

**MINUTES OF TARPORLEY PARISH COUNCIL ANNUAL OR FIRST MEETING
HELD ON MONDAY 11TH MAY 2026
THE SCHOOL ROOM, TARPORLEY CHAPEL.**

Present

Chairman – Cllr John Millington

Cllr Gill Clough Cllr John Growney Cllr Catherine Helm Cllr Charlotte Hodgkinson

Cllr Lisa Miller Cllr Mark Ravenscroft Cllr Alex Sawkiw Cllr Peter Tavernor

Cllr Nigel Taylor

Clerk Ann Wright Deputy Clerk Abigail Morris

Other

CW&C Cllr Charles Hardy

Public – 4

1. Chairman

Resolved 26/001– That Cllr John Millington be elected Chairman of Tarporley Parish Council for 2026-2026.

2. Vice-Chairmen

Resolved 26/002 – That Cllrs Pete Tavernor and Mark Ravenscroft be elected Vice-Chairmen of Tarporley Parish Council for 2026-2027.

3. Apologies for Absence.

Cllr Stuart Walton – family commitment.

4. Declaration of Interests

No interests declared.

5. Co-option of Councillor

Resolved 26/003 – That the Council co-opt Nick Maycock who signed the acceptance of office and joined the meeting.

6. Public Participation

Neighbourhood Plan Review

A request was made for an update of the Neighbourhood Plan review, in particular the actions identified in the report of the site allocation consultation results. It was noted that Councillors have started meeting with landowners and the notes of these meetings will be published on the Council's website.

CW&C Charles Hardy Report

Cllr Hardy reported he is still working with CW&C regarding the development of the Rode Street site noting now an application has been submitted for the site enforcement is not able to act until that has been resolved. He stated that he had concerns regarding contamination of the site making it unsuitable for people to live there.

The Parish Council's purchase of the Speed Indicator Device (SID) was discussed noting the Parish Council is only seeking a donation towards its purchase from Cllr Hardy and understood from PC Gilchrist that Cllr Hardy was seeking to buy a SID for use by the other parishes in his ward.

Cllr Hardy encouraged the Council and residents to get in touch if they have any issues.

7. Minutes

Resolved 26/004 – That the Chairman sign the minutes of the meeting held on the 9th March and the extraordinary meeting on the 23rd March 2026 as a true and proper record.

8. Minutes of Working Groups and Other Meetings

Resolved 26/005 – That the Council accepted the notes of working groups and other meetings from page 8 of the minutes including notes of the play area meeting held on the 24th April.

10. Council Dates & Rota

Resolved 26/006 – That the Council agree the below rota:

	Planning	Surgery (Night of meeting)	Meeting Actions
8th June <i>Informal</i>	Gill Clough John Growney		
13th July	Catherine Helm Lisa Miller	Gill Clough Charlotte Hodgkinson	
10th August <i>Informal</i>	Nigel Taylor Charlotte Hodgkinson		
14th September	Mark Ravenscroft Stuart Walton	John Growney Stuart Walton	
12th October <i>Informal</i>	Alex Sawkiw John Millington		
9th November	Peter Tavernor New Councillor	Catherine Helm Nigel Taylor	Budget Review
14th December <i>Informal</i>	Gill Clough John Growney		
18th January	Catherine Helm Lisa Miller	Lisa Miller Mark Ravenscroft	Precept
8th February <i>Informal</i>	Nigel Taylor Charlotte Hodgkinson		
8th March	Mark Ravenscroft Stuart Walton	John Millington Alex Sawkiw	Risk & Assets Grant Apps
12th April <i>Informal</i>	Alex Sawkiw John Millington		
10th May TBC	Peter Tavernor Nick Maycock		First / Annual

11. Committees, Working Groups & Outside Bodies

Resolved 26/007 - That the Council agree the below appointments:

Committees	Membership
Cemetery Committee (4)	Catherine Helm , Lisa Miller, John Millington, Peter Tavernor.
Staffing Committee	Gill Clough , Catherine Helm, Nick Maycock, Peter Tavernor.
Working Groups	Membership
Allotments & Bowling Green Land Working Group (Former RBL)	Gill Clough, Peter Tavernor, Nigel Taylor.
Christmas 2026	Gill Clough, Charlotte Hodgkinson, Nick Maycock, Lisa Miller, Alex Sawkiw, Peter Tavernor.
Maintenance	Lisa Miller, Alex Sawkiw
Neighbourhood Plan (Review) Working Group	John Millington, Peter Tavernor, Nigel Taylor , councillors to attend as meeting as required.
Play Area Development Group	Charlotte Hodgkinson, Lisa Miller, Mark Ravenscroft , Alex Sawkiw.
Play Area Maintenance	Mark Ravenscroft.
Policies Working Group	Catherine Helm, Peter Tavernor, Nigel Taylor.
Public Rights of Way Working Group	Catherine Helm, Mark Ravenscroft, David Press.
Risk Assessment Group	Catherine Helm, Mark Ravenscroft, Nigel Taylor.
Outside Bodies	Membership
Arthur Meredith Charity	Gill Clough.
Rowcliffe Homes (3)	Gordon Adam, Gill Clough, Stuart Walton.
Tarporley Community Centre	Charlotte Hodgkinson, Nick Maycock.
Other	
Cheque Signatories	Gill Clough, Catherine Helm, John Millington, Peter Tavernor.

