



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 THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
 Wednesday 2nd August 2017 10am Cheswick Green Village Hall**

Present: Cheswick Green Parish Councillors: Brian Brown, Ian Bruce, Margaret Gosling, Steve Hall and Mick Swain.

Mr. Piers Cockroft and Mr. Peter Davison

Clerk: Marie Zizzi

5 members of the public

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

13.1 Not applicable all committee members present.

14. Declarations of Interest.

14.1 None.

15. Dispensations.

Note all members have dispensations in relation to living in the parish and commenting on planning applications and being involved with the Neighbourhood Plan (NP).

16. Public Participation.

Note: Mr. Peter Townsend and Mr. Greg Allport two local residents were present, with Ms. Bernadene Crossen (Western Power Distribution (WPD) - Team Manager, Birmingham South East) and one of her colleagues.

16.1 Cllr. Gosling said she had spoken with workers from WPD, that she had seen near the site yesterday.

16.1.1 Mr. Peter Townsend, referred to the 'H' pole that had been installed on the Mount Dairy Farm site, he pointed out that everyone present was aware of the situation and that the offending structure had been in place since February 2017. He said he was pleased to be able to say, that after 6 months of intense communications, Bloor Homes had accepted that it should be moved and there was now a plan to re-site it, to a more favourable location for the area.

16.1.2 It was noted that this was why people from WPD had been out on site yesterday. It was stated that there would be an impact on Parish Council owned land and it was explained that that the intention was to move the pole, but extra 'stays' would be needed in the new location, because the tension would change. It was stated that there was also a need for third party land owner permission this.

16.1.3 It was stated that currently WPD was trying to establish who the land owner was; it was suggested that it could be part of an estate and noted that WPD had contacted the tenant and asked the tenant to pass on a message that WPD was trying to contact the owner. It was hoped this message would be passed on as soon as possible, as progress would be held up until contact and communication could be made.

16.1.4 Cllr. Swain enquired whether WPD had to power to go ahead with the plan, if it could prove that it had tried in every way to contact/find the owner. The reply was no. It was noted that WPD had tried to find out via the Land Registry Office and that the

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd August 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

best line of communication was via the tenant. It was stated that it was presumed that there was a tenant agreement.

16.1.8 It was also pointed out that the tenant could not give permission or provide the information and that the tenant had been asked to ask the land owner to get in touch with WPD.

16.1.9 A map was provided to show the intended location. There were comments that this piece of land was not really used and it was stated that the sooner this could be done, the better, while it was drier, once WPD had permission. It was stated that the pole would not obstruct the path and that some trees would need trimming, there were comments about checking about TPOS, however it was stated that it was not thought that it would be necessary to take any trees out.

16.1.10 It was noted that Mr. Townsend was happy with the situation and that he was working with WPD. It was stated that this would remove the physical cables and that it was a good solution.

16.1.11 It was suggested to write to another land owner and enquire if they knew who the land owner was, it was agreed that the Parish Council would do this.

16.1.12 It was stated that the start of the problem with the site of the poles was in relation to the flood defences and wet land.

16.1.13 In relation to the funding for the removal and relocation of the pole, it was stated that Ms. Crossen's manager had spoken with people from Bloor Homes and once the cost was known, WPD and Bloor's would come to an arrangement, she said this was a big priority for her now and she pointed out that WPD was a regulated business and it needed to consider how money was spent, she also said that from an electrical point of view, there was nothing wrong with where the pole had been sited.

16.1.14 It was suggested that the cost could be in the region of £28,000.

16.1.15 There were comments about no-one wanting to take responsibility initially and Mr. Townsend said it had been an arduous struggle, but hopefully they were there now.

16.1.16 Thanks were given to everyone that had been involved with this and the residents and representatives from WPD left the meeting at 10:20.

17. To invite the Urban and Regional Planning Masters student from the University of Birmingham, who contacted the Parish Council, to participate and to conduct a short interview – 30 minutes.

17.1 Ms. Rachel Mengham was introduced to those present and she introduced herself and explained that she was writing a dissertation, she had contacted a number of groups that were involved with Neighbourhood Plans (NPs), to obtain real life experiences and an insight. She asked what people's roles were in relation to the NP.

17.2 Cllr. Brown said he was the longest serving member on the Parish Council, which had been created in 2009. He said back in 2011, the late Parish Council Chairman had started the process of creating a NP. It had been decided to apply for the whole of the parish to be the designated area for a NP and approval had been given by Solihull MBC. Since then they had been trying to draw up a plan, which was now Parish Council led, there had been a few attempts but various other factors had caused delays.

