

**MINUTES OF TARPORLEY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD IN THE TARPORLEY METHODIST & BAPTIST CHURCH  
ON MONDAY 14TH MARCH 2016**

Parish Councillors

Chairman - Ken Parker

Elaine Chapman	Gill Clough	James Kennedy	John Millington	Jeremy Mills
Gordon Pearson	Richard Statham	Nigel Taylor	Peter Tavernor	Andrew Wallace

Clerk - Ann Wright.

Public - 9

Apologies

Cllr Julie Hall - family commitment.

CW&C Ward Councillor Eveleigh Moore Dutton.

Declaration of Interests

No interests were declared.

Minutes

**16/081 Resolved** - That the Chairman signs the Minutes, as circulated, of the Parish Council meeting held on 8th February 2016 at the April meeting following a minor correction on page 132.

Public Participation

It was noted that the former British Legion Car Park will close on the 1st April which will have an impact not only on residents but also on Bowling Club members and teams visiting for matches as there will be no close parking, there are serious concerns about emergency vehicles being able to access the bowling club, it was noted pedestrian access will be retained.

Tony Yeates reported that the Community Centre Committee have been raising funds for a new community defibrillator and cabinet to be located outside the Hall. He requested the Council consider purchasing the defibrillator and gifting it to the Community Centre. He reported that the Community Centre Committee was planning only permit dogs will on the Community Centre playing field path and only when on leads, he requested advice regarding enforcement and byelaws which it was agreed the Clerk would investigate.

It was noted that Mr & Mrs Lees had offered to plant and maintain the planters on the High Street, the Council welcomed this offer and agreed it would cover the cost of the plants.

Community Defibrillator Funding Request

It was noted that the proposed defibrillator would be housed in an unlocked cabinet which would be alarmed and include a small CCTV camera.

**16/082 Resolved** - That the Council purchase the defibrillator and gift it to the Community Centre to manage and maintain on behalf of the community using Council funds and donations collected by the Community Centre.

Public Participation

The Chairman reopened public participation to allow resident David Press provide an update on the Royal British Legion Site. Mr Press requested that the Council write again to the Charity Commission confirming the Council had received no formal notice informing it that the RBL site was for sale. It was highlighted that covenants existed that permit users (allotments holders and bowlers) to cross the site on foot or by vehicle.

It was suggested that the Parish Council should contact Antoinette Sandbach and request legal advice regarding the schools rights of access and parking on the site.

It was stated that around 2006 Cheshire County Council had an agreement with the RBL allowing the school access through the site which would still be in place. The Council was asked to highlight that

the advertising of the sale notice in the Northwich Guardian was not acceptable as only 13 households in Tarporley and Kelsal receive the paper. It was reported by a resident that when they had question why no 'For Sale' board had been erected on the site it was stated it was 'no concern' of residents of Tarporley that the site was for sale.

### Planning

**16/083 Resolved** - That the Council undertake the following actions with regard to the former RBL site:-

1) Write to Royal British legion on the following grounds:-

To request the memorandum of understanding as noted on page 2 of the RBL letter dated 4th March 2016 noting the removal of vehicle access to the site and also the closure of the public car park.

Note the fact that the car park, bowling green and allotments were well used and were therefore not 'no longer required' as stated in the above letter.

Highlight that allotment holders and bowling club members are RBL Branch members.

State that the notice in the Northwich Guardian was not adequate public notice for the sale of the site.

State that residents had been informed the sale of the site was of no concern to Tarporley residents.

Reiterate the damage to RBLs reputation.

2) Contact Antoinette Sandbach MP and request a meeting as soon as possible to discuss concerns including the possibility of legal advice and other planning matters.

3) Obtain copy of agreement between Cheshire County Council and RBL regarding school access to the site which was established around 2006.

4) Write to the Charity Commission stating the Council were not formally notified of the sale of the site and request a response to correspondence sent to date.

**16/084 Resolved** - That the Council submit the following comments:-

Application 16/00719/FUL, - Residential development comprising demolition of existing outbuildings, partial demolition of wall an erection of 48 dwellings including access, parking, landscaping and associated works (Re-submission of application 15/00700/FUL), Land Rear And Adjacent Of Swallow Cottage 2A High Street Tarporley.

That the Council submit the comments as submitted for application 15/00700/FUL and make the following additional comments:-

Proposal extends the frontage of the High Street into open countryside/green fields which is out of character with Tarporley.

