Jones
J. Kershaw	N. Matthews	C. Parry	E. Saddler Williams	
A. Scarratt	N. Sharp	L. White		

Non-Parish Councillors

CW&C Cllr Mike Jones

Public – 8

APOLOGIES

All councillors present.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Cllr Black declared an interest in item 16.4 the Barbour Institutes application for Covid funding, she confirmed she would remain in the meeting but not take part in the discussion or vote.

Cllr Jones declared an interest in relation to the street naming on Gifford Lea as she is employed by Inspire Villages, she confirmed she would take no part in the discussion.

PARISH NEWS

It was noted Cllr Keeping is responsible for the Parish News report, the deadline for which is the 9th October.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Chester Road Development

The Council were asked to consider the proposed path which runs at the rear of 2-4 Ravensholme Court due to the nature of these properties and the size the gardens the path will result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for these residents.

The following questions were raised regarding the development:

- 1) Can you confirm the orientation of the first house on the development which is opposite 2 Brook Hall Cottages, does the entrance or garden facing the existing dwelling?
- 2) Can you clarify how much of the existing hedgerow will be removed by this dwelling, is it removed as far back as the Copse by Ravensholme court?

It was agreed the Clerk would obtain the answers to the above and forward to the residents in question.

Mill Brook Nature Park

It was confirmed that due to the deadline the Council was not able to apply for funding from the Green Recovery Challenge Fund however further funding would be available to apply for in the 2021 which would allow more time for the preparation of the application.

Field next to Chester Road Development

The Council was asked to consider finding out who owns the remaining third of the field next to the proposed Chester Road development as it had been suggested in the past this should be obtained for a community wood and to protect the land from development in the future. It was agreed to forward this to the Neighbourhood Review Committee to consider.

MINUTES

RESOLVED 20/310 - that the Chairman sign, as a correct record the circulated minutes of Parish Council meeting held on the 7th September 2020 when possible.

ACTIONS

The Council noted the actions list as circulated, from page 356 of the minutes.

PLANNING

1) Planning Register

Councillors noted the planning register, pages 59 and 60 including comments submitted since the last meeting noting that the following comment had been submitted for application 20/03111/FUL, 52 Keysbrook since the agenda had been published:

The proposal is in accord with the Tattenhall Village design statement and the Neighbourhood plan. The Parish Council have no objection.

20/03263/FUL – Exterior of house to be rendered & clad in timber, new external doors and windows, internal alterations & conversion of garage, installation of flue, enlargement of driveway, erection of new shed – 19 Greenlands, Tattenhall, CH3 9QX.

RESOLVED 20/311 – that Tattenhall & District Parish Council submit the following comments: The proposal is in accord with the Tattenhall Village Design Statement. The Parish Council have no objection.

2) 20/02824/FUL, Erection of 30 dwellings together with associated public open space & infrastructure, Land at Chester Road Tattenhall.

RESOLVED 20/312 – that Tattenhall & District Parish Council submit the following comments: Tattenhall & District Parish Council has no objection to the application.

The Council recognises the application conforms with the Tattenhall Village Design Statement. The Council would like to raise concerns regarding the location of the proposed path at the rear of 2-4 Ravensholme Court, due to the nature of these properties and the limited size of the gardens the path will result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for these residents, as such we ask the path is relocated to address this concern.

The Council asks that the applicant confirms the amount of open space provided in the development as this information is missing from the application.

The Council asks that conditions are imposed to ensure the development complies with the conditions of policy R2 of the CW&C Local Plan Part 2.

It should be noted that the application is in fact contrary to the Tattenhall & District Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2 as it encroaches on the gap between the Tattenhall and Gatesheath settlements.

3) Applications received since publication of agenda

The Council confirmed it had no objection to the proposed street name, Sandstone Close, for the Gifford Lea development.

4) CLT Application Update

It was noted the CLT application had not gone to the September CW&C planning committee meeting as the planning officer had raised a number of additional queries, a site meeting has been arranged to try and resolve these issues.

5) Response to Government White Paper

The Council noted the response submitted on the Government White Paper on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Review Committee and the Parish Council.

6) Lead Planning Councillors

It was noted that Councillors Chapman and White are the lead planning Councillors until October meeting.

TRANSITION VILLAGE

It was reported that there had been 2 meetings of the Transition Group and the group were focusing on exploring the background of the transition concept and existing relationships to identify the best way forward. The Group plans to speak to the Youth Council and have further discussions with the Sandstone Ridge Trust.