12. Neighbourhood Plan Review Update

1) Update

It was reported that Kirkwells had been undertaking the Plan Review while ONH had led on the site allocations process.

It was noted the results of the site allocation consultation are attached from page 11 of the Minutes and included a number of actions:

- Establishing the primary school capacity, it was confirmed the school has provided this information.
- Engage with landowners, it was confirmed these meetings are now taking place and that the notes of these will be posted on the Council's website, to date the meetings have been constructive. It was confirmed that some landowners had responded that they do not wish to develop their land.
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), it was reported that ONH have started this process.

It was confirmed that CW&C have now supplied an indicative number of 631 new homes for Tarporley for the Local Plan period of 20 years. It was noted that this is currently only an indicative number which may change. It was reported that at the recent CW&C Extraordinary meeting CW&C had stated that they do not expect to meet the December 2026 deadline for the Local Plan and will now have to develop a new Local Plan under the new system leaving a policy vacuum of 2 to 3 years.

It was discussed that engagement with CW&C is important and that it is vital that CW&C do not delay the neighbourhood Plan process.

2) Appointment of ONH.

Resolved 26/008 – That the Council appoint ONH to complete the Neighbourhood Plan review.

9. Planning

1) Planning Register

The planning register was approved as circulated, pages 54 to 58.

Resolved 26/009 – That the Council submit no objection for the following applications:

26/01124/FUL - Two storey extension, single storey rear extension and new parking area - 10 Flaxyards, Eaton Road, Tarporley, CW6 9GL.

26/01125/FUL – Two storey side extension & single storey rear extension with alterations to windows - Laurel Bank, 6 Forest Road, Tarporley, CW6 9HX.

Resolved 26/010 – That the Council submit no objection for application 25/03262/FUL – Erection of a boundary fence (Retrospective) – Buffer Depot, Rode Street, Tarporley, CW6 0EF.

2) Planning Applications

No further applications received.

3) Lead Planners

Cllrs Clough, Growney, Helm & Miller were noted as lead planners until the July meeting.

13. Annual Report

Resolved 26/011 – That the Council delegate authority to the Deputy Clerk to finalise the Annual Report in consultation with Councillors. An abbreviated version of the report will be published in Tarporley Talk with a link to the full version on the Council's website.

14. Tarporley Carnival

Resolved 26/012 – That the Council purchase a full page in the Carnival Brochure for £100 advertising the play area refurbishment and highlighting the funding of the road closure.

It was agreed to take part in the carnival parade and possibly hand out some small gifts, Nick Maycock, Lisa Miller and Alex Sawkiw to lead on project.

15. Playing Field Improvements

The meeting noted the notes of the meeting held on the 24th April, from page 23 of the minutes. It was agreed to not submit a Spacehive application at this time.

16. Delegation of Power

1) Planning

Resolved 26/013 – That the Council delegate authority to the Clerk to submit planning observations in consultation with councillors outside meetings in line with the Council's Planning Standing Orders.

2) Payments

Resolved 26/014 – That the Council delegate authority to the Clerk to make payments in between meetings with the agreement of a minimum of 2 cheque signatories.

17. Internal Auditor

Resolved 26/015 – That the Council confirm the appointment of Morren Accountancy to undertake the internal auditor for 2025-2026 noting they have no connections to the Parish Council and had been supplied with an appointment letter highlighting the requirements of the internal audit including their independence.

18. Annual Governance & Accountability Return 2025-2026

1) Quarter End & Year End Accounts

Resolved 26/016 – That the Council agreed the quarter end accounts, including the yearend accounts prepared in income and expenditure, pages 88 to 92 of the cash book.

2) Audit Information

Resolved 26/017 – That the Council agreed audit information as circulated.

3) Report of Internal Auditor

Resolved 26/018 – That the Council agreed the internal audit report as circulated, page 93 of the Cash Book.

4) Governance Statement (Section 1) 2025-2026

Resolved 26/019 – That the Council answer YES to questions 1 to 8 and 10, noting question 9 is not applicable, of the Governance Statement as circulated, page 94 of the Cash Book.

It was agreed Cllrs Maycock and Tavernor would lead on a review of the Council's IT arrangements.

5) Accounting Statement (Section 2) 2025-2026

Resolved 26/020 – That the Council agreed the accounting statement as circulated, page 95 of the cash Book.