17.2.1 Cllr. Brown went on to explain that Cllr. Gosling had then joined the Planning Committee and taken on the role of Chair.

17.3 Cllr. Gosling said initially she had been co-opted and had joined to assist, then she had joined the Parish Council and was elected as Chairman to the Planning Committee. Since then they had sent out a couple of newsletters which had a very poor response, possibly about 20 had been returned. However, in relation to the recent questionnaire (a copy was given to Ms. Mengham), possibly due to threats to the parish and development that had already commenced at Mount Dairy Farm, as well as development that had been given permission at Blythe Valley, the response had been much better possibly 156-162 forms had been returned.

17.3.1 It was pointed out that this was out of a possible 950 households, it was not brilliant, but it was much better than before. It was stated that the responses were

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd August 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

currently being analysed and pointed out that besides residents, businesses had been provided with the questionnaire.

17.4 Ms. Mengham said other areas were also having problems getting businesses to respond. There were comments about local shops/businesses, including the pub and a local bakery, being happy to have more development, as it increased their business and it was stated that the bakery had even expanded to provide a café.

17.5 It was stated that people responded more if there was a problem, rather than in support. Cllr. Hall said they were trying to get ahead of the game and have a plan in place but it was hard to get people to understand.

17.6 Mr. Cockroft spoke about the biggest changes since the initial concept of having a NP, he referred to the changing status of SMBCs Local Plan, he said initially it was looking at land in CG, Mount Dairy Farm and Blythe Valley as longer-term sites. The Parish Council was aware that these sites were in the Local Plan, but at that time they were not a present threat, he pointed out that the Parish Council had fruitlessly objected, before the public examination.

17.6.1 Mr. Cockroft went on to talk about a High Court ruling, which had stated that SMBC had underprovided in another parish and due to this ruling and inadequate provision in the Local Plan, SMBC had then not been in a position to refuse other planning applications.

17.7 It was stated that initially the Mount Dairy Farm site was for 2023, but it was being built now. When CGPC had embarked on a NP, this site was not going to be developed for another 10 years, therefore it had not been a concern.

17.8 It was stated that after the High Court decision, there had been a domino effect and there were threats, consent had already been given not only for Mount Dairy Farm but also for Blythe Valley and therefore, the position and role of a NP had changed from having about 1000 houses in the parish to 2000 and this was a fait accompli, the parish would double in size.

17.9 It was stated that due to SMBC having inadequate land supply, it was now looking at even more land in/near the parish, in the green belt, areas abutting on to Birmingham.

17.10 It was stated the Birmingham City Council was also looking to SMBC to provide land and that there were concerns about coalescence and green belt land. There were comments about land very close to the junction of the M40 etc and attracting European businesses.

17.11 There were comments about land earmarked for development and this not being what local people wanted, about suffering from green belt loss, that land that was firmly in the green belt was now being considered.

17.12 It was stated that the motivation for having a NP was to protect the green belt land and to prevent urban sprawl, that there needed to be a gap. That CG was a village in a rural area, an agricultural area, initially it had been a brown field site, it had been pleasure gardens, allotments sites and then shanty dwellings had been built, before it was developed in the 1970s. It was stated that SMBC Planners were now saying they were suffering from under development of the past.

17.13 It was stated that potentially the parish could go from 950 houses to possibly 4000.

17.14 There were comments about the former Parish Council not objecting to Dickens Heath and this perpetuating the situation. Cllr. Brown said the former PC had objected to the number of houses and tried to have it limited to 750.

17.15 There were comments about flooding issues due to the River Blythe and Mount Brook, that it was not known what would happen if there was a flash flood, if all the grass and fields were gone and replaced with housing.

17.16 It was pointed out that the EA had recognised that the area was a flood risk.

17.17 It was stated that it could be thought that developers would not wish to build on land that could flood, but that they did and it made matters worse.

17.18 It was stated that the main challenge was that the NP had to be in line with the Local Plan and reiterated that Mount Dairy Farm was being built on now and Blythe

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd August 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

Valley had outline permission. There was also another piece of land, in the north of the parish that had been put forward in SMBCs 'call for sites', the Parish Council had already objected to this and from the results of the NP questionnaire, there was more evidence that this was not wanted.

17.19 Ms. Mengham spoke about 'Planning for Real', the Accord Group, that had a hands-on approach for the community, a map was provided and people could actively show what they wanted.

17.20 It was stated that the Parish Council/Planning Committee had held two consultation meetings, one in the morning and one in the evening, over the two sessions about 25 people had attended. It was stated that people did not react until it was too late, there was a lot of apathy, it was very disappointing, there had been opportunities for people.