MILL BROOK NATURE PARK

1) Spinney Project Master Plan

The Council considered the master plan produce by John Seiler and the notes of the meeting held on the 25th September, from page 358 of the Minutes.

Support was voiced for the design and project, however concerns were raised regarding the expense of the project to deliver and to maintain in the future.

It was agreed that the Council should proceed with developing the Spinney area based on the project attracting grant funding and where possible grants should also cover future maintenance.

It was noted the Council will need to consider allocating funding to support grant applications and that this could be allocated from CIL funding.

2) Project Partnership

Matter deferred to future meeting.

3) Application for Funding

Matter deferred to future meeting.

4) Earmarking of Funding for Project

Matter deferred to future meeting when funding situation is known.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW

The Council noted the minutes of the Committee meetings on the 9th and 23rd September, from page 361 of the minutes. It was noted the working group has now reached the point where the performance of the Plan has been reviewed and there is a need to carryout public consultation. It was noted given the current Covid pandemic and the uncertainty created by the Government's planning white paper it may not be possible to undertake the consultation however work can be done to prepare it.

It was noted the Committee is in the process of arranging meeting with Cheshire Community Action to discuss moving forward and possible consultation and also Rob Charnley, CW&C Head of Planning, to discuss the findings of the monitoring report.

TATTENHALL ROAD FOOTWAY

It was noted despite assurances the new footway would link with the existing footway into Tattenhall from Newton by Tattenhall, it had become clear that the developer did not have the required permission from a landowner to connect the two paths. The Council had been advised of a scheme which had been developed which would allow for the paths to be connected by creating a 1.2m rather than 1.8m wide footway and by narrowing the carriage way.

RESOLVED 20/313 – that Tattenhall & District Parish Council object to the proposed scheme as the proposed narrowing of the carriage will make it extremely dangerous for large vehicles to pass each other particularly in the dark and would create a danger for the increased pedestrians that will use the path once the new dwellings are occupied.

The Parish Council supports the relocation of the telegraph pole and removal of the tree which are currently preventing the linking of the footpaths by compulsory purchase if required, noting the developer has had some time to resolve this issue.

The Parish Council does not support any occupation of the new dwellings before this matter is resolved and the footways are linked.

REMEMBRANCE

It was noted that due to the on-going Covid-19 Pandemic the usual arrangements for Remembrance Sunday are not able to go ahead. As such plans have been drawn up for the service to go ahead at St Alban's and for a limited number of wreaths to be laid within the church, these will later be moved to the memorial the details of which had been forwarded to Councillors before the meeting.

Cllrs Chapman and Kershaw agreed they would act as stewards at the service and Cllr Black agreed to undertake the reading on behalf of the Council.

It was noted that regulations regarding social distancing may change before November and that these would continue to be monitored.

CHRISTMAS 2020

The notes of the Community Pride meeting held on the 17th September were noted, page 368 of the minutes.

1) Erection of Christmas Trees & Wreaths

It was agreed that the Parish Council would purchase Christmas trees as in previous years.

RESOLVED 20/314 – That the Council employ MJBs to decorate the Millfield tree and erect the smaller trees and wreaths.

The Clerk will discuss the details particularly regarding size of the Millfield Tree and report back to the Council.

2) Elf Trail

It was agreed that the Council would run an Elf Trail from the 1st December until the 2nd January 2021, and that families, groups and businesses would be encouraged to make Elves to decorate Tattenhall, particularly along the High Street.

YOUTH COUNCIL

The Council noted that Cllr White was now the lead Councillor for the Youth Council due to the resignation of Cllr Gibson who would still be involved with the project.

It was noted that the Youth Council had met on the 28th September and that their priority was to increase their membership.

TREE POLICY

RESOLVED 20/315 – That the Council adopt the Tree Policy as circulated from, page 369 of the minutes.

ACCOUNTS & PAYMENTS

1) Half Year Accounts

RESOLVED 20/316 – that the Council approve the half year accounts as listed on page 51 of the Cash Book and confirmed the following payments:

P. Marsden	Reimbursement: Plant Food	14.49
Sanctuary Housing	Garage Rental	50.40
Cumbria Clock Company	Church Clock maintenance	186.00
I. Keeping	Reimbursement – Support Line phone	42.00
Furnells	BKV Plaque	202.80

2) Accounts & Payments

RESOLVED 20/317 – that the Council approve the payments as listed on page 52 of the Cash Book.