19. Accounts & Payments

1) Accounts & Payments

Resolved 26/021 – That the Council approve the accounts and bank reconciliation, which had been checked at a virtual meeting by Cllrs Clough and Growney, including the below payments as on page 96 of the cash book:

A. Morris	REIM: Printing & Zoom	109.96
PJ Hellmers Ltd	TCC & Brook Grounds Maintenance	1740.00
A. Wright	REIM: Phone	20.00
YU Energy	Storeroom Power	2.03
PJ Hellmers Ltd	Playing field, Cemetery & Other	1548.00
Chapel	Room hire - Jan & March	150.00
TCC	Room Hire - Feb	72.19
Nest	Pension - March	202.87
A. Wright	Salary & REIM: fence & stamp	1126.75
A. Morris	Salary - March	1106.14
Gaskells	Cemetery & Brook Rd Bins	163.64
Caloo	Gym instruction plates	89.40
R. Jones	Holy planting Poppy Lane	25.00
Kirkwells Ltd	N-Plan work	550.00
C. Helm	REIM: Padlock	7.99
PJ Hellmers Ltd	TCC, Cem & Other	1476.00
PJ Hellmers Ltd	Brook Grounds Maintenance	1620.00
Talkabout Publishing	Tarp Talk	144.00
Accounts Centre	Payroll - April	24.00
M. Ravenscroft	REIM: Paint	111.40
Unity Trust Bank	Bank charge	7.00
NatWest	Bank charge	11.90
Morren Accountancy	Internal Audit 2025-2026	270.00
R. Walker	Play area clean and works	560.00
YU Energy	Storeroom Power	18.67
HMRC	PAYE/NI	355.29

2) Accounts & Payments

Resolved 26/022 – That the Council approve the following payments:

Gaskells	Cemetery & Brook Rd Bins	265.98
A. Wright	Salary – February	1028.92
A. Morris	Salary – April	1105.94
HMRC	NI & PAYE – April	355.49
Nest	Pension Contribution – April	202.87

Resolved 26/023 – That the Council hire a small skip to get rid of waste materials.

20. Annual Subscriptions

Resolved 26/024 – That the Council approve the following annual subscriptions:

Institute of Cemetery & Crematorium Management (ICCM) £110

Mid-Cheshire Footpath Society £8

Resolved 26/025 – That the Council agreed to move into private session and request the press and public leave.

21. Planter Watering

Resolved 26/026 – That the Council appoint PJ Hellmers Ltd to undertake planter watering.

22. Road Closures

Resolved 26/027 – That the Council appoint Dutton's Traffic management to undertake road closures for 2026.

Meeting closed: 8.46pm.

Signed:
Ann Wright 12/05/2026

Dated:

Next Scheduled Parish Council Meeting
Meeting of the Parish Council
Monday 13th July 2025 - 7pm
School Room, Tarpoley Chapel

Tarporley Parish Council Minute Book
Committees, Working Groups and Other Meetings
Presented at the May 2026 Meeting

Notes Included:

	Page
Neighbourhood Plan Review – Consultation Results Tuesday 17 th March 2026	9
Informal Meeting Notes Monday 20 th April 2026 at 7pm via Zoom	22
Notes from Play Area Meeting Friday 24 th April Via Zoom	23

Neighbourhood Plan Review – Consultation Results

Tuesday 17th March 2026

Present:

ONH – Leah Coney

Tarporley Parish Council - Cllr Gill Clough, Cllr John Growney, Cllr Catherine Helm, Cllr Lisa Miller, Cllr John Millington, Cllr Alex Sawkiw, Cllr Peter Tavernor, Cllr Nigel Taylor, Cllr Stuart Walton. Clerk Ann Wright, Deputy Clerk Abigail Morris.

Purpose of Meeting: To review consultation results

The meeting discussed the attached results report.

It was discussed that landowners/ agents seeking to promote their own sites for development have unsurprisingly criticised alternative sites. It was confirmed objections raised need to be interrogated further to assess if they are valid or not.

It was noted the response from the GP was positive but its support for a specific site had not taken account of other sites offering space for a health centre.

It was noted no response had been received from the Primary School. Some assumptions have been included in the report regarding school admissions which need to be validated.

The report identified concerns raised by respondents which included:

- Flooding
- Surface water – it was noted that surface water can be mitigated.
- No scenarios include level 2 or 3 flood zones.

It was noted responses had been received from Turnberry, Carden Group but not CB Homes or Jones Homes.

Scenario 2 Viability

It was confirmed at this point there is nothing to say this site is not viable. The next step is to contact landowners and identify if they are interested in developing their land and if so their timescales.

It was noted it may be easier to work with a single landowner however if different landowners are willing to work together there can be an 'equalisation clause' agreed which means all landowners benefit equally from the development of the site which may result in some land being used for access roads or infrastructure while others are mainly housing.

Other concerns that had been raised regarding scenario 2 included:

- Limitations of 1 access road.
- Flooding/surface water
- Hedges which would be lost
- Impact on heritage and conservation area

- A landfill on the site.

It was noted the site does not include Grade 2 agricultural land or land of county value.

