



Mrs. Marie Zizzi
 Clerk to the Council
 Cheswick Green Village Hall
 Cheswick Way, Cheswick Green
 Solihull B90 4JA

Tel: 01564 700168
 clerk@cheswickgreen-pc.gov.uk
 www.cheswickgreen-pc.gov.uk

**MINUTES OF CGPC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
 Monday 9th January 2017 10:00am Cheswick Green Village Hall**

Present: Cheswick Green Parish Councillors: Margaret Gosling (Planning Committee Chairman), Brian Brown, Penny Phillips and Mick Swain

Co-opted member: Piers Cockcroft

0 members of the public

34. Apologies for Absence and to approve, if thought fit, the reasons - if any given – for absence from the meeting.

341.1 Apologies were given for Cllr. Ian Bruce and Cllr. Steve Hall, these were accepted.

35. Declarations of Interest.

35.1 None.

36. Dispensations.

36.1 None.

37. Public participation.

37.1 Not application - no members of the public present.

38. To resolve to accept the Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 14th November 2016.

Resolved; all in favour - that these Minutes should be accepted as a true and accurate record.

It was proposed at this stage that Item 7 on the agenda (planning applications received) be brought forward to this point – all members agreed.

39. To discuss any planning applications received.

39.1 It was agreed that the draft letter circulated by the Clerk, in relation to CGPC response to a recent planning application for 66B Salter Street should be sent.

39.2 It was agreed that the draft letter to Anne Brereton should be sent, with copies to Nick Page, James Carpenter, Jim Harte and the Blythe Ward Councillors.

39.2.1 There were comments about if it was possible for the Parish Council to make a formal complaint in relation to the Local Authority and/or regarding an Officer.

39.3 It was agreed that recent photographs taken of the Bloor Homes development should be sent to the Considerate Construction Scheme, with an explanation.

39.3.1 Cllr. Gosling said that there needed to be more from individuals in relation to any complaints and/or concerns about this development, not just from the Parish Council, then SMBC might take more notice.

39.4 In relation to the Blythe Valley application, it was felt that this had been a done deal before it went to the Planning Committee. It was stated that the fact that HHPC, CGRA and CGPC all had different views about this, had not helped.

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Monday 9th January 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

39.4.1 There were comments about working with surrounding Parish Councils and the RA. It was pointed out that there had been some communication with HHPC and that Cllr. Brown, Cllr. Bruce and the Clerk had all attended the meeting about Blythe Valley held by HHPC.

39.4.2 There were comments about the Kineton Lane access and the existing bus gate. It was noted that CGPC had suggested that part of Kineton Lane was closed, so that traffic did not go through Illshaw Heath, it was felt that this had been ignored.

39.4.3 There were comments about Cllr. Ken Meeson and Cllr. Ian Courts, both objecting to the Kineton Lane access and about Cllr. Ken Meeson referring to what had been agreed in 1997 for a separate development, for use as an industrial area and sticking to this.

39.4.4 It was noted that an email had been sent to the Parish Councils planning consultant, about Blythe Valley but no reply had been received yet.

39.5 It was noted that Cllr. Gosling had produced a draft response for CGPC in relation to SMBCs Local Plan Review and this would need to be approved at the Parish Council meeting.

Action item: Cllr. Gosling to send a copy of this to Mr. Cockroft.

40. To discuss the Neighbourhood Plan.

40.1 It was noted that three Newsletters had been issued about this now and pointed out that in the RA Minutes, it stated that there was no Neighbourhood Plan.

40.2 It was felt that this could not be produced before the Local Plan Review went through, as it still needed to be written, consulted on and go to a referendum.

40.3 Cllr. Gosling referred to putting information on the Parish Council notice boards and the website about the need for a Neighbourhood Plan, due to more and more development.

40.4 It was noted that discussion about this had been going on for 18 months now and that it would be impossible to complete the formal process before the Local Plan Review.

40.5 It was suggested that a draft needed to be produced shadowing the Local Plan, that after the Local Plan Review consultation was completed, it would go to an inquiry and that it could be a very long time, because of Birmingham and other urban areas possibly saying that Solihull hasn't allocated a fair share of housing, looking at the West Midlands and its pressure.

40.6 It was stated that it was easy to develop on green belt land, therefore it was a soft target and it was possible that former industrial land in Birmingham, would be left. It was felt that there could be concerns and therefore Solihull may not get a fast ride.

40.7 It was stated that in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, the fact that the Parish Council was doing this, even if it was not completed and approved, could give certain weight.

40.8 It was agreed that there was nothing to lose by developing a Plan, or a pre-consultation plan. There were comments about where things were now and about circulating something to Cheswick Green residents for comments, to get something approved locally, as SMBC could not approve it due to the process.