There is no community benefit provided by the development other than additional housing.

Highlight requirement for ecological surveys.

If approved consideration to be given to providing a full width footpath/pavement from 4 High Street to the development site to allow safe pedestrian access. Also site should be linked with existing public rights of way as required by the Neighbourhood Plan.

16/00698/FUL, Erection on 1 Dwelling, Bakers Cottage, 26B Forest Road, Tarporley, CW6 0HX.

It was noted this application was not for the dwelling but an amendment regarding the doors and windows.

That the Council is disappointed by the use of UPVC windows in the conservation area.

16/00514/FUL, Two storey and single storey side extension, 4 Walkers Lane, Tarporley, CW6 0BX. Support.

16/00697/FUL, Amendment to previously approved two storey extension (14/00465/FUL) to replace windows and doors to UPVC to both properties, 24 & 26 Forest Road, Tarporley, CW6 0HX.

That the Council is disappointed by the use of UPVC windows in the conservation area.

The Council noted the planning register as circulated.

It was noted that Councillors John Millington, Richard Statham and Andrew Wallace will review planning applications for the Council's April meeting.

### Neighbourhood Plan

**16/085 Resolved (unanimously)** - That the Council approve with regret the Neighbourhood Plan to go forward to referendum with the amendments recommended by the examiner.

It was noted that Councillors fully supported the policies included in the neighbourhood plan but regret the loss of policies that had been the result of extensive community consultation and which the examiner had removed from the plan, it was felt a number of the policies removed had been misunderstood by the examiner and it was disappointing that the process had now allowed for discussions with the examiner to resolve these issues.

Councillors had agreed to move the plan forward as withdrawing it to amend policies may have resulted in a number of speculative and in appropriate planning applications coming forward. The plan still includes very important policies protecting green space and enabling policies to encourage good planning proposals with community benefits to come forward and relocation of services. The approval of the Plan will also entitle Tarporley to receive an increased percentage of CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) if approved by CW&C and the plan will add strength to judicial review of the recent Daffodil Field approval by appeal

Payroll

**16/086 Resolved** - That the Council appoint CVS to manage the Council's payroll including pension for 2016-2017 financial year.

Accounts

**16/087 Resolved** - That the Council approve the accounts and payments as listed on page 12 of the Cash book, noting a £612.80 payment of has been received from Hibberts LLP to reimburse the council for payment made to undertake a search on Brook Road, this had been funded by CW&C. The Council approved the following payments

Kirkwells £880.00 (inc vat) for work done on the Neighbourhood Plan to be reimbursed by CW&C.

Tarporley High School £60, to replace cheque 003565 which had not been received.

Payment of SITA by monthly direct debit £60.55 inc vat for removal of church yard and cemetery waste.

It was noted the Council had still not received the service level agreement for the PCSO, it was agreed the Clerk should pursue this.

Community Transport Contract

The Clerk reported she had been unable to get quotes from companies other than one already supplying the service. It was noted there was a need to identify who is using the service and establish some form a simple booking process and that the service should be publicised so that other residents who are eligible could take advantage of the scheme.

**16/088 Resolved** - That the Council appoint MB Travel to run the service.

Note Informal Meetings

The Council accepted notes of the following meetings:-

Parish Cooperation Meeting 18/02/16, pages 162 to 164 of the minutes.

Informal meeting with CW&C Planning Officers 22/02/16, pages 165 and 166 of the minutes.

Informal meeting with McCarthy & Stone 26/02/16, pages 167 to 170 of the minutes.

\_Meeting closed 8.15pm.

**Next Parish Council Meeting**

**Monday 11th April 2016, 7pm, Tarporley Community Centre Committee Room.**

Signed .....

Dated .....

## Notes from a meeting of the Ward Cooperation Meeting 18 February 2016

Venue: Utkinton Village Hall

Present:

- Frank Tunney (Chair Utkinton PC)
- Graham Stewart (Vice Chair Utkinton PC)
- Gill Clough – Tarporley PC
- Elaine Chapman – Tarporley PC
- Richard Langley – Darnhall PC
- Laurence Jinks – Darnhall PC
- Mike Wilson – Rushton PC
- Graham Cookson – Little Budworth PC

FT read the notes from the last meeting and asked for any updates.

