



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 6th February 2017 10:00am Cheswick Green Village Hall**

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

Co-opted member: Mr. Piers Cockcroft

1 member of the public

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

41.1 None all members present.

42. Declarations of Interest.

42.1 None.

43. Dispensations.

43.1 It was noted that all members had completed a dispensation form as they all lived in the parish.

44. Public participation.

44.1 Mr. Peter Davidson was welcomed and thanked for attending, he was invited to participate. It was noted the Mr. Davidson had been living in Cheswick Green since 1975, he had been the Chairman of the former HHPC and the RA in the past.

45. To resolve to accept the Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 9th January 2017.

Resolved: proposed Cllr. Phillips, seconded Cllr. Brown, all in favour - that these Minutes should be accepted as a true and accurate record.

46. To resolve that unsigned sets of Minutes which have already been approved shall be signed by Cllr. Gosling.

46.1 It was noted that there were only two unsigned sets from April and June 2015.

Resolved: proposed Cllr. Brown, seconded Cllr. Phillips; that these Minutes should be signed.

It was proposed at this stage that items 8 and 9 on the agenda (*planning applications received & to discuss Mount Dairy Farm and BV applications*) be brought forward to this point – all members agreed.

47. To discuss any planning applications received.

PI/2017/00107/TPO – 7 Chartwell Drive, large sycamore requires pruning.

PL/2017/00155/PPFL – One Central Boulevard, insertion of a new double doorset at ground level opening to the external area.

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 6th February 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

PL/2017/00175/PPFL - Tri-Gen House Central Boulevard Shirley Solihull B90 8AB, refurbishment of the existing Trigen House building including the renewal of internal finishes, upgrading the building core and new landscaping to the front and rear of the building. The existing entrance lobby is to be extended in size to increase its prominence and usable space. The front facing facade is to be reclad to update the aesthetic in line with the developments occurring across the wider context of Blythe Valley Business Park.

47.1 Cllr. Gosling said the application for the tree to be pruned had already been declined.

47.2 It was agreed that there were no comments to be submitted.

48. To discuss Mount Dairy Farm and BV applications.

48.1 In relation to Mount Dairy Farm, it was noted that the application for 54 dwellings had been approved.

48.1.1 It was stated that the site was still not secure and noted that members of the Parish Council were meeting with James Carpenter (Head of Service - Development and Regulatory Management Managed Growth & Communities Directorate SMBC), next week.

48.1.2 It was stated that this meeting was to demonstrate the Parish Council wanted to work with SMBC.

48.1.3 It was stated that there was a very narrow footpath near to this site, which was now a very muddy area.

48.1.4 It was stated that work was now taking place on the cables, there were concerns about flooding and comments about the table top at the junction of Creynolds Lane.

48.1.5 It was noted that the Considerate Construction Scheme had informed the Clerk that it had not yet received any response from Bloor Homes regarding various issues.

48.1.6 It was stated that about 20 houses were possibly occupied now, there had been 5 cars and 2 vans parked there. It was pointed out that the 'no parking' restriction was not being taken notice of and that there was no enforcement in relation to this.

48.1.7 It was stated that Parish Council newsletters needed to be delivered to the houses that were occupied.

48.2 In relation to Blythe Valley, there were comments about whether this could be called in and whether there was any time limit for this to be done.

48.2.1 It was stated that the Parish Council consultant had done a very good job representing and speaking for the Parish Council.

48.2.2 It was stated that there needed to be 1500-2000 houses to warrant a school and that Local Authorities could no longer build schools.

48.2.3 It was suggested that any relevant photographs should be taken in relation to both sites for reference and evidence.

49. To discuss Cheswick Green Neighbourhood Plan including key objectives, timescales, current status and next steps, communications and resourcing.

49.1 It was noted that Cllr. Gosling had circulated some thoughts in relation to the NP, there had been some comments returned about this from Mr. Cockroft and Cllr. Bruce.

49.2 It was stated that no more housing should be allowed in the parish, due to what had already been approved.

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 6th February 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

49.3 Mr. Cockroft suggested that a map was a valuable tool to show what/where development had already been approved and other possible sites that had been put forward, he said this would illustrate the area that has/could be taken up.

49.4 In relation to a map, it was stated this could also demonstrate the proportion of the gap and how narrow it could become, between existing villages.

49.5 Cllr. Hall said he had heard on the news, that there were more empty properties over the country than the need for housing. There were further comments about protecting greenbelt land, people renting housing and people downsizing.

49.6 There were comments about the site proposed for Dog Kennel Lane and about the TRW site, in relation to protecting and having a boundary not to cross.

49.7 There were comments about the characteristics of the parish, establishing principles, setting precedence's, development within the greenbelt, greenbelt boundaries and these being changed, that this was an important issue.

49.8 It was stated that up to a point, it was difficult to oppose development at Blythe Valley, as it had its own boundary. It was noted that there were varying views on whether this development should have connectivity or not.

49.9 There were comments about flooding issues and Dog Kennel Lane, the impact on the stream and that the level could change very quickly. There were comments about the impact of more and more tarmac and impermeable surfaces. It was pointed out that the developers at Mount Dairy Farm, had admitted that the land was far wetter than they had realised, after they had started development.

49.10 There was a discussion about how to address the various issues and the need to be very careful about what and how things were put forward, as development could be used to provide solutions.

49.11 There were comments about the possible value of having a NP and the lack of volunteers for this.

49.12 There was a discussion about narrow country lanes and how to reduce the risk of incidents/accidents, by possibly reducing speed limits. It was stated that speed limits could be lowered but there was nothing to enforce this.