17.21 It was stated that it could be that people were happy with what the Parish Council was doing, the Parish Council had been asking for years for people to get involved and to support it.

17.22 It was stated that there had been a lot of word by mouth, for example via the U3A, asking people to complete and return the forms, which had probably helped, as well as the changing position of the parish.

17.23 It was stated that in earlier newsletters, very open questions had been asked due to the Local Plan not being formally approved, but now the Parish Council was able to write what the threats were and due to the history of the parish, it was now possible to ask more closed questions, to try and get people talking and thinking, there was a change of tone in what was being asked.

17.24 It was pointed out that there were issues that could not be addressed via the NP, for example education/schools.

17.25 Ms. Mengham said she had heard this often, there were national issues and it was stated that this also related to medical facilities and doctor's surgeries, which were now commercial decisions.

17.26 Ms. Mengham asked if they were struggling to access the younger generation and it was agreed that this was a difficulty. It was stated that this could be to do with time and that it was difficult to assess what the younger generation wanted.

17.27 Ms. Mengham enquired whether SMBC had assisted much? It was stated that there had been some meetings initially, but not much else. It was noted that a copy of the questionnaire had been sent to SMBC, but it had not been returned.

17.28 Ms. Mengham asked if people had been involved with public participation in other areas. Cllr. Swain and Mr. Davidson had both had a lot of involvement. Cllr. Swain said in relation to responses to questionnaires, up to 10% was good, 12-15% was very good, over 20% was amazing.

17.29 There were comments about getting more interest when there was a direct threat and it was pointed out that in relation to things like satisfaction surveys, if people were happy they didn't bother to say.

17.30 Ms. Mengham spoke about the challenge of not being able to sell or promote the NP. There were comments about exploring use of the media/social media, Facebook and having a NP Facebook page; Ms. Mengham referred to a Facebook page that a number of residents had joined and they gave feedback and posted comments. There were comments about The Only Way is Cheswick (TOWIC) and that now people had to be on Facebook and a member to use this, it was for a closed group now. It was stated that it had sometimes been used unproductively and there had been misinformation. It was also pointed out that members could join this as individuals.

Rachel thanked the Planning Committee for its time and assistance and she left the meeting.

18. To resolve to accept the Minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 21st June 2017.

Resolved; - proposed Cllr. Brown, seconded Cllr. Gosling; that these Minutes should be accepted as a true and accurate record.

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd August 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

19. To discuss any planning applications received.

19.1 There were none. However, it was noted that since the July Parish Council meeting, a response had been submitted in relation to planning application PL/2017/01792/PNTC – Telecomms Installation Stratford Road; prior notification telecommunications for the installation of 17.5m high street works pole; installation of 2 No. dish antenna of 300mm diameter; installation of 3 No. equipment cabinets, installation of 1 No. meter cabinet, plus minor ancillary works.

20. To discuss Mount Dairy Farm and BV applications.

20.1 In relation to MDF, it was stated that the hedges/overgrowth on Creynolds Lane had been strimmed now. Cllr Swain said it was meant to be done every 20 days unless the weather conditions were poor. He referred to it not being done for at least 30 days and reporting this to SMBC and then is being done 2 days later, he said they had missed a few bits and photographs had been taken and he would keep an eye on this, as the company was being paid to do the work.

20.1.1 There were comments about an email and the sweeping of roads, it was pointed out that weed killer had been put down and therefore, it was currently not appropriate to sweep.

20.1.2 It was pointed out that it was still possible to access the site, the block was still in the river and nothing had been done in relation to the dust either. It was noted that there had been no response since contacting the Considerate Construction Scheme, with copies to various people at SMBC.

20.1.3 Mr. Cockroft asked about the extra housing at MDF generating CIL. It was stated that it was all a bit vague at present.

20.2 In relation to Blythe Valley, it was noted that there had been a meeting of the Illshaw Heath RA and the Chairman had asked people to inform him of what they wanted to see outside their house and that he would consolidate these observations.

20.2.1 There were comments about the Section 106 money, about the top end of Illshaw Heath Road being closed, as apparently the water mains were being located, that since the trees had been cut down no work had started, that this could possibly be due to the weather and road works in Illshaw Heath.

20.2.2 Cllr. Bruce said surveyors had been out. He referred to a reply he had received from SMBC in relation to roads, stating it was limited by what the planning consent given was, he said he did not understand why planning affected the roads and referred to money for a table top by Wedges Bakery and two-sided one-way roads. He said there had been no thought about traffic queuing etc. it was very poorly thought out, it was all based around the crossroads in Illshaw Heath Road.

20.2.3 Cllr. Bruce said in relation to the development, nothing much had happened and he commented about not knowing how the approach to the canal could be widened.