The 'Agenda' for this meeting was to include:

- Possible time limited parking on High St
  - Much discussion on this:
    - That it could be limited to the High Street. TPC had held meeting with CWAC with an inconclusive result and that TPC would seek to meet with Businesses in Tarporley to better understand their needs and then have further meeting with CWAC.
    - The 90 new houses and the new regulations vis-à-vis school bus allowances had led to substantial chaos and a knock on effect with some buses half full. GWB asked if the loss of the bus subsidy had increased usage.
    - There were suggestions about a park and ride – but where to put it as there was a degree of land-owner reticence. There also needs to be consideration of the parking of buses at pick up.
    - A question was asked about the proposed traffic lights at Nantwich Road and the by-pass. GC said that the developers (David Wilson Homes) had committed to starting the work 'soon' – by September. This caused discussion about the knock on effects that could be felt in Cotebrook and Eaton with a 'rat run' being created at 'The Red Fox' to avoid the lights.
    - Members were asked to discuss the issue of parking at their Councils and then to forward suggestions to FT for circulation and consideration.
- Affordable homes at The Birches, Birch Heath Rd development
  - There was a degree of discussion about Birch Heath and TPC asked the members to circulate on their notice boards and web pages (GC to provide information)
- Celebrations for Queen's 90<sup>th</sup> birthday.
  - In general there was not a great deal of enthusiasm for QEII's celebrations and Tarporley would mark it by using the same decorations as for the carnival
  - No other PC was planning to do anything formal.

- Dog fouling and use of pink chalk spray
  - Whilst TPC had started marking dog fouling on pavements (mainly as a warning to pedestrians) there was no indication that the application of pink chalk has lowered the incidence of fouling.
- Tarporley neighbourhood Plan update
  - GC reported that the Inspector had examined the plan in detail and much of what it contained was, broadly, acceptable
  - It was noted that a number of 'protected' green spaces had been included by the inspector
    - Daffodil Fields
    - The bowling Green and allotments
    - The site previously forming the basis for the Aldi proposals (see later)
    - Burton Square
    - The Community Centre playing field
    - The leisure field along Brook Road
  - It was suggested that CWAC has still to do a settlement boundary but that this meant the overall housing 'plan' would require 30+ additional dwellings.
- Road and highways conditions
  - The influence of Tarporley developments / road changes, that may affect all local Parishes.
  - Meeting with CWAC Cabinet Member
  - In broad terms the meeting felt that the condition of roads and highways was, generally, poor and FT would seek to establish a meeting with the group and the Head of Highways at CWAC (Brian Clarke(?)) and his team (Jerry Gibb) to better understand how priorities are set for major road changes (Fishers Green was mentioned as well as the Willington – A51)
  - Rushton has formed a separate working group to discuss with Police, Highways and residents
- New Homes Bonus and CIL
  - Whilst it was accepted that the consultation for New Homes Bonus (NHB) and CIL had been put in place results were disappointing in terms of respondents. It was felt that the mechanisms for enabling residents to complete were both complex and onerous and required access to broadband and a degree of persistence.
  - PCs to publicise the consultations and to encourage residents to complete.
- Large developments across the ward
  - GC reported on the state of play in Tarporley:
    - **Arderne Home Farm** - Eaton Rd (45 dwellings) application refused by CWAC planners. Gone to appeal, awaiting inquiry
    - **Brickyard Farm, Rode St.**, near Burton Square (48 dwellings) application re-submitted to CWAC by Jones Homes
    - **Daffodil Field** behind 32 and 32a High St (28 dwellings) application refused by CWAC, gone to appeal, awaiting decision by inspector
    - **Rode St.**, near roundabout, up to Utkinton Rd (100 dwellings) developers withdrew from public enquiry. Since met with Parish Council to talk about alternative ideas
    - **Field behind the Manor House** Aldi shop and community car park, no application submitted to CWAC. Now McCarthy and Stone wish to talk to Parish

Council about building a retirement home complex with small community car park on that land

- **Royal British Legion Land** no application yet submitted to CWAC, which did include a retirement complex by McCarthy and Stone.
- Under CWAC Local Plan 2010 – 2030 allocation, Tarpoley needs another 34 or 36 houses so that it has the “at least 300” houses required. All the above are outside the Vale Royal Borough Settlement Boundary.
- From the other members only Darnhall reported anything significant with around 180 dwellings being proposed between it and Winsford
- Bus services and the Cheshire Community Action survey related to community transport.
  - In broad terms the overall service between Crewe and Chester had been retained through two providers – Arriva NW and Routemaster buses. There are some problems with timing and the location of the terminuses (each uses a different location in Chester) and the problems using a return ticket across both services. It was also commented that the timing of each service was less predictable

The meeting closed and Rushton PC to host the next meeting at the ‘Jessie Hughes Hall’ a date and time to be provided but 27 April was suggested. MW also wanted to have a more ‘rigid’ format – this to be discussed .