It was agreed the Council needs be guided by the communities response and carryout due diligence on the preferred sites.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

It was noted the SEA has to go out for consultation for a 6 to 8 week period. The SEA will assess the allocated site as well as the rejected sites.

It was noted that it is good to have received concerns regarding the preferred scenario as this allows the concerns to be addressed before the Reg. 14 consultation.

Hybrid Scenario

It was discussed what would happen if Scenario 2 could not deliver the housing required. It was stated a hybrid scenario can be developed which might use the best bits of the most popular scenarios.

If a hybrid solution is put forward the reasoning behind the decision would need to be explainable to the community, justified and evidenced.

Response Rate

It was noted there were 270 responses to the survey was a very good response rate.

Next Steps

- Letter to be sent to landowners.
- Contact primary school to validate assumptions.
- Write to golf club based on comments raised in consultation responses.
- Arrange meeting with CW&C spatial planning and highways planning teams revisiting Council's Transport Plan consultation response.
- Publish report and redacted results on website.

All were thanked for attending the meeting.

Ann Wright
20/03/2026

FILE NOTE

Project: Tarporley SSP
 Ref: 4025_033
 Date: 17th March 2026

Circulation: Ann Wright (Clerk)
 For circulation to Council

TARPORLEY SSP REPORT COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT OUTPUTS & NEXT STEPS

Introduction

Tarporley Parish Council recently undertook community engagement on its Settlement Spatial Planning work developed between November 2025 and February 2026. This was promoted as a "Future Development" Consultation and took place between Tuesday 24 February and Friday 13 March 2026. It included a Parish Meeting, a drop-in session and an on-line survey (which could also be completed off-line)

Its purpose was to ask the local community for their views on potential growth options for the village. This will, in turn inform subsequent discussions with land interests, other key stakeholders and the local planning authority to establish a preferred growth option for Tarporley. The outputs of this and subsequent engagement will also be used along a technical assessment of scenario options as part of the iterative SEA process to enable the Parish Council to determine the most appropriate locations for inclusion as site allocations in the modified neighbourhood plan.

Content for the informal engagement was prepared by ONH and the Parish Council including a "slide pack" and a survey for community stakeholders to complete.

Responses

The first section of the survey asked people to state whether they felt positively about each scenario.

Respondents were then given a free form box to write any comments they had in respect of each of the scenario. A thematic summary of the responses to the four scenarios is set out below as well as an AI generated summary in the Appendix.

Respondents were then asked to rank the scenarios in order of preference. This resulted in scenario 2 being preferred, scenario 3 placing second, scenario 1 placing third and scenario 4 placing last.

There were 272 responses (270 on-line, one paper not uploaded and the response from the surgery) Virtually all responses were from residents of the parish. A small number were received from neighbouring parishes. There were responses from land interests including 3 detailed responses sent via email (two representing the same land parcels) and a submission from the local GP surgery which are summarised below. There were also two paper responses which were received off-line and are also summarised.

Scenario 1 – Dispersed Growth

Level of Support

- Positive: 15.56%
- Negative: 73.33%
- Don't know / Not sure: 11.11%
(270 responses recorded)

Key Themes in Responses

1. Infrastructure concerns

Respondents frequently questioned whether existing infrastructure, including schools, healthcare services and parking capacity, could support development across multiple sites.

2. Traffic and congestion

Many comments highlighted concerns that dispersing development would increase traffic movements across the village and worsen congestion on routes such as the High Street.

3. Flooding and drainage

Flooding and drainage capacity were regularly raised as issues, with residents concerned that additional development could exacerbate existing problems.

4. Village character

A common concern was that dispersed growth would gradually change the character of Tarporley and weaken its identity as a rural village.

5. Growth model

Respondents frequently described the approach as fragmented, with concern that development on multiple small sites would lead to prolonged disruption and a lack of coordinated planning.

Scenario 2 – Sustainable Transport Corridor

Level of Support

- Positive: 51.85%
- Negative: 37.78%
- Don't know / Not sure: 10.37%
(270 responses recorded)

Key Themes in Responses

1. Infrastructure concerns

While this scenario attracted the highest level of support, many respondents still raised concerns about pressure on schools, healthcare provision and other services if growth occurred at the scale proposed.

2. Traffic and congestion

Some respondents felt concentrating development could help manage traffic if new connections or infrastructure improvements were delivered. However, others remained concerned about additional traffic on surrounding roads.

3. Flooding and drainage

Flood risk was identified as a key issue for some of the land within this scenario, and respondents emphasised the need for adequate drainage infrastructure.

4. Village character

Views were mixed. Some felt concentrating development in one area could help protect the historic core of the village, while others worried that the scale of development could still alter Tarporley's character.

5. Growth Model

Compared with other scenarios, this option was sometimes viewed more positively because development would be more concentrated rather than spread across multiple sites

Scenario 3– Linear Growth

Level of Support

- Positive: 47.41%
- Negative: 40.74%
- Don't know / Not sure: 11.85%
(270 responses recorded)

Key Themes in Responses

1. Infrastructure concerns

Many respondents questioned whether existing infrastructure and public services could accommodate the level of development proposed.