49.13 There were comments about accidents reported and that these were only recorded if someone was injured, the level of incidents could be more than what was actually recorded.

49.14 There were comments about medical facilities and issues around this. There were comments about the existing facility in the village and any possible extension/expansion.

49.15 Cllr. Swain said it could be argued, that there was an unfair amount of development in the area compared to other parishes.

49.16 There were comments about an increase in population and pressure on facilities, the need to see the impact of existing new development, before any more was considered.

49.17 Members felt that whatever argument was put forward, it was ignored by the Local Authority.

49.18 It was stated that the primary argument was about the loss of greenbelt and the threat that the greenbelt was already under, due to current permitted development.

49.19 There were comments about possible road and sewer improvements and the effect this could have.

49.20 It was stated that when any proposals were put forward, they needed to be robust and defensible.

49.21 It was stated that it was unlikely a NP would be approved before the Local Plan Review, but that a draft plan was needed, which was fully supported that could be submitted to SMBC, as then at least the parish had something to say when the Local Plan review took place, there would be something to put forward, not a wish list or any spurious comments, just hard facts.

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 6th February 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

49.22 There were comments about establishing local needs and looking at the population, which would double. It was pointed out that it was not known who would come into the parish and what they would want.

49.23 There were comments about a need to be generic and not to go into detail.

49.24 There were comments about the possible rapid change, due to houses already starting to be occupied, that the population could change and it being possible to speculate regarding the needs of a different population in the parish, to what it currently was and how it was 20-30 years ago.

49.25 It was felt that the current ageing population could change with those coming in being younger people.

49.26 It was pointed out that there was some value in looking at the current population and speculation, as the plan could be reviewed in the future.

49.27 In relation to collecting evidence and data, it was noted that information was more about Wards than parish by parish, there was lots of information on the SMBC website but it was more related to Wards.

49.28 It was noted that the Parish Council distributed about 1000 newsletters and therefore, it was possible to do an approximate overall estimate for ages. It was pointed out that 40 years ago, the population of the parish had been much younger, when Cheswick Green had first been established, there had been an over 50s club and a baby-sitting circle.

49.29 Mr. Davidson said he was happy to help and he was willing to knock on people's doors.

49.30 Mr. Cockroft said they needed to make sure what they did was the right document to use at the Local Plan inquiry.

49.31 Cllr. Gosling said this needed to be done fairly quickly, to get it out to residents.

49.32 There were comments about when the Local Plan inquiry would take place, it was suggested either later this year or early next year.

49.33 It was stated that something needed to be put together, that could be sent to SMBC, showing that it was supported and had been consulted on, as this would be looked at. To have only factual information, rather than comments, so that it stood up to the test.

49.34 It was stated to have a map and no unguarded comments.

49.35 It was stated that open spaces on developments such as Blythe Valley needed to happen, that there was a need to ensure these proposals were honoured.

49.36 Cllr. Bruce said that he had been told objections to roads would not stop development and he referred to the amount of money to be spent on transport and footpaths for Blythe Valley.

49.37 There was a discussion about parking and parking permits at Blythe Valley, about it being necessary to provide access to the Country Park and about dogs having to be on leads.

49.38 There were comments about keeping existing roads as they were, but to have some repairs, because if roads were improved and for example widened, they would form different boundaries.

49.39 There were comments about the existing Bloor Homes site and having to cross Tanworth Lane twice or walking through a very muddy area, it was stated that this was very dangerous. It was suggested that a footpath could be installed, even though it would be very narrow.

49.40 It was suggested that any speed limit review should be dealt with separately and not as part of the NP. It was stated that the issue of speed had been raised before and consulted on via newsletters, this could be reported in the NP as part of the evidence.

49.41 Mr. Cockroft said the first draft should be the bones without any background information, a list of all the points raised could be included and to restrict it to what the argument was, but to be careful how issues were addressed.

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 6th February 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

49.42 It was suggested that residents should be given an opportunity to attend a public meeting and/or drop in sessions for this.

49.43 It was stated that a small, short, readable document was needed which covered all the points mentioned by residents, a succinct executive summary needed to be provided.

49.44 It was stated that someone needed to put the bare bones together and take the lead.

49.45 Cllr. Gosling said she was happy to look at maps. Cllr. Swain said if Cllr. Gosling was happy to take the lead, he would help.

49.46 It was stated that when this was distributed to residents, it needed to clearly state that this is an important document that they needed to read and to point out that in 10 years' time, there would be 200% more housing, this was already at 100%, to show the narrowing of the gaps.

49.47 Mr. Cockroft said he was happy to put time into this, it could not be done as a committee and it needed to be done fairly quickly.

49.48 Cllr. Swain recommended that a timescale was produced.

49.49 It was stated that this should be a top priority for the Parish Council, to try and get something out by mid-April.

49.50 Cllr. Gosling, Cllr. Swain and Mr. Cockroft to put something together for the next meeting and to include Mr. Davidson in this.

49.51 There were comments about templates being more for the format than the content and about lists, not proper plans. It was stated some members had looked at other NPs, coastal ones were no help, edge of city ones were of no help and rural ones were specific to their areas.

49.52 It was stated to set in contact what was happening in Solihull, CG parish and surrounding local parishes and to link this in with Warwickshire.

50. To discuss SMBC Local Plan Review.

50.1 Covered.

51. Time and date of next meeting(s).

5.1 Monday 20th March 2017 at 10am.

Meeting closed at 11:30am

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 6th February 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....