**Informal Meeting with Nial Casselden, CW&C Planning Manager  
Monday 22nd February 2016, Tarporley Community Centre Committee Room.**

Present :

Parish Council - Gill Clough, Elaine Chapman, James Kennedy, John Millington, Ken Parker (Chairman), Gordon Pearson, Nigel Taylor, Andrew Wallace.

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - Catherine Egan

Cheshire West & Chester Council - Cllr. Eveleigh Moore Dutton, Nial Casselden Planning Manager.

Clerk - Ann Wright.

The following points were raised during discussions:-

Mr. Casselden reported there had been pre-application discussions with representatives of McCarthy & Stone regarding the former RBL site and also the site identified by Aldi. It was suggested that the examiner's report on the Neighbourhood Plan had strengthened the Green Space protection on the bowling green and allotments.

It was stated the Settlement Boundary policy which had been removed by the examiner had been pivotal to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Clarification was sought on whether this means Tarporley had no settlement boundary or whether the Vale Royal boundary is still in place.

**ACTION** - Nial Casselden to seek clarification.

It was noted the draft Local Plan Part 2 is expected later this year and will include the revised settlement boundaries.

It was stated that there is no maximum limit to housing as illustrated by recent Davenham appeal decisions.

Policy is the starting point for all planning decisions.

Pre-NPPF negotiations could take place with developers to deliver community benefits along with developments, since the NPPF developers can only be asked to deliver things which make the development acceptable. Any additional benefits offered by the developer cannot be given weight in the planning decision.

It had been suggested by CW&C spatial planning that there was very little desire to extend the settlement boundary by a large amount.

It was noted that drawing settlement boundaries is a complicated process as they need to allow reasonable growth. It was noted that the Parish Council want to be involved in this process.

It was noted that inspectors are putting weight on providing extra houses above Local Plan part 1 numbers targets.

It was asked if the Parish Council could be involved in the site allocation process. it was noted that this is a process determined by legislation.

**ACTION** - Nial Casselden to raise possible parish council involvement with policy management.

It was asked if CW&C could prove a need for retirement properties in Tarporley. It was stated that the developer will need to prove the need. Although it was stated that need is identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. It was noted there is a difference between need and market forces.

A discussion took place regarding the possible development of a new vehicle/bus entrance into the High School off Nantwich Road. It was noted that currently 27 buses pick up and drop off at the School and that the current situation of Eaton Road is dangerous. It was noted that the school would need to prove no loss of playing fields as monitored by Sports England. It was noted that the school will need to raise this matter with CW&C planning.

It was asked if planning officers when having pre-application discussions raise the issue of creating new footpaths. It was confirmed that officers do encourage footpaths and permeability through new developments. However it is complicated by the fact developers do not always control land neighbouring the development site.

Clarification was requested on the expiry date for the outline permission for the Brook road sports field.

**ACTION** - Nial Casselden to establish date, John Millington to forward information.

It was noted that Parish Council's have a range of permitted development rights on land they own.



**Informal Meeting with Representative of McCarthy & Stone  
Friday 26th February 2016, Tarporley Community Centre Committee Room.**

Present :

Parish Council - Elaine Chapman, Jeremy Mills, Ken Parker (chairman), Gordon Pearson, Richard Statham, Andrew Wallace.

Clerk - Ann Wright.

McCarthy & Stone - Richard Dean, Land Director North West Region.

The following points were raised during discussions:-

Mr Dean provided some notes as an introduction (attached).

McCarthy and Stone are looking to grow and have been looking for an opportunity in Tarporley where the Neighbourhood Plan has identified a need for older peoples housing.

The site to be discussed is off the High Street (site identified by Aldi) but it was noted as a protected Green Space therefore the proposal would be contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.

It was noted McCarthy & Stone had also been linked with the former Royal British Legion Site, and that potentially applications could come forward for both sites.

It was confirmed McCarthy & Stone do not have an option yet to buy the site off the High Street but had carried out a topographical survey, some trial pits and undertaken a desktop survey on the site.

