MINUTES OF THE EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING OF ACTON EDLESTON AND HENHULL PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT ACTON PARISH HALL ON 13 FEBRUARY 2020

PRESENT: Councillor Carol Mace
Councillor Dave Taylor
Councillor Paul Weaver
Councillor Tom Doyle

APOLOGIES: Councillor Les Hobson
Councillor Philip Percival
Councillor Claire-Lewis Jones

IN ATTENDANCE: Chris Pattison - Turnberry Associates
Charles Roundell – Dorfold Estates
CE Councillor Sarah Pochin
Annie Coombs
Peter Foster

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

DISPENSATIONS

No Dispensation Forms were submitted.

MATTERS ARISING:

DISCUSSIONS WITH DORFOLD ESTATES AND TURNBERRY ASSOCIATES RE THE POTENTIAL COMMUNITY BENEFITS REGARDING THE PLANNING APPLICATION 19/5211N – LAND SOUTH OF MONKS LANE AND WEST OF CHESTER ROAD ACTON

Carol Mace opened the meeting with thanks to Chris Pattison and Charles Roundell for coming along to the meeting.

Chris Pattison thanked the Parish Council for their comments and support on the above application. He commented that the letter of support was very well crafted and felt it was a fair letter, taking into account everyones views and comments.

Chris referred to said letter as follows:

2. Referendum Version of the Neighbourhood Plan - Chris referred to the Neighbourhood Plan saying that it was a key document and that the recent survey regarding housing saw the desire for some housing on different scales but does not allocate any sites. He said that if the Referendum on 27 February was successful and that the Plan was adopted it would not make any difference.

3. Alternative Site(s) for the Pub – Chris said that there were issues with putting the pub on the current Car Park site as Cheshire East were very sceptical about this and also it was Battlefield Site and would be very close to the Old Vicarage. The site is very tight and that it was a struggle to fit in car park surfacing. He said that the current proposed

positioning of the pub was good and would be in open park and a good setting. Footpaths within the Estate and Parkland would be resurfaced.
Carol Mace said that the village weren't happy with the new proposed position of the pub. Chris replied that this can not be changed (moved).

5. (a) Enabling Development – Chris explained that the "enabling development" that was referred to in the application (with lower case letters) was not meant in the same way as the reasons for ENABLING DEVELOPMENT which has a specific meaning within the planning process. **- CHRIS PATTISON TO ADD TO THIS POINT.**

Dave Taylor said that it was a shame that the definition of "enabling development" had not been more simply explained by Turnberry in the application as it had caused a lot of confusion and frustration.

Chris went on to say that if the development were approved, because of its individuality, others would find it hard to match its design and financial feasibility. He also explained that money from the scheme would be put in an escrow account (which means that the monies can only be used for the purpose it was originally intended – like a trust) for feasibility work for listed buildings on the estate which in turn would create new income for future maintenance.

He said that Cheshire East had said it has an open mind on the proposed application and that the design and conservation officers still have to comment.

He said that if the application was refused they would go to appeal and hoped that the Parish Council would support the appeal.

(b) Open space and village green – the objective is to incorporate a play area near to the Pub but the intention is that this play area is not part of the Pub. The Play area would be managed and maintained by Dorfold Estates.

Peter Foster asked if it would be a formal play area. Chris replied that it would be a sympathetically designed soft play area constructed with natural timbers. The estate also wants to see the parkland used informally as open space.

(c) School – Chris said that they would have to pay Education contributions.

(d) Traffic and Roads – The proposed new road would reduce traffic on Monks Lane and improve traffic flow. There are already Plans from the S106 from Kingsley Fields (Kingsbourne Development) and this proposed development would not detract from that. The northerly approach to Monks Lane would be designed so that it would encourage people to drive through the new development rather than along Monks Lane. He said that HGV's could continue to use Monks Lane but the priority would be along the new road which would be designed to accommodate HGV's. Paul Weaver asked if there would be double yellow lines. Chris said not at this stage. Carol Mace asked if there would be a Pedestrian crossing. Chris replied that they don't need to do that now.

6. (a) Balancing benefits – details in Parish Councils letter noted.

(b) Biodiversity – Chris replied this needed to be done offsite.

(c) Car Parking – More car parking would be added near to the Church. The existing car park to be resurfaced and there would also be the Pub car park. Overall there would

be an increase in the number of spaces available for public use. Charles Roundell said that if a big function was taking place in the village then one of his fields could be used for additional parking if required – he had no problem with this. Chris said that the Village Green would not be designed around the Car – No cars would be allowed on it. He said the Village Green could be used for Festivals, Christmas Fayres etc. Dorfold would maintain it. It would be for everyone to use – not just the proposed development. It would be there to be used and Dorfold Estates are supportive of this.