A. Wright	Salary	756.48
P. Marsden	Salary (watering)	21.60
HMRC	Paye/NI	267.80
Nest	Pension contribution	52.91
SPS	Payroll services	34.20
Grants Gardening Services	Grounds maintenance	766.00
Tilston Parish Council	Contribution Clerk training	10.00
Waterplus	Allotment water	13.78

3) Additional Invoices

RESOLVED 20/318 – that the Council approve the additional invoices received since publication of the agenda:

SPS	Payroll services	34.20
-----	------------------	-------

4) BI Covid Funding

RESOLVED 20/319 – that the Council give grant to the Barbour Institute from the emergency Covid fund of £483.86

The meeting closed at 9.04pm.

Signed

Dated

Ann Wright 06/10/2020

**The next meeting of the PARISH COUNCIL MEETING
is on Monday 2nd November 2020, 7.30pm**

Action List

Action	Date	Comments	Complete
<u>Bunting Brackets</u>	08 09 20 21 09 20 23 09 20 28 09 20	All property owners' permissions obtained. Checked necessary planning permissions required. Consider moving bunting backet to Butchers Forwarded contact number to BT Requested update	
<u>Church Bank & Rosemary Road</u>	12 02 20 12 02 20 01 09 20	Emailed Highways for update Emailed BE – Rosemary Row update Requested update	
<u>Christmas Elf Trail</u>			Oct Agenda
<u>Christmas Carol Singing</u>	23 09 20 24 09 20	Seek advice from CW&C Circulated advice	
<u>Christmas Trees & Wreaths</u>	18 09 20	Requested priced	
<u>Climate Day</u>			Consider 2021
<u>Community Room Meeting</u>	19 03 20	Cancelled will reschedule when schools reopen.	
<u>Dog Fouling Signs</u>			
<u>Drop Kerbs</u>	12 02 20 01 09 20	Emailed Highways for update Requested update	
<u>Emergency Plan</u>		Submit to CW&C	
<u>Emergency Plan</u>		Bags in Locations	
<u>Glebe Meadow Grant Application</u>	22 10 19 08 11 19 22 01 20	Emailed TWiG to agree process AH completed registration with Heritage Lottery Fund. emailed AH for update	Oct Agenda
<u>Glebe Meadow – Mowing</u>	02 06 20 15 09 20	Confirmed quotes accepted (& declined) Late August early Sept mow. Contacted Grants regarding mowing.	
<u>Maintenance</u>		Walks Programme developed	
<u>Microphones</u>			
<u>Millennium Mile</u>	12 02 20 12 08 20	Posts invoice paid IK arranging to collect posts with JK	
<u>Millennium Mile Path repairs</u>	11 08 20	NM confirmed works to be undertaken asap	
<u>Neighbourhood Plan Review</u>			Oct Agenda
<u>Parish News Article</u>	10 09 20	PB confirmed provide article	Complete
<u>Parish News Grant</u>	08 09 20 14 09 20	Emailed confirmation of bank details. Paid	Complete
<u>Parking Restrictions & Speed Limits</u>	01 09 20 16 09 20	Requested update works schedule for 28 09 20 – requested outside peak times. Installation due 2 nd October 2020	
<u>Planning</u>	08 09 20 08 09 20 14 09 20 15 09 20 28 09 20	20/01473/FUL – comments submitted 20/02561/FUL – comments submitted Draft letter to IK (LG) Submitted letter to CW&C. 20/02824/FUL – circulated.	

<u>Play Area Repairs</u>	10 09 20	Met PB & IK on site – agreed works IK &NS to complete.	
	12 09 20	Dropped of bolt covers with IK	
	14 09 20	Contacted MB to release swings	
	15 09 20	Email Parsons cost to tighten zip wire.	
	28 09 20	Resent email.	
<u>Priorities</u>	08 09 20	Circulated priorities for Councillors to rank deadline 28 09 20.	
<u>Remembrance – Event</u>	18 09 20	Apply to CW&C Emailed the Church Contact TBA & BE Filming	
<u>Remembrance - Poppies</u>	18 09 20	Sent email volunteers for Streetlight poppies	
<u>Risk Management</u>		IK & PB – meeting - NOV	
<u>Speed Indicator Device - SID</u>		Advertise for volunteers Set date for Training set dates for using SID	Consider 2021
<u>Spinney Project</u>	03 08 20	Emailed JG for update on Spinney survey	Oct Agenda
	12 08 20	Circulated Ecology Report	
	15 09 20	Requested update	
<u>Tree – Ownership Query</u>	10 09 20	Circulated email to Cllrs.	
	22 09 20	Emailed letter to CS and resident.	
<u>Tree Survey</u>	03 08 20	Emailed ATC update on survey Awaiting Barnfields Glebe Meadow Survey	
	16 09 20	Requested update	
<u>REPORTED FAULTS</u>	15 04 20	Reported uncut grass rear of Oaklands	Complete
	15 06 20	Reported above again	
	04 08 20	Reported again	
	11 09 20	Reported to MB	
	15 09 20	Response CW&C cut by School	
	15 09 20	Emailed school.	
	16 09 20	School confirmed - cut and maintain asap.	
	28 07 20	Cookes Court Junction visibility - HW232716072	Complete
	14 09 20	Residents confirmed works undertaken.	
	04 08 20	Rean Meadow pavement & shrubs - HW234965001 + emailed AM & JB.	
	08 09 20	Emailed MB about above	
	16 09 20	Raised with GJ	
	07 08 20	Reported overgrown hedges Park Road HW236139086 Park Road/Tattenhall Road junction HW236145872 Greenlands Junction HW236147427	
	11 09 20	Reported verge on Park Ave, opposite bungalows after receiving complaint through FB.	
16 09 20	Raised with GJ		
14 09 20	Streetlight on –Covert Rise – HW249463840 Streetlight on – Gifford Lea – HW249469293		
22 09 20	Fly tipping -BBW towards Russia Hall - SS252551043		

