

Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group Meeting
Minutes of a meeting held at Broad Lane Methodist Chapel on
24 March 2015

Present: Parish Councillors
 Jo Hillman
 Martin Malbon

Non-Parish Councillors
 Pat Cullen
 Val Ingram

In attendance: Andrew Thomson CCA-appointed consultant

1. Appointment of Note Taker for the Meeting

Martin Malbon

2. Apologies for Absence

Parish Councillors
Matthew Theobald
John Davenport
Peter Groves

Non-Parish Councillors
Noel Wagstaff
Mary Hennessey Jones
Andrew Cliffe
Sue Pritchard

3. Conflicts of Interest (non-parish Councillors)

None.

4. Declarations of Interest

None

5. Approval of the Minutes of the last Meeting (19th February 2015)

Approved, no comments

6. Preliminary results of returned questionnaires (if available)

Jo has collected around 30 so far and Matthew has a few from Broad Lane School, but we don't have enough to make any meaningful comment so far.

7. Drafting of Policies, with Andrew Thomson

Andrew thought it was a bit too early to start drafting policies. He said he would start once we have a more substantial number of returned questionnaires and some themes start emerging.

Andrew has supplied us with the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Bunbury, which has a few printing mistakes, but contains some useful parts which we can adapt for our draft plan, such as the preamble which has a useful description of why "no development" is not an option.

Andrew informed us that we can use the Cheshire East Council logo for the front page header strip of our draft policies document (as Bunbury have) as they are available to download and use from the Cheshire East Council website.

8. Funding Application

We can obtain funding for various uses, such as for marketing material, e.g. advertisement for public meetings etc.

As Carol Jones (Clerk to the Parish Council) has pointed out, this application needs to be presented to the Parish council at its April 20th meeting to make funds available in a useful timeframe. Andrew is going to prepare this for us this week.

Once obtained, funding has to be spent or allocated within 3 months.

9. Possibility of Designating a Local Green Space

Andrew had been looking into this prior to the meeting, regarding similar policies in Neighbourhood Plans for Tattenhall, Bunbury and Malpas. The following are some notes from Andrew on this: *NPPF stipulates that Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space and identifies 3 criteria which must all be satisfied, namely;*

- *That the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves*
- *The green space is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, and*
- *It is local in character and not an extensive tract of land.*

Planning practice guidance also suggests sites should be within easy walking distance of the community served particularly if public access is a factor. If we are proposing to include any sites of nature conservation value we will need to provide some evidence of that value to justify designation. Planning guidance also emphasises the importance of contacting land owners at an early stage. Malpas identified 42 sites of which the Inspector felt only 3 complied with guidance and he threw out the policy.

At Tattenhall the Inspector recognised that the local community wished to protect green areas of particular importance to them for their natural beauty, historic significance, tranquillity, recreational value or richness in wildlife. Policy 6 in the plan lists all of the sites designated as green spaces separating them into sites of open space value, their sport, recreation and amenity value; and their nature conservation value.

The Inspector felt that it was important that the policy referred to 'Local' green spaces and would then be consistent with the rest of the plan.

Two very different approaches and I would advise that we do the following;

- *Categorise and identify our local green spaces*
- *Notify the owners of our intentions and;*
- *Test each one against the criteria in the guidance set out in the Malpas report.*

We talked about a **Green Space Audit** of the green areas within the Cronkinson Farm estate. It was suggested that Noel Wagstaff could follow this up with CE, with the aim of establishing ownership of the pieces of land, as he already undertaken some work in this area. Andrew suggested that this would probably not form part of a policy in our Neighbourhood Plan but would still be valuable. We then moved on to the possibility of a **Wildlife Audit** which could be performed by Rachel Giles of Cheshire Wildlife Trust, who would look at all aspects of wildlife within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Andrew suggested that we should commission CWT to do this and produce a report which could be fed back into the green space policy. It was agreed that we should try to get her to come and talk to the Steering Group.

We discussed more formal green space uses, e.g. football fields with associated car park (such as at the Barony playing fields). Andrew advised us that this could be incorporated as an 'aspiration' in a NP policy.

10. Letter from Adrian Cox

Adding a specific policy for that proposed development is not appropriate. If we did we'd have to do an assessment of all potential development sites in the NP area and explain why this particular one fits our criteria but all others don't.

Andrew suggested that we could make a policy to ask for a contribution from any development, without going into anything specific. This can fund other things we want to do in the NP. For an example of this see the Community Infrastructure Contribution C12 Policy from the Bunbury draft Neighbourhood Plan.

We can make specific requirements for any new development, e.g. all surfaces must be permeable or all developments must include houses with solar panels.

We can add policies like this to our NP if we think they are a good idea, even if we haven't consulted on them at the questionnaire stages because the draft policies will be subject to public scrutiny. Andrew has offered to come to the PC at some time and answer any questions. We thought this may be appropriate once we get a little further with our draft policies.

11. Rota for the drop-in on Saturday 28 March.

The drop in session will be from 11:00am to 4:00pm at the Community Hall. Jo will open up for us at 11:00am.

So far we have the following members available:

Pat 11:00 – 1:00 pm

Martin 11:00 – 1:00 pm

Jo 1:00am – 4:00 pm

Jo is going to email the SG to see if anyone else is available on Saturday.

12. Resources/volunteers to complete results input and analysis after 30th March 2015

All present at the meeting (Pat/Val/Jo/Martin) are able to help with questionnaire data input. We wondered if it would be better to input the data via SurveyMonkey or directly into an Excel spreadsheet template but could not come to a conclusion. Jo was going to contact Tom Evans (CE) for advice on this.

13. Feedback from "meet the developer" day with CCA

Pat and Matthew have full notes for this, which are currently with Matthew. These will be sent out as soon as he is able.

Overall it appeared to be very useful, involving presentations and workshops. Two developers were in attendance, 'Arcadian' and 'Your Group' (not sure if those names are correct). Both are small/medium sized organisations. No large developers attended.

All presentations from the day are available on CCA website.

Pat is to ask John Heselwood for complete list of invitees.

14. Date of next meeting

We could not decide the date of the next meeting, there were not enough people in attendance.

Next meeting with Andrew – his availability is as follows: Monday 13th Wed 15th Thu 16th (all 3 in Easter holiday), nothing the following week, then 28/29/30th on the last week of April.
NP day on Tuesday 31st March – Jo will email if anyone else will want to go. Jo is already attending..

At the end of the meeting Andrew suggested we should have a constitution and provided us with a hard copy of one from another NP group on which we could base ours.