40.9 There were comments about having something to put forward based on the current/existing Local Plan, that it would be better to have something rather than nothing or there would just be NIMBY-ism.

40.10 It was felt that the proposals put forward by Savile's had nearly gone through as a possible site and that this was due to the RA wanting a separate school and medical facility.

40.11 It was agreed that Mr. Cockroft and Cllr. Swain could produce and put something forward using information provided by Cllr. Phillips and flooding information.

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Monday 9th January 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

40.12 It was felt that a draft Neighbourhood Plan should address the issues that members wanted to see in the Local Plan, to then circulate this around the parish to get some response, as to whether residents liked it or not and what their comments were.

40.13 It was stated that this was not as powerful as having a plan in place and noted that no volunteers had come forward, it had not been possible to get anyone involved.

40.14 There were comments about ideas, thoughts and conclusions on how issues, such as flooding, could be resolved.

40.15 In relation to flooding it was stated that the development at Mount Dairy Farm was not helping.

40.16 There were comments about looking at other Neighbourhood Plans such as Meriden Parish Council and Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council.

40.17 It was agreed that there was a need to work with the RA and that the Parish Council and the RA should not be against each other. It was pointed out that there was a need to discuss the management of the Village Hall.

40.18 It was stated that the Parish Council had credibility with a Neighbourhood Plan and with planning matters within the parish.

40.19 It was noted that so far there was nothing, not since obtaining the designated area in 2014 and it was now 2017, but nothing had been produced.

40.20 It was felt that something needed to be produced, structured and circulated, but not necessarily a questionnaire, to raise issues that had come to light via various developments.

40.21 There were comments about a presentation that had been given and this addressing several issues and using this as a basis.

40.22 It was suggested that a planner could be employed, but also that members should know what was wanted for the parish and that this could be quite brief.

40.23 It was noted that various documents had been produced in the past by Mr. Cockroft and Cllr. Cresswell.

40.24 Cllr. Gosling said she find all the information there was and circulate it to all members so that something could be put together.

40.25 Mr. Cockroft spoke about the need to be clever how they approached this, he gave an example of flooding and that this was an issue and the EA recognised this.

40.26 There were comments about Bloor Homes not doing anything and that flooding could be controlled with an upstream attenuation, it was stated that this was something the parish wanted to see, not to go into detail about how and to cover other issues such as schooling and medical facilities in a similar way. To make high level statements - without going into detail.

40.27 It was stated that the Parish Council was powerless about how these things were done, but it may be possible to influence developments.

40.28 In relation to Meriden and Hampton-in-Arden Neighbourhood Plans, it was felt that these were more about their parishes and that in relation to Cheswick Green, the concerns were more about outward threats.

40.29 It was stated that there was a need to see what stakeholders thought.

40.30 It was stated that it was possible that Cheswick Green school could be extended opposed to St. Patrick's or Hockley Heath and it was noted that Cheswick Green school was the only one that was not an Academy, it was the only one the LA had control over.

40.31 There were comments about a community centre and where this could go and about various thoughts on medical facilities.

40.32 It was suggested to draft an outline Neighbourhood Plan, with some questions attached was what was needed and to possibly leave space in the document for comments.

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Monday 9th January 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

40.33 It was stated that comments were needed rather than yes/no answers, except on high level policy points and to ask residents if they thought what was being suggested was right or wrong.

40.34 It was agreed that there was a need to strike a balance, as a couple of open ended questionnaires had already been issued and that information had already been provided from these, which could be used, the Neighbourhood Plan was to reflect the resident's views as they could currently be seen, to produce a draft Neighbourhood Plan and to then see what people thought. It was felt that some areas may conflict with some of the views of some of the members of the RA.

40.35 It was pointed out that the Parish Council had to lead the Neighbourhood Plan and that the RA could have an input, but no-one had come forward, there had been enough opportunity, it was all very well to make comments and say there was no Neighbourhood Plan.

40.36 It was reiterated that it needed to be quite a brief document and to get the principles established, to put collected everything and try and pull a draft together.

40.37 Comments were made about the proposed MSA. It was noted that CGPC had already submitted a letter to SMBC opposing this application. It was stated that the proposed MSA was not needed at J4 of the M42. It was felt that as there are restaurant, retail and petrol station facilities already close to J4, it would just need appropriate signage on, and adjacent to, the motorway junction to direct traffic to these facilities. It was agreed that these additional comments should also be submitted to SMBC.

40.38 It was agreed to hold the next meeting on Monday 6th February 2017 at 10am with a draft Neighbourhood Plan document to look at.

Meeting closed at 11:15am

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Monday 9th January 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....