Notes of Open Space Working Group
Spinney Briefing
25th September 2020 – Held Virtually via Zoom.

PRESENT

Parish Council – Georgina Blackhurst, Iain Keeping, Cindy Parry, Lisa White, Ann Wright (Clerk)

Other – Andrew Hull Chairman of TWiG¹ & Sandstone Ridge Trust.

CW&C – John Seiler.

Public - 1

Purpose of Meeting: To discuss proposed Master Plan.

John Seiler raised the following points in relation to the plans he had produced:

- The plans had been developed based on discussion which took place in January 2020 and recognised the strong divide between the dense wooded area and the open grass land which belongs to CW&C.
- He had taken into account key characteristics of the area and the findings of the ecological survey including the Mill Brook which is a key feature of the area.
- There is a need to protect its tranquillity and undisturbed character in a central location in the village.
- It was noted the area is under used and has poor natural surveillance.
- The Plan proposes to clear some vegetation at the edge of the Spinney and the grassed area which will open up views into the Spinney. Joe Gough who had undertaken the ecological survey had confirmed that this would not damage the ecology.
- The scheme suggested the creation of a pond area on the grassed area which could attract separate grant money.

Pond Area

The meeting discussed whether the pond area would require fencing. It was noted there has been a lot of research done into pond safety and that it is possible for it to be designed with safety in mind.

It was noted that Joe Gough was currently working on installing an additional 30 ponds in CW&C.

A safety audit would need to be done of the pond which would have shallow edges about 2 or 3m wide before it become deeper.

It was agreed the pond needed to be safe but accessible to allow pond dipping and for it to be used for educational purposes.

It is possible to install a low-level fence around the pond or alternatively fence off a wider area. The Parish Council will need to consider this outside the meeting.

It was noted this meeting is to look at the aspirations and agree principles of the project and once the principles have been agreed we will need to review the project in more detail and how it will be delivered.

It was noted that Tattenhall has an organised play area and that this area is for a different purpose and has a different feel and is about nature, preservation, and education.

¹ Tattenhall Wildlife Group

It was noted the area has limited access for heavy machinery.
It was noted the area of scrub where the pond would be located does have some ecological value however the introduction of the pond would have a far greater value.

It was noted there needs to be good interpretation of the area for all ages, and that by using the pond to education young children it will make them understand and take ponds and safety more seriously.

Master Plan

John Seiler talked through features of the Master Plan:

- Intention was to create a welcoming community wood.
- A tranquil oasis with surfaced paths
- Protect and enhance the biodiversity of the area.
- Create areas for more dwell time.
- Introduce signage and interpretation
- Improve views and natural surveillance of the area.
- Create a network of paths and bridges, create an adventure and journey encompassing the Mill Brook and glades.
- Encourage locals who walk through regularly to engage in the space and recognise the features and changes of the different seasons.

Twig had reviewed the plans and fully supported them as the 'perfect development'.

It was agreed that the scheme once delivered will have a tremendous impact on residents' well-being in Tattenhall and will be of huge benefit to the village.
It was noted it was unique for a village to have a green centre of this kind and should be something Tattenhall is proud of.

It was noted the Spinney is part of a wider area along the Mill Book including the Jubilee Wood and flood management areas.

