



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 17th January 2018 10am Cheswick Green Village Hall**

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

Mr. Piers Cockroft and Mr. Peter Davidson

Clerk: Marie Zizzi

0 members of the public

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

67.1 Not applicable.

68. Declarations of Interest.

68.1 There were none.

69. 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).

70. Public Participation.

70.1 Not applicable.

71. To resolve to accept the Minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 20th December 2017.

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

72. Update on funding for the plan.

72.1 This had now been submitted and there had been an email from Locality requesting some more information and someone from Locality had telephoned, therefore this was in hand.

73. To discuss how to progress CG NP/questionnaire.

73.1 It was noted that the Working Party, consisting of Cllr. Bruce, Mr. Cockroft and Mr. Davidson had met and put together questions for a survey, this had been circulated to everyone present.

73.1.1 Cllr. Gosling thanked the members of the Working Party for the time they had spent on this.

73.2 It was noted that reference was made to having a Neighbourhood Plan, however from researching other Plans for the front cover of the survey, Cllr. Sedgley said they all referred to a Neighbourhood Development Plan. There were various comments about this.

73.2.1 Cllr. Brown said there was a need to identify areas for development.

73.2.2 It was stated that the parish had enough already and could not justify any more.

73.2.3 Cllr. Brown said that Parish and Town Councils had to identify areas. Mr. Cockroft said that was not in any legislation he had read.

73.2.4 It was suggested that only small areas could be identified for infill, such as the derelict properties on Creynolds Lane.

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday 17th January 2018 at 10am

Signed

Date.....

73.2.5 Mr. Cockroft spoke about using the existing policy for development in the green belt and said a small number of houses, for example 6 could be endorsed and they could support these.

73.2.6 It was reiterated that the plan could positively propose the derelict houses on Creynolds Lane.

73.3 Cllr. Bruce referred to the draft questions for the survey, he said question 16 was factual and he queried how the survey should be structured and whether the questions were in the right order. He said they had used questions from other surveys and added some that were more specific to the local area.

73.3.1 It was stated that Mr. Simon Purfield would advise about this when the draft survey was submitted for his comments and advice on the final form of the document.

73.3.2 Mr. Cockroft commented about whether to start with questions that were easy for people to answer or to start with more detail.

73.3.3 Cllr. Gosling said if it started with the easier questions this would draw people in.

73.4 Cllr. Bruce said he thought Sections 1 and 2 were in the right place. He said Section 3 covered what there was already, how things could be improved and what was wanted in the future. He said they could ask for any ideas on how to improve things.

73.5 Cllr. Gosling said the question about internet services should be moved to Section 6.

73.6 Cllr. Bruce queried if Section 4 was acceptable where it was. Mr. Davidson replied that whatever they did, someone would disagree and suggested that it was left to the professional to decide.

73.7 Cllr. Bruce referred to Section 5. Mr. Cockroft said that in development plans the transport network was important. He referred to lanes being a landscape feature and queried whether areas were properly accessible, he said some lanes had residential homes, he said this was key to land use.

73.8 There were comments about tackling and talking about any negative issues and whether people preferred for example chicanes etc. It was stated that the question was more about if the roads could support development.

73.9 Mr. Davidson said question 26 should be part of the future additions to the survey, part of the back sheet of general questions, of information that they wanted to know.

73.10 Cllr. Bruce spoke about a number of questions about traffic being contentious, but that they needed people's views on this.

73.11 There were comments about asking if more playing fields and/or allotments should be provided and if so, where would people like them, to give people an opportunity to write more, it was stated this was like a wish list. It was stated the answers from this could be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.

73.12 It was noted that there was some land that SMBC owned, for example at the back of the school and that this could be used for a playing field or allotments.

73.13 Cllr. Bruce referred to the level of traffic cause by development, he said they had tried to cover this in the survey, by including what was happening at Blythe Valley etc.