2. Traffic and congestion

Concerns were raised that extending development along key routes could increase traffic pressure on already busy roads and junctions.

3. Flooding and drainage

Flood risk and drainage capacity were again highlighted as important considerations for areas within this scenario.

4. Village character

Respondents expressed concern that linear expansion could alter the scale and form of the village and extend development into currently open countryside.

5. Growth model

Some respondents suggested that development along a corridor could appear fragmented and disconnected from the existing settlement.

Scenario 4– Linear Growth

Level of Support

- Positive: 9.26 %
- Negative: 81.85%

- Don't know / Not sure: 8.89%
(270 responses recorded)

Key Themes in Responses

1. Infrastructure concerns

Respondents frequently stated that infrastructure and public services would struggle to support the level of growth proposed under this scenario.

2. Traffic and congestion

Many comments highlighted fears that increased housing numbers would lead to significantly higher traffic levels in and around the village.

3. Flooding and drainage

Flood risk and drainage capacity were raised as key constraints that should be addressed before any large-scale development proceeds.

4. Village character

A strong theme was concern that the scale of development could fundamentally change the character and identity of Tarporley.

5. Piecemeal development

Some respondents commented that combining multiple growth areas could lead to development occurring across several locations, creating cumulative impacts across the village.

Across all four scenarios, a number of consistent themes emerged from the consultation responses.

These included concerns about the capacity of existing infrastructure, particularly healthcare and education services; the potential impact of additional traffic on local roads; the need to address flooding and drainage constraints; the importance of maintaining the character and identity of the village; and concerns about piecemeal or uncoordinated development.

These issues will be important considerations in determining the preferred approach to future growth within the Tarporley Neighbourhood Plan.

Paper submissions

Two paper submissions were received which were not uploaded to the on-line survey.

One from a respondent who had completed the survey and wished to make an additional submission focused on design and character, noting that new developments should blend sympathetically and be of good architectural design and layout, preserving the scenic setting of the village. Concern was raised in respect of the proposed Brickfield Farm development (by the same developers as Daffodil Field), which was felt to be lacking character or integration with local Georgian-style architecture. The respondent felt the Daffodil Field development was poorly designed and lacking inspiration and missed the opportunity for a shoppers' car park. The respondent felt future development is necessary but it must be carefully designed to protect the village's character and amenities.

The second paper submission from a local resident, expresses an overall negative view of most development scenarios, particularly Scenarios 1 (Dispersed Growth), 3 (Linear Growth), and 4 (Higher Growth), citing concerns about increased congestion, flood risk, lack of supporting infrastructure, and

potential harm to the village character and local economy. While Scenario 2 (Sustainable Transport Corridor) is viewed more positively due to its potential for improved connectivity and reduced High Street traffic, they still have concern about deliverability and impacts. The respondent highlights that large-scale growth (e.g. Scenario 4) could lead to unwanted commercialisation, including supermarkets and chain outlets, potentially undermining existing local businesses. They also emphasise infrastructure pressures (schools, parking, sewage), question whether sufficient use is being made of lower-grade agricultural land, and raise the need for stronger local authority powers to ensure development delivers community benefits. Overall, the response stresses that protecting the High Street, managing traffic, and ensuring infrastructure provision should be central to any future development strategy

Developer Submissions

Bloor Homes Land at Ardenne Home Farm

Bloor Homes express a clear preference for Scenario 1: Dispersed Growth, which they rank as their most favourable option. Their support is primarily because this option includes land at Ardenne Home Farm, a site they are promoting for up to 140 dwellings with associated public open space. They state that the site is available, deliverable and subject to a current outline planning application, supported by technical assessments demonstrating that development is feasible and sustainably located close to village services. They also highlight that development would generate Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions to support local infrastructure.

Bloor Homes raise significant concerns regarding the other spatial options. They consider Scenario 2 (Sustainable Transport Corridor) to have fundamental deliverability issues due to multiple landownerships, uncertain site availability, access constraints from Rode Street and numerous environmental and heritage constraints, including Local Green Space designations, flood risk and proximity to heritage assets.

They also object to Scenario 3 (Linear Growth) on the basis that several sites are affected by heritage, flood risk and infrastructure constraints, and that one site lies outside the Tarporley Neighbourhood Plan boundary, meaning development there would not provide the same infrastructure funding benefits to the parish.

While acknowledging that Scenario 4 (Higher Growth) reflects a more realistic level of housing growth, Bloor Homes still raise concerns as it relies on the same sites as Options 2 and 3, which they consider having significant constraints and uncertain deliverability. They therefore recommend that deliverable sites such as Ardenne Home Farm should be included in all spatial options to ensure housing delivery and support local infrastructure.