Funding

It was noted the Parish Council will need to consider the scheme and the funding.
It was noted the Council has agreed in principle that any project would need to be grant funded and have manageable future maintenance costs.

Andrew Hull highlighted The Green Recovery Challenge Fund which offers 100% funding for projects from £50k to £250K and has three criteria:

- 1) Connecting People to Nature
- 2) Nature-based solutions, particularly for climate change mitigation and adaptation
- 3) Nature and Conservation

It was confirmed that the project meets many aspects of these criteria.

Expressions of interest for the funding are required by Friday 2nd October which it was agreed could be achieved.

To apply for the funding the project needs to involve an environmental charity, Andrew Hull confirmed that after discussion with the trustees of the Sandstone Ridge Trust, the Trust would

be willing to act as a partner to the Parish Council for the application. Noting the Trust had a good relationship with the Environment Agency and the Heritage Fund.
The Trust did request that the Project is known as the 'Developing Mill Brook Nature Park'.

The full funding application, if the expression of interest is approved, would be submitted in the name of the Parish Council.

It was noted that it would be advantageous for the funding application if other bodies including the Parish Council earmarked funding for the project.

It was noted the costings supplied by John Seiler were estimates and that when the detail is decided costs could increase. As such it was agreed that the application would need to be for a greater amount than the estimate but needed to be considered application.

It was agreed the bid should include educational materials.

It was discussed whether the application could include future maintenance of the site. It was agreed the bid would include the funding to employ a part time warden for three years.

It was suggested that the application would be for the region of £200k and would also cover the works to the Glebe Meadow Haha to allow the field to be grazed.

It was agreed that the Parish Council will need to consider creating an outline of how the project will be taken forward.

The Chairman thanked all for attending the meeting, Andrew Hull for his work regarding the possible funding and John Seiler developing master plan.

Ann Wright 25/09/20

Minutes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Committee Held virtually via ZOOM. 9th September 2020

PRESENT

Chairman: Iain Keeping,

Pat Black

Sheila Chapman

Adele Evans

Caryl Roberts

Esther Sadler-Williams,

Peter Weston

Ann Wright (Clerk).

Cheshire West & Chester Council

Cllr Mike Jones

Catherine Morgetroyd - Principal Planning Officer Planning Policy

Public 1

APOLOGIES

Andy Freeman, Lisa Fearn.

DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None declared.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No matters raised.

DISCUSSION – REVIEW OF MONITORING REPORT

Catherine Morgetroyd raised the following points during a discussion based on the monitoring review.

It was noted that there is no specific guidance or legislation on how a Neighbourhood Plan should be reviewed however it is recommended that a monitoring report is produced, it was noted to date not many reviews of neighbourhood plans have been undertaken.

Ms. Morgetroyd confirmed the prepared report was very detailed and an excellent example of a monitoring report which she has shared with other groups.

It was noted the report was based on a simplified version of the CW&C monitoring reports.

It was highlighted that the government have produced a White Paper² which is currently out for consultation which could have a far reaching impact on the planning system as a whole including neighbourhood plans and the process by which they are made and reviewed. The white paper does state that Neighbourhood Plans will be preserved as part of the planning process.

If only minor amendments are made to a neighbourhood plan e.g. correcting words and minor errors these can be approved by CW&C.

Larger changes to the Plan which do not change the nature of the Plan would require consultation, limited examination, and no referendum to be made.

Changes beyond the above will be required to go through the whole process again including a referendum.

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>

Policy 1

It was noted that Policy 1 is not consistent with the CW&C Local Plan Part 1 as it permits the development of up to 30 homes adjacent to the settlement boundary. As such it was asked if bringing the Plan into consistency with CW&C Local Plan would require a referendum. Plan policy permitting development at Newton by Tattenhall and Gatesheath are also not consistent with the CW&C Local Plan Part 1.

It was noted that Neighbourhood Plans must be consistent with strategic policies of Local Plans. It was noted that the policies of the CW&C Local Plan Part 1 are all strategic, not all policies of the Local Plan Part 2³ are.

It was noted that the Committee had not yet consulted on whether more development was supported in these areas by residents.

It was suggested the next step is consultation with the community. It was suggested that any consultation should be as open as possible and be flexible to allow for changes in the planning system rather than stating certain policies will or will not be included.

It was reported that white paper implies that that new housing numbers will be imposed on local authorities by central government.

It was noted that the government is currently undertaking two planning consultations the White Paper plus a consultation on how housing numbers should be calculated, and affordable housing provided.

It was noted that ACRE and CCA have produced a paper on the impact these proposed changes could make to rural communities which will be circulated shortly by CW&C.