21. To discuss results of the questionnaires received in relation to proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

21.1 It was stated that the open consultation events had taken place and now there was a need to consolidate all the comments and that the information needed to be submitted to SMBC, as soon as possible, due to other possible future proposals.

21.2 Cllr. Bruce said the main problem was the lack of support from the infrastructure, the roads, health facilities and schools/education, in relation to the Illshaw Heath part of the parish. It was stated that for the CG part, it was more the loss of green belt and concerns about flooding.

21.3 It was stated that in relation to health and education, there was not much the NP could do. In relation to the roads, it could be possible to do something but this could have an adverse effect. It was stated that the roads needed repairing not improving. Cllr. Bruce spoke about the BV Section 106 money and there being £90k for health, £200-300 for schools and something like £3-4 million for roads/buses.

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd August 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

21.4 Cllr. Gosling referred to the Neighbourhood Watch scheme looking at carrying out speed surveys, using a speeding device. Cllr. Bruce spoke about traffic and speed measures and comparative information being used.

There were comments about speed limits, such as 30 mph, but nothing being enforced and that it was only when someone was killed or badly injured, that anything would be done.

21.5 Mr. Davidson suggested contacting the Central Commissioning Group and sending it information from the results of the survey with regard to additional medical facilities.

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

22.1 It was stated that once a summary had been produced with the comments from the questionnaire, to try and move forward with the NP. There were comments about the possibility of a planning application being put forward and possibly using a Planning Consultant again. Members were pleased with Mr. Neal Kennedy and there were comments about being happy to use him again.

22.2 It was stated that there was a strong element of people that were not happy about the possibility of a proposed site on Dog Kennel Lane and this needing to be looked at in a lot more detail.

22.3 In relation to the Dog Kennel Lane site, it was stated that SMBC seemed to think this was a great idea, to have lots of houses in one area.

22.4 It was suggested that the Parish Councils concerns should be sent to Andy Street (Mayor of the West Midlands) and his deputy Bob Sleigh.

22.5 It was stated that the NP was there to try to influence future development.

22.6 Mr. Davidson suggested setting key target dates for having things done. It was stated that the Parish Council was more stable now, previously there had been a lot of turnover after losing Chris Noble and that this had not helped progress.

22.7 There were comments about whether this was achievable by Christmas, to get something submitted and to include everything that had been done so far with back up material. It was stated that there needed to be a record of what had been done, including meetings that had taken place, whether these were called by the Parish Council or meetings with developers, such as consultation with local residents. As well as newsletters that had been issued etc. as this had been a long process, with formal and less formal events, this was all part of the evidence needed to be put together by December, to have a cohesive plan in place to be submitted in the new year.

22.8 Cllr. Brown referred to possibly appointing a planner to produce the documents.

22.9 It was reiterated that there were issues for the Health Authority, planning issues as well as issues around education. It was not all direct land use planning concerns, but there were issues to work out.

22.10 There were comments about how to word policies and what evidence there was to support this.

22.11 There were comments about having a picture of the area and what was going on and what had changed and how the area could be in 10 years' time.

22.12 It was stated that there needed to be an introduction and an explanation of how and why the issues were important.

22.13 Mr. Cockroft said CG village was in a rural area, with landscapes of Warwickshire and Worcestershire, it was a settlement in a rural area, this is what drove the area and the core arguments needed to be looked at. He referred to finding out how much of the land was used for agriculture etc.

22.14 It was stated that the results of the survey should be put on the PC website and a list of all the organisations contacted should be produced.

22.15 Mr. Davidson suggested that groups of 2-3 could work together. It was agreed that Cllrs. Gosling, Hall and Swain would work together to look at the questionnaire results and traffic. Mr. Cockroft and Mr. Davidson would work together to look at evidence and policies.

Minutes of CGPC NP Committee meeting held on Wednesday 2nd August 2017 10am

Signed

Date.....

22.16 It was agreed that there was a need to co-ordinate everything that was currently available now.

22.17 It was queried whether Neal Kennedy had done anything in relation to Neighbourhood Plans and suggested that he could be used again, if and when necessary, to object to the Dog Kennel Lane proposals.

22.18 It was pointed out that the NP had to accept MDF and BV as they had already been approved.

22.19 It was suggested to have a consultation draft ready for Christmas, to issue to residents, before a final version was sent to SMBC.

23. To consider what funding is available and whether to commence applying for this.

23.1 It was stated that funding needed to be investigated.

24. Time and date of next meeting(s)

24.1 Wednesday 20th September 2017 at 10am.

Meeting closed 11:50am