(d) Footpath network – Chris asked for a marked up Ordnance Survey Map with the footpath numbers. He said they would not be changing any of the existing footpaths and that a link would be created through the estate. Dave Taylor said that Cheshire East and said one of the footpaths was going to be blocked off. Chris said No, the footpaths stay as they are and will be accessible. Peter Foster said that the Cheshire East PROW submitted with the planning application gave all the footpath reference numbers. Peter said that the state of the current footpaths was very bad – especially "2 Saints Way" which was unpleasant to use. Charles Roundell said that other footpaths would link in with the whole of the development and all needed improving such as the link to Dig Lane. Peter Foster said that the footpaths had rapidly deteriorated and were in a bad state. He said people using the pub would be all muddy from the paths. Charles Roundell said that barbed wire had been taken down from part of the paths and some money had already been invested in repairing them. The surfacing on the track to Dorfold Dairy Farm had increased usage already.

Chris reported about Cheshire East's Community Infrastructure Levy and said the Parish Council should look into getting monies for improving footpaths from this as funds would be in place once the NP is adopted.. (This item to be put on the agenda for the next meeting). *"The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted by Cheshire East Borough Council on 21 February 2019 with effect from 1 March 2019. CIL is a planning charge introduced across England and Wales by 'The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). CIL is used by Local Authorities to help fund a wide range of infrastructure that is needed as a result of development."*

Chris suggested that Cheshire East might accept a reduction in CIL if footpath improvements were made into Nantwich which could be combined with S106 monies from Kingsley Fields.
Annie Coombs and Peter Foster asked whether the footpaths/cycleways – would be along existing ones or new ones be created on additional land. Chris Pattison said new ones.

(f) Lighting – Low wattage lighting would be used.

(g) Pub – Chris reported that Cheshire East Council felt there were design issues and would be providing more detailed comments. The Parish Council is very keen to support the need for a "Locals" side for the Pub where locals and walkers could go. Chris said there would be a bar area for locals and a community area.

(h) Open space and village green – reported earlier.

(i) Phasing of development – Chris said there would be a Construction Management Plan.

(k) Sustainability – Chris said that the proposed houses would have solar air source heat pumps. The SUD pond would require remedial tree planting in the woodland area therefore benefiting the impact on biodiversity, not have an impact on views – if it did

though there would be an increase in trees planted outside the site boundary. Paul Weaver said he felt more trees were needed anyway.

Community Benefits Section

1. The lease on the current car park would be renewed on a 99 years term and at a peppercorn rent.
2. Open Space – all open spaces to be open and accessible. No barriers – not a gated community.
3. Access to fields behind Wilbraham Road and the school – Charles Roundell said that the field could be linked in with the School to make a multi-purpose facility for the community and for the School. Tom Doyle said that this would need to be looked into very carefully due to Health and Safety legislation and safeguarding issues for children. Chris said there could be a gate provided for the School and a gate for the community with controlled access and supervised with the option of locking the gate when the School was open. Chris said he would look into this. Carol Mace suggested the planting of fruit trees and a woodland walkway that would be open to all – there isn't anything like this available at present. Charles Roundell said that this idea of a Woodland walkway would be educational for the school children. Chris said that the area could be a Wildflower area but the area was limited. Chris said there was a danger of over providing but that the land there could be made available. Maybe money for Education from the development could be offset against this. Peter Foster said about a Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council Millennium project of regrading land off the north side of the footpath on Wilbraham Road. He said that the residents were very keen on these proposals but nothing had come of it.

Paul Weaver asked if the houses would be leasehold or freehold. Chris said Freehold. Paul also asked about Service charges on the development as he was concerned on the costs of these charges over the Country. Chris said there would be no maintenance costs on the open spaces.

Carol Mace asked about reducing the borders on the car park and possibly adding an extra row and then Dorfold resurfacing it. Charles Roundell said he had no objections to this but it would be for the Parish Council to take this forward.

Tom Doyle asked about Affordable Housing on the Development. Chris said they would be honouring the 30% figure of Affordable Housing.

Annie Coombs asked about Biodiversity. Chris said he would be having further discussions with Cheshire East regarding this and that this could possibly be a specific part of the S106 for the development.

Carol Mace asked if the application was not passed would it go to Appeal. Chris Pattison said yes they would go to appeal and would like the support of the Parish Council if this happened. He did say that if the Parish Council didn't give their support then all the points detailed above would not go ahead.

The Parish Council thanked Chris Pattison of Turnberry Associates and Charles Roundell of Dorfold Estates for coming along to this Extra-ordinary meeting.

The meeting finished at 8.15pm.