It was highlighted that the Plan did not take into account climate change and it was asked if additional objectives could be added to the plan.

It was confirmed new objectives and policy areas can be included and that consultation should be used to evidence these additions. It was noted in terms of the climate policies these would be supported by CW&C having declared a Climate Emergency.

It was discussed that objective 8 which lacks a clear policy may well be addressed by the white paper.

It was suggested that a policy could be included to the plan which seeks the future development of the disused railway between Gatesheath, Frog Lane and Chowley Oak as a cycleway/bridle path and could be included in the consultation along with request for other links which should be developed in that way to be highlighted.

It was discussed if the consultation should go ahead while the new homes at Newton by Tattenhall are not occupied.

³ Guidance on strategic policies in the adopted Local Plan', is available in Step two of the neighbourhood planning toolkit:

http://consult.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/portal/cwc_ldf/np/toolkit

Funding

It was noted that funding is available from Locality for the review of Neighbourhood Plans and that there is additional funding for technical support and allocation of sites.

Designated Area

It was noted the Plan area needs to be re-designated to cover the Parish Council area due to changes in the boundary since the Plan was made, noting that this did not impact any neighbouring Neighbourhood Plan areas.

It was believed the re-designation of the area would result in the plan requiring a referendum.

White Paper Consultation

It was agreed that Cllr Keeping would circulate a suggested response to the White Paper which Councillors and committee members could consider before being submitted by the Parish Council.

It was not clear when the government will make changes to the planning system it is expected this will become clear in early 2021, and that Local Authorities will be given only a short time to revise Local Plans as a result of any changes imposed.

Despite this uncertainty it was suggested the Committee should proceed with consultation on possible changes to the Neighbourhood Plan and on areas which should be added to the Plan as information gathered is likely to inform any future consultations on the CW&C Local Plan.

It was noted in addition to the current government consultations the change of use class orders have recently been changed increasing the number of changes of use which can take place as permitted development.

It was noted individuals and groups can respond to the White Paper consultation.

The Chairman thanked Ms. Morgetroyd for attending the meeting.

MINUTES

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on the 23rd July 2020.

NEXT STEPS

To undertake community consultation as discussed. It was agreed at the next meeting the Committee should consider bringing in expertise to assist with the consultation process and look at applying for funding.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

As below.

Meeting closed at 8.16pm.

NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 23rd September 2020
7.30pm virtually via ZOOM.

Ann Wright 10/09/2020

Minutes of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan Review Committee Held virtually via ZOOM. 23rd September 2020

PRESENT

Chairman: Iain Keeping,

Pat Black

Steve Densley

Adele Evans

Doug Haynes

Andrew Hull

Caryl Roberts

Peter Weston

Ann Wright (Clerk).

Public 1

APOLOGIES

Lisa Fearn, Esther Sadler Williams.

DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None declared.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No matters raised.

MINUTES

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on the 23rd July 2020 noting that Andrew Hull had submitted his apologies in advance of the meeting, but these had not been reported.

WHITE PAPER RESPONSE

It was noted that the government is currently hold two planning related consultations one on the calculation of housing needs and the second, the white paper.

The Committee considered the draft response circulated before the meeting and highlighted the following areas:

Timescales

It was not known what timescales there were for introducing changes to the planning system however given the white paper quotes building 1m new homes in the life of this parliament it was assumed changes would need to be introduced quickly.

Online Consultation & Responses

It was noted that the use of only online consultation would reduce the number of responses received. It was agreed that the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Review Committee would submit a letter of response but that individuals should also submit their comments.

It was noted that there were 10 complex suggestions regarding possible changes to speed up the Local Plan process, all of which would have a huge impact on the planning system and would reduce local input.

Neighbourhood Plans

The consultation effectively appears to reduce Neighbourhood Plans to the level of Village Design Statements, creating a centralised Local Plans with little scope for local feedback, effectively reducing the voice of local communities.

Proposal 1

It was suggested that Local Plans designate land into 3 categories, growth, renewal and protected. It was noted that there is no indication how these areas will be designated and once in place Neighbourhood Plans appear to have no input on how these areas are used/developed. Areas designated as growth appear to have outline permission for developments automatically in place and that only reserve matters type applications would need to be submitted.

Given the time scales involved it was feared that when designating land corners will be cut and important matters not addressed.

Protected areas it was assumed will be the rural areas which will stop development including that of affordable homes which are essential for our communities.

Renewal sites were less contentious relating to the development of brown field sites.