Carden Group - Forest Road and Utkinton Road

Carden Group's representation focuses primarily on concerns with Growth Option 2 (Sustainable Transport Corridor) and the promotion of land off Utkinton Road and Forest Road as a more deliverable development opportunity.

Carden argue that Option 2 is unlikely to deliver the proposed 675 homes due to significant constraints. These include fragmented land ownership across multiple parcels, heritage impacts within and around the Tarporley Conservation Area, surface water flood risk, access limitations, ecological constraints from extensive hedgerows, and the presence of the former Elm Tree Farm landfill site. They also highlight that safe highway access for development of this scale would be difficult to achieve, with only limited access potentially available from Rode Street. As a result, they conclude that the realistic

capacity of the site is likely to be significantly lower, potentially between around 255 and 375 homes once constraints are taken into account.

In contrast, Carden promote land off Utkinton and Forest Road, which forms part of Options 1, 3 and 4, as a more suitable and deliverable location for development. They state that the site is in single ownership, benefits from two potential access points, has limited flood risk, and sits at a greater distance from key heritage assets, making it easier to develop. The site could deliver approximately 300–400 homes, alongside community infrastructure including a potential new GP surgery, which they describe as a significant public benefit.

Overall, Carden conclude that Option 2 alone will not deliver the required level of housing growth and that the most appropriate strategy for the Neighbourhood Plan would likely be a combination of multiple spatial options, incorporating more deliverable sites such as the land at Utkinton and Forest Road.

Turnberry - Forest Road and Utkinton Road

The response, submitted on behalf of a Tarporley resident and landowner, expresses support for Growth Options 1, 3 and 4, while raising strong concerns regarding the viability of Option 2. It promotes a 46-acre site off Forest Road and Utkinton Road, which has the potential to deliver approximately 300–400 homes and is subject to a current planning application. The site is presented as highly deliverable due to single ownership, minimal flood risk, appropriate buffers from heritage assets, and the provision of two access points to improve connectivity and traffic distribution. The proposal also emphasises community benefits, notably the potential delivery of a new GP surgery. In contrast, the respondent considers Option 2 is constrained by factors including heritage impacts, flood risk, highways, ecology and former landfill, and is therefore unlikely to achieve its projected housing numbers. The response concludes that no single growth option will meet the village's needs in isolation and recommends a blended approach, also supporting land to the south of the village for mixed-use development including residential, employment and retail uses.

Healthcare Provision

The GP practices in Tarporley state that the current health centre is outdated, too small, and already operating at full capacity, with around 14,400 patients expected to rise to about 17,000 due to new housing developments.

They argue that a new purpose-built neighbourhood health hub is needed to meet future healthcare demand and support modern services. The practices support the Forest Road site for this facility and therefore back Neighbourhood Plan Options 1, 3, and 4, which include this location.

They stress that healthcare infrastructure must be planned alongside housing growth and offer to discuss future provision with the Parish Council.

NEXT STEPS

Education Provision

Whilst no response was received during this engagement period from Tarporley CofE Primary School, as a key element of social infrastructure, its sustainable limits need to be understood as part scenario planning.

The school currently operates as a 1.5 form entry primary school, which gives an overall capacity of approximately 315 pupils. The school has a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 30 pupils for year R, which has dropped from 45.

As of March 2026, the school had c.278 pupils on roll, meaning it was operating at close to 90% of its total capacity. Based on these figures, there are approximately 36 remaining pupil places available within the existing school capacity.

Using a standard planning assumption of 0.21 primary-aged pupils generated per new dwelling, the current spare capacity could theoretically accommodate demand arising from around 170 additional homes before the school reaches its full capacity.

Engagement with the school will be required to ascertain:

- 1) If the current reduction in PAN from 45 to 30 continues across all year groups in time, then in effect this takes the school to a 1 form entry of 210 pupils over time. As such, around 500 additional dwellings could be accommodated to bring the school capacity back up to 315, supporting retention of the higher 1.5 form entry model, rather than allowing the school to roll forward to an effective 1 form entry model.
- 2) If the current reduction in PAN from 45 to 30 is a one off in response to a low intake year, but otherwise remains operating at around 90% capacity in its forward plan, this allows for up to a further 36 children (170 home equivalent). As such, development beyond 170 homes may require an expansion of the school from 1.5 form entry to 2 form entry, increasing capacity from 315 to approximately 420 pupils, creating an additional 105 pupil places. Based on the pupil yield assumption, approximately 500 additional homes would be required to generate sufficient pupil numbers to support this level of on-site expansion if there was scope to extend the building.

These figures provide an indicative assessment of primary education capacity in Tarporley, based on pupil numbers recorded in March 2026, and illustrate the potential relationship between future housing growth and primary school provision in the village. **The figures will need to be verified with the school.**

LANDOWNER ENGAGEMENT

It is strongly recommended that the Parish Council undertakes follow up engagement with land interests who responded to the survey to better understand land availability and to discuss the community benefits sought from development.

