

**Notes of Informal Meeting of Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan
Review Committee & CW&C Planning Officers
Held virtually via TEAMS.
9th November 2020**

PRESENT

Chairman: Iain Keeping,
Pat Black Adele Evans Caryl Roberts
Ann Wright (Clerk).
Rob Charnley, Nick Smith – CW&C Planning Department

Housing Numbers

It was noted by the Chairman that the housing number for Tattenhall as Key Service Centre (KSC) was a source of some dispute and that 2 areas of land had been identified in the CW&C Local Plan Part 2 as CW&C did not recognise that the village had met its housing numbers.

It was noted that CW&C currently has a 7.65-years housing supply compared to the required 5 years. However, it was noted that the Government is currently consulting on changing the way in which housing numbers are calculated and if the proposed methodology is introduced CW&C would have less than 5 years housing supply. It is not clear if the methodology changes when the new numbers would apply, for example at the end of the current Plan period or before then.

It was noted because an area has met its housing allocation that does not mean applications will be refused based on too many houses. However, if CW&C has its housing numbers other policies inc. Strat 9 will have more strength.

It was noted as of 1st April 2020 Tattenhall as a Key Service Centre (KSC) had 158 complete properties and 146 with permission.

It was noted that Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan is not in conformity with the CW&C Local Plan as it allows for the development of up to 30 dwellings “immediately adjacent to the built-up part of the village” which is not consistent with CW&C Local Plans which does not allow building outside the settlement boundary of the key service centre.. It was suggested that if CW&C housing numbers fell below the required 5 years this would provide an additional defence against large developments on green field sites outside the settlement boundary by limiting development to 30 properties.

It was stressed that the planning system may be subject to radical change.

It was noted the settlement boundary is the same as the key service centre boundary. As such it was noted that the development of 64 homes at Newton by Tattenhall do not count in the Tattenhall housing allocation even though their proximity to Tattenhall contributed to their sustainability.

Weight of Neighbourhood Policies

It was noted the review of the Neighbourhood Plan has highlighted that Plan policies were not given the weight they should have been and had not been listed in relevant documents reviewed when assessing some planning applications.

Mr Charnley confirmed he would be more concerned if the Plan had not been mentioned or used when considered in significant applications where it would be instrumental in the decision being made.

Planning officers are instructed to write focused reports and refer to the policies which are key to the decision.

It was noted the Village Design Statement is also not often referred to in planning decisions and that one of the issues with this document is its age.

Future of Neighbourhood Plans

It was asked given the Government White Paper how far the Committee should go in reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan. It was stated the White Paper does state Neighbourhood Plans will continue to be important, but it is not clear what they will look like. It was noted the White Paper is stressing the importance of design in Neighbourhood Plans.

It was asked if a two phased approach would be acceptable when reviewing the Plan, undertaking a quick review to bring the Plan up to date therefore increasing its weight in the planning system particularly if the CW&C housing supply falls below 5 years and then undertaking a second review allowing more time to consider more significant changes.

It was noted this was the way in which the CW&C Local Plans had been completed, in two sections and that the approach would make a lot of sense but should be discussed with the Spatial Planning Team.

Gifford Lea Retirement Village

It was noted that this was a large development within the settlement boundary which included a number of anomalies. The development had originally proposed 71 care beds but had finally resulted in the development of 56 standalone apartments which had not been included in the housing numbers. In addition, the development had not resulted in S106 payments and had avoided CIL.

It was noted by the officers that it can be difficult to categorize these types of properties and usage depending on the support the residents receive, for example a house's designation does not change if the resident requires more care over time.

It was noted the site only yielded 20 affordable properties well below levels set by the CW&C Local Plan or the Neighbourhood Plan.

Mr Charnley confirmed he would be happy to speak to the Council again on planning matters and expects more conversations with Parish Councils as the outcomes of the White Paper become known. The Chairman thanked him and Mr Smith for attending the meeting and his offer of future support.

FUTURE MEETINGS

Wednesday 18th November 7.30pm – Committee Meeting
virtually via ZOOM.

Ann Wright 09/11/2020