New Settlements & Villages

It was discussed that adding large developments to existing towns and cities created problems with infrastructure and that the creation of new towns was a possible alternative. It was noted that new villages had been spoken of for a number of years and were a real possibility.

It was suggested that as pollution reduces, and air quality is improved in our cities this would allow for increased residential density. Noting that policy is already in place to convert offices etc. to housing.

Proposal 6

To introduce faster decision making in the planning process and firmer deadlines.

It was noted that creating centralized digital systems in other areas including the NHS have failed.

It is suggested that areas will have surveys produced e.g. newt surveys which developers will take off the shelf when submitting applications.

Fining local authorities for not meeting deadlines would be detrimental as it would take money out of an already over stretched system.

It was suggested that the white paper was concerned with housing numbers and nothing else and was a developer's charter to hold the planning system to ransom.

Proposal 9

That neighbourhood plans should be retained as an important means of community input. It was noted that Neighbourhood Plan should have an input on the designation of areas which there was not provision for, without this involvement the principle of increasing democracy in the planning system as stated in the introduction to the white paper would fail.

Concerns were raised regarding the use of purely digital methods to involve the community in the planning process stating it was in fact a gag on local democracy.

It was noted there are tools being used in other areas including health which do allow for community input and produce real results.

Proposal 10

Placed emphasis on the building out of sites where permission had been granted. The following suggestions were made:

That the definition of 'starting' a development should be tightened and require a significant amount of work e.g. completion of a property.

That sanctions were required including possible restrictions on other permission granted to the same developer in the area.

That the time to start a development should be limited to 12 or 18 months.

Pillar 2 – Planning for beautiful and sustainable places

It was highlighted that Tattenhall and other villages have suffered from 'off the shelf' houses with no local character or design features and which are utilitarian.

Sustainability is about local accessible services, public transport, post office, shops and reduction of carbon footprint.

It was noted that there is no direct correlation between new developments providing more residents and more customers in local shops.

The white paper suggests a single sustainability test which is to be defined and will be the basis on which planning is given.

Proposal 11

Village Design Statements are already in existence and largely ignored by planning officers.

Proposal 12

There are already robust design codes but there is no way of enforcing them.

Proposal 13

Creating fast tracking systems are usually slow to deliver and defeat their own objective.

It was also noted that beauty is subjective.

Pillar 3 – Planning for Infrastructure & Connected places

It was highlighted that more development must bring with it affordable housing in the form of tradition 'social' rented housing.

Proposal 19

The replacement of the community infrastructure levy (CIL) and S106 payments with a new consolidated Infrastructure levy which would include a threshold under which contributions will not be made.

It is important how this threshold is set and by who as well as what level it is set at. If it is set at 40 or 50 houses this will prevent rural areas receiving payments.

Developers ability to reduce payments on a viability (profitability) basis will have no transparency as information will be protected as commercially sensitive. It was asked if developers will be able to argue once a development is completed it is no longer viable to pay the levy.

In addition the levy would be paid on completion of a development which will offer local authorities no guarantee of payment noting that it would be highly risky to borrow against levys as suggested in the white paper.

Consultation Response

It was agreed to submit a response the white paper in the current format, once finalized this will be circulated to this Committee and Parish Council for comments before submission early next week.

CONSULTANTS

The Committee considered the appointment of consultants and progressing a consultation strategy.

It was agreed that the first step should be to meet with the new Head of CW&C Planning and discuss the findings of the monitoring report particularly the failure of CW&C to acknowledge the Neighborhood Plan and Village Design Statement.

It was noted that undertaking a large amount of work revising the Plan at this stage would be unwise given the likely to changes to the planning system and Neighbourhood Plans.

It was highlighted that much of the previous consultant and the support for the Plan originally was due to face to face consultation which currently cannot be undertaken safely.

It was noted that as discussed at the last meeting it would be a useful process to start undertaking consultation on possible changes to the Plan and that although any consultation which can be undertaken at the moment would be very limited it would be a good time to understand what consultation is needed and how it should be carried out.

FUNDING

That the matter is deferred.

NEXT STEPS

Meetings to be arranged with Rob Charney Head of Planning to discuss the finding of the Monitoring report and Cheshire Community Action to discuss their proposal to assist with the Review.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

To be confirmed.

Meeting closed at 8.46pm.

NEXT MEETING
TBC
virtually via ZOOM.

Ann Wright 24/09/2020

Notes of Community Pride Meeting 17th September 2020 via ZOOM

Present:

Pat Black David Bish Anne McGrath Esther Sadler Williams
Lisa White.
Ann Wright (Clerk)

Apologies:

Georgina Blackhurst, Lesley Jones.