McCarthy & Stone build three types of development:-

- 1) Retirement Living - main type of development for those who are 65+
- 2) Assisted Living - providing care and assistance where needed for residents this might be a cleaning service or medical care.
- 3) Ortus - apartments for younger retired people, 55+.

Looking to provide either 1 or 3 in Tarporley.

Buildings would be designed to suit their locations.

McCarthy & Stone are currently lobbying the Government with regard to the need for more properties for the aging population which is growing.

It is estimated that during construction the development will bring in £8.64m into the local economy.

Policy TH5 of the Neighbourhood Plan supports development of housing for old people. It was acknowledged that there was a large amount of demand for smaller houses in Tarporley for locals to down size but apartments have not been previously discussed.

It was noted that the Retirement Living apartments are only about 10 or 15% smaller than the average small house.

All properties also have a lift.

Apartments are sold and have a service charge for all maintenance.

It was noted previously the Parish Council had supported an application for retirement properties which were then resubmitted as normal homes. Mr Dean confirmed if it was possible he would be happy to limit any planning approval purely to homes for older people, although it was noted an applicant could apply for something else on the site. It was noted that McCarthy & Stone seek permission for their own company to develop and that they only develop this type of housing, they do not look to sell the land on with planning approval.

It was noted the landowner will retain the barn on the site.

Mr Dean asked if there would be any level of interest or support for this type of development?

Councillors stated they were unable to speak for the Council and that they would want to know residents views before making any comments of support or otherwise.

The proposal would include a community car park of 20 or 30 spaces. Concerns were raised about the size of the car park, it was stated this could be discussed in more detail and there was a need to balance its scale with its appearance. The location of the car park could also be discussed.

It was noted there had been strong objections to the proposed Aldi on the site on the following grounds:-

Extra traffic it would create on the High Street.

Entrance and exit on a blind corner, noting there has been a significant number of vehicle collisions outside the neighbouring business.

The site is a green space with public views to the open countryside.

It was stated the development would be 2.5 or 3 storey.

It was noted this would still be a very large building compared to others in Tarporley overlooking the graveyard and close to the Church.

Retirement Living properties have 70% parking plus a couple of visitor parking spaces. Ortus developments have 100% parking spaces plus visitor spaces.

It was suggested the community car park could be gifted to the Parish Council.

It was also suggested a pedestrian path could link to the Lychgate area, Mr Dean supported this if possible.

It was noted if the development was a Retirement Living Development it would have 30 to 35 apartments, if Ortus it would have 25 to 30 apartments.

It was noted that issues surrounding the possible development of the RBL site in Tarporley had damaged McCarthy & Stone's reputation in the village.

It was felt that the development on the High Street site would be better use than the building of a supermarket.

It was thought there may be more support for the development if any development on the former RBL site was withdrawn.

McCarthy & Stone were asked to consider holding a public consultation event to gauge public opinion on the proposal.

It was confirmed there would be no affordable element on the site, instead a contribution would be paid to CW&C to provide affordable housing elsewhere in Tarporley. Mr Dean agreed if legally possible this money could be earmarked for a 'Tarporley Community Land Trust' if created.

Key features of any development would be provision of adequate community parking, preservation of the visible green space off the High Street and retention of views of the open countryside.

The chairman thanked Mr Dean for attending the meeting.

Copy of notes provided by Mr Dean.

**High Street, Tarporley**

**26/2/16 1pm, Tarporley Community Centre**

- We understand there is a requirement in Tarporley for Housing For Older People, as shown in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan
- McCarthy and Stone are the market leader in the provision of accommodation for older people and would like to develop in Tarporley if a suitable site can be identified.
- McCarthy and Stone benefits:
  - Market Leader
  - Quality 5 Star Home Builder Customer Satisfaction HBF 2015, ten years consecutively
  - Developed over 50,000 apartments since 1977
  - Low maintenance, sense of community
  - Homeowners lounge, guest suite, lift, secure, private car park, handyman service, house manager, emergency call system, peace of mind
  - An Ageing Population Leaflet
- Locations – Draft Neighbourhood Plan doesn't allocate a suitable site to address the need for older persons
- McCarthy and Stone have assessed Tarporley and identified this site as being suitable. However its proposed allocation would prevent this.
- Plans – discuss
- Potential for community parking on site which will improve traffic flow by taking traffic from the High Street
- Delivery of homes would support local businesses, given proximity to shops and also reduce the need to use the car
- Retirement living is not a significant generator of traffic, such as retail or family housing.
- Views of the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Committee? Is there any support for these proposals?

end