In addition, the community identified other parcels of land to the east of the village, notably land owned by the golf course and it would be appropriate to contact them to understand their intentions.

STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (SEA)

The Parish Council will need to work with its appointed Neighbourhood Plan consultants to prepare a joint screening opinion and scoping report for SEA. The outputs of this should be used to inform discussions to determine a preferred growth scenario and subsequently to assess individual sites within that scenario which are taken forward as potential site allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan. This process should be started as soon as possible.

ENGAGEMENT WITH CHESHIRE WEST AND CHESTER COUNCIL

The Parish Council will need to discuss the emerging Local Plan with the Policy Team and establish the indicative housing number for Tarporley and also discuss the other policies in the Plan – noting that the basic condition relating to general conformity with the Local Plan will be removed on 25 March 2026. The new narrower condition will be much simpler to meet as it focuses solely on housing supply. This might make a significant difference to how your Plan brings forward and argues its policy proposals and therefore will need to form part of your discussions with your planning consultant and the LPA. It is also advised that you review your existing/proposed policies to ensure they are consistent with the decision-making policies in the new NPPF (currently due to be published in early summer) to ensure they have functional weight post adoption.

Given the highway issues in Tarporley, engagement with the Highways and Transport teams may also assist in refining scenario preferences e.g. access to Rode Street in Scenario 2.

MODIFIED NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Once these steps are completed the Parish Council will be in a position to drafting the site allocations policy/policies for modified Neighbourhood Plan, to be accompanied by the draft SEA, modification statement and modification proposal ready for the Regulation 14 consultation.

It is suggested that this note is retained for use in your Consultation Statement which will accompany your submission version of the Plan in due course.

Appendix – Summary of scenario responses (AI-generated)

Scenario #1 – Dispersed Growth

Overall sentiment: Strongly negative (≈73% negative from chart)

Positive Themes

1. Less visual impact due to dispersed layout
2. Maintains “village feel” vs large estates
3. Avoids one, large concentrated development
4. Variety in housing styles possible
5. Smaller developments seen as more manageable
6. Retains some green gaps between sites
7. Perceived flexibility in delivery
8. Limited countryside encroachment (compared to others)
9. Some access to main roads without central concentration
10. Seen as “least bad” option by a minority

Negative Themes

1. Traffic congestion (most dominant issue) – especially High Street & junctions

2. Car dependency due to poor walkability
3. Lack of infrastructure planning (piecemeal growth)
4. Overload on existing services (GP, schools, parking)
5. Loss of village identity / creeping urbanisation
6. Poor site access via unsuitable minor roads
7. Impact on countryside & Grade 2 agricultural land
8. Construction disruption across multiple sites
9. Increased pollution and safety concerns
10. No clear community benefits (seen as developer-led)

Many respondents explicitly described it as “piecemeal,” “uncoordinated,” and offering “virtually no benefits”

Scenario #2 – Sustainable Transport Corridor

Overall sentiment: Mixed but more balanced than Scenario 1

Positive Themes

1. Strong active travel potential (walking/cycling)
2. Better access to village centre
3. Opportunity for masterplanning
4. Reduced High Street traffic via alternative routes
5. Infrastructure delivered alongside development
6. Logical boundary using A49
7. Safer and more organised growth pattern
8. Potential for integrated green corridors
9. Easier access to services and transport
10. Seen as more “future-proof”

Negative Themes

1. Concerns about heritage impact (Conservation Area, Salters Well)
2. Scale still considered too large by some
3. Risk of traffic displacement rather than reduction
4. Pressure on western edge of village
5. Potential loss of green buffer
6. Flood risk concerns (surface water)
7. Doubts about delivery of infrastructure promises
8. Increased density in one area
9. Visual impact on village edge
10. Concerns about overdevelopment near A49

Generally viewed as a more strategic and coherent option, but with environmental concerns.

Scenario #3 – Linear Growth

Overall sentiment: Moderately positive / pragmatic

Positive Themes

1. Best balance of growth and infrastructure
2. Housing closer to village centre (walkable)
3. Delivery of community infrastructure (GP, transport hub, car park)
4. Supports local services and businesses
5. Smaller scale than other options
6. Good mix of housing types (incl. for older residents)
7. More integrated with existing village
8. Potential to improve facilities
9. Logical distribution of sites
10. Seen as realistic and deliverable

Negative Themes

1. Some countryside encroachment (ASCV, farmland)
2. Still increases traffic (though less than others)
3. Concerns about spreading development too far
4. Southern parcel outside neighbourhood plan boundary
5. Pressure on infrastructure if not delivered properly
6. Loss of green spaces in parts
7. Potential visual impact
8. Concerns about density in northern area
9. Questions about feasibility of infrastructure delivery
10. Some see it as a compromise rather than ideal

Often viewed as the “middle-ground” or most acceptable option.