Remembrance

It was noted that due to the on going pandemic it was not possible to hold the Remembrance Service and Act of Remembrance as usual however it was agreed that some Act of Remembrance should take place.

Action: Clerk to apply to CW&C for licence to hold an event which would be by invitation.

Action: Clerk to contact Church to discuss their plans for Remembrance Sunday.

Action: Clerk to contact TBA and Bolesworth Estate to inquiry about companies to film events for broadcast.

It was agreed a road closure would not be required.

Action: Clerk to circulate email to obtain volunteers to erect streetlight poppies if no volunteers available to obtain price to have them installed and removed.

Poppies to be erected by 25th October and removed Friday 13th November 2020.

Mr Bish confirmed he would put poppies up on the church gates.

It was agreed to meet again in a couple of weeks to discuss arrangements further.

Christmas 2020

It was suggested the Council consider closing the High Street to hold carol singing.

Action: Clerk to contact CW&C on proposal and seek advice.

It was noted due to the ongoing pandemic it was not possible to hold the childrens' Christmas parties this year.

Action: To establish a Christmas Elf Trail

Christmas Elf Trail

Families and businesses to be encouraged to make an Elf to display and create a trail from the 1st December to the 2nd January 2021, all Elves to be registered by Monday 9th November to be included in the paper guide.

Action: Clerk to obtain price for erection and removal of Christmas trees and wreaths including decoration of trees and setting of lights timers.

NEXT MEETING

TBC

Ann Wright
18 09 2020

TATTENHALL & DISTRICT PARISH COUNCIL

Tree Policy

Introduction

Trees help to add variety to our landscape and provide valuable habitats for many species while providing us with cleaner, filtered air. Tattenhall & District Parish Council aims to preserve Tattenhall's trees for future generations to enjoy.

Tattenhall & District Parish Council owns and is responsible for number of trees on land know as Barnfields, Glebe Meadow and The Spinney.

Cheshire West and Chester Council (CW&C) generally own trees on highways verges, public parks and open spaces.

The Parish Council takes seriously its obligation to maintain and preserve the trees it is responsible for and employs qualified specialist to undertake a tree survey every two years of all its trees and undertakes the works recommended.

Work that Tattenhall and District Parish Council will carry out on Parish Council Owned Trees.

In maintaining our trees, we will:

- Remove dead, dying and dangerous trees
- Remove dangerous and damaged limbs

It is our policy to survey our trees on a regular basis, however if members of the public are concerned about the safety of a Parish Council owned tree, then they should contact the Council by emailing tattenhallpc@outlook.com or in an emergency call 01948 861035.

The trees will be inspected every 2 years and works will be programmed as recommended.

Works to Parish Council Owned Trees,

Tattenhall and District Parish Council will not undertake works or fund works on trees unless they have been identified as dangerous or in a poor condition by a qualified arboriculturist and reserves the right to ask the Council's own specialist to review the report and tree or trees in question if produced by another body.

The Parish Council has no obligation to carry out the following tree works:

- Cut back branches overhanging private property.
- 'Top' trees or remove branches to increase daylight or decrease height in relation to property.
- Remove branches or trees affecting views or interfering with TV reception.
- Remove branches or trees to prevent falling leaves, honeydew from aphids or other minor debris.
- Remove roots from drains or repair root damage to structures, where the tree has not been clearly demonstrated to be the principle cause.
- Remove branches or trees to prevent potential root damage to structures.
- Remove branches nearly touching buildings, walls, roofs, fences etc.
- Remove branches or trees to prevent access to squirrels or birds.

Common Law rights allow you to remove tree branches that cross over your boundary without the need to seek your owner's permission.

You do not need to get permission from Tattenhall and District Parish Council before carrying out any upkeep, as long as it is limited to the pruning of side branches back to the boundary

line. However, the Parish Council asks that you notify us if you are planning to remove any significant branches which overhang your boundary.

It is your responsibility to dispose of all removed branches.

Before undertaking any works, you should check if the tree or trees in question are protected, see below map or visit below link, works on protected trees will also require permission from CW&C.

<https://maps.cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk/cwac/webmapping>

Tattenhall and District Parish Council will generally look to grant permission for works to be undertaken on council property if required so long as the details of the works to be undertaken are submitted in advance and are undertaken by an appropriate person.


Tattenhall & District Parish Council does not undertake works on privately owned trees.

Adopted:

Date of Review:

DRAFT

CW&C Protected Trees



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

DRAFT