Scenario #4 – Higher Growth

Overall sentiment: Highly polarised, largely negative

Positive Themes

1. Ability to deliver major infrastructure upgrades
2. New primary school, health hub, transport hub
3. Improved connectivity (walking/cycling routes)
4. Potential for supermarket and services
5. Comprehensive masterplanning possible
6. Economies of scale for infrastructure
7. Reduced piecemeal development
8. Better long-term planning opportunity
9. Potential improved public transport
10. Could meet housing targets fully

Negative Themes

1. Scale overwhelmingly too large (dominant concern)
2. Major impact on countryside, heritage, and landscape

3. Loss of village character / turning into a town
4. Significant traffic increase despite mitigation
5. Pressure on services during transition
6. Environmental concerns (ASCV, farmland loss)
7. Risk of overdevelopment and urban sprawl
8. Infrastructure may lag behind development
9. Visual and aesthetic impact
10. Community resistance to rapid expansion

Frequently described as "too much, too fast" despite infrastructure benefits.

Informal Meeting Notes

Monday 20th April 2026 at 7pm via Zoom

Present:

Gill Clough, John Growney, Catherine Helm, Lisa Miller, John Millington, Mark Ravenscroft, Alex Sawkiw, Peter Tavernor, Nigel Taylor, Abigail Morris (Deputy Clerk), Ann Wright (Clerk).
(Apologies: Charlotte Hodgkinson, Stuart Walton)

Site Allocations & Neighbourhood Plan

It was noted that the Plan review and site allocation had come to a critical point where decisions needed to be made regarding moving forward and who would undertake the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), attend meetings with landowners and write the site allocation policies.

It was agreed ONH are best placed to complete the Plan.

It was agreed to request ONH to provide a revised timetable.

Pete Tavernor to write 1 page summary of what we want from the Plan.

Internal Audit

A discussion took place regarding who should undertake the Council's internal audit given it is an intermediate Audit. It was agreed to contact Hacker Young to see if they can carry out the audit in time, noting an extraordinary meeting might be required if the Audit is not completed by the May meeting.

S106 Discussions

It was noted the Clerk has requested a meeting with the CW&C S106 officer to discuss S106 agreements and what influence the Parish Council can have on those agreements.

It was emphasised that it is important that the agreements allocate the funding to Tarporley.

It was agreed the Clerk request a meeting with CB Homes to discuss possible Brook Road drainage.

Annual Report

Councillors were reminded that Abbie is putting together the draft Annual Report for the May meeting and to get their articles to her as soon as possible.

Phase 2 Play Area Works

It was noted a working group is due to meet to discuss the next phase of works to improve the Community Playing field. It was suggested the Group focuses on delivering the path possibly using crowd funding. It was noted that S106 and CIL funding from new developments could be 3+ years away.

It was agreed to investigate installation of drains on the field.

It was agreed to review the grass seeding and when to remove the fence.

Carnival

Councillors were asked to consider taking part in the Carnival parade, it was agreed the Clerk would investigate getting a float.

Ann Wright
21st April 2026

Notes from Play Area Meeting

Friday 24th April Via Zoom

Attendance: Mark Ravenscroft, Lisa Miller, Alex Sawkiw, Abigail Morris (Deputy Clerk),

Signage Update

The group discussed the proposed signage for both the play area and playing field. It was agreed that draft designs should be circulated to all Councillors for feedback and approval prior to going to print.

The following signage provision was agreed:

- Four signs to be installed around the playing field, with one positioned at each entrance.
- Two additional signs to be located within the play area itself (next to gates)
- A play area map to be included to help visitors navigate the site and identify key features.

It was also agreed that the signage should include relevant emergency location information using *what3words* references for individual access points, including locations such as Eaton Road and Churchill Drive, to assist emergency services if required.

Phase 2 of the Play Area Project

The group discussed the scope of Phase 2 works and agreed that the installation of a perimeter pathway should be included as part of the next stage of development. The pathway was viewed as an important addition which would improve accessibility and encourage wider community use of the site.

Additional seating was also discussed as part of Phase 2. Consideration was given to involving Tarporley High School Sixth Form students in the design or creation of seating elements.

Concerns were raised regarding the most appropriate locations for seating around the playing field so consideration will therefore be required before final positions are agreed.

Phase 3 Review

The group agreed that Phase 3 proposals should now be reviewed following the opening of the play area. Some originally proposed equipment and features may need to be reconsidered in light of how the space is currently being used and feedback received since opening.

Updated costings and priorities will therefore be required before progressing further.

Actions Agreed

- **Abbie** to contact the Planning Department to confirm whether planning permission will be required for the proposed perimeter path.
- **Abbie** to contact Mike Holmes to:
 - obtain costings for the proposed pathway and additional seating;
 - request approximate costings for potential Phase 3 equipment options.
- **Abbie** to investigate whether the creation of a perimeter pathway could support the introduction of a junior parkrun, and whether this could help attract additional external funding opportunities.

- To consider reinstating seating on the existing hard-standing area in the short term, subject to the seating being securely fixed into place.