73.14 It was queried whether to move sections around and whether to move questions that did not relate to land use to the end of the survey. It was felt that questions could appear to be leading when they included facts about what was happening and various issues, such as turnings at junctions. It was stated that people had different views and did not see all the issues. People in Illshaw Heath saw things differently depending on where a person lived and their journey.

73.15 It was agreed that there was a need to be careful about leading too specifically.

73.16 Cllr. Bruce said the plans for Illshaw heath were already in place, he commented that the overall intent of the proposals seemed to be to make the various routes through Illshaw Heath much less desirable.

73.17 Mr. Cockroft queried how widely spread the consultation on roads in Illshaw Heath had been. Cllr. Bruce said it had been sent to everyone in Illshaw Heath and copies had been posted in various locations throughout the village. It was stated that the proposals would have implications that could affect Hockley Heath and Cheswick Green, as well as Illshaw Heath.

73.18 Cllr. Bruce said he and some other residents had submitted comments on the proposals which had been acknowledged.

73.19 It was stated that if the effect of the traffic mitigation measures proposed for Illshaw Heath did result in traffic being diverted elsewhere, there seemed to be little attempt to determine what routes the diverted traffic might use although inevitably, much of it would use routes through Hockley Heath, and Creynolds Lane. Mr. Cockroft stated that the proposed changes should have been circulated in Cheswick Green and Hockley Heath. It was pointed out that in relation to traffic issues and Illshaw Heath, that SMBC would not take any further comments after the consultation had finished.

73.20 Cllr. Bruce stated that the underlying problem was the condition of the entire network of lanes between the Stratford Road and Broad Lane, as this was already very busy at peak periods, yet it was apparent from the supporting documents for the Blythe Valley development, and resultant consultations that these roads would provide a means of reducing traffic on the main road network. He said that, in his response to the Blythe Valley application, in an attempt to quantify the serious nature of the problem, he had developed a network diagram of the various routes, indicating the quality of each section of road, and highlight badly sited junctions. It was considered that there was a very fine line between highlighting the poor state of local roads, and these being subject to improvement which would attract yet more traffic.

73.21 It was reiterated that the NP survey should avoid any leading questions, but it was felt that this was not always easy. It was noted that the draft survey was based on an already approved version of a survey that had been used elsewhere and adapted to suit the parish, based on development and implications on existing residents.

73.22 There were comments about the sheet at the back, picking up on other issues and providing people with an opportunity to write something that would not fit into the relevant boxes.

73.23 It was stated that if people thought there was a need for housing for the elderly, they should be asked where this should be and the same for allotments. It was stated that land was an issue and that it would be useful to know and a need to find out who landowners were. It was suggested that the current last page could be removed, as it was intrusive. It was generally accepted that this was an issue that could be put to Mr. Purfield for his advice.

73.24 It was stated that details of a housing needs survey were needed and that SMBC should have this.

73.25 It was stated that a very important part of the argument was about intrusive development, this was a stable community and people chose to live here, it was out of choice and not because a house had been built here. It was stated that people moved within the parish and there was a need for evidence to support this from the survey results.

73.26 It was stated that a strong case was needed, to argue this with the Local Authority and the Inspector.

73.27 Cllr. Gosling suggested asking people if they had moved within the parish and how long they had been at their present address. Mr. Cockroft added how long they had been in the parish.

73.28 Cllr. Bruce queried if Mr. Cockroft was happy to draft some suitable questions.

73.29 It was stated that to support the argument against excessive development, something may appear intrusive. Mr. Cockroft suggested also asking people if they had extended their properties to stay here, to see if people had lived here for a long time, he said this would provide greater weight than someone who had only lived here for 10 minutes. He referred to asking if people's children had remained here in the area and whether they would have stayed, if housing was available at a reasonable price.

73.30 Mr. Cockroft reiterated that essentially this was a stable community, people lived here because of its green belt and rural location, a lot of people that lived here valued the environment. It was pointed out that this argument could be used both ways, as it could be stated that was why it was ideal to build more houses here.

73.31 There were other various comments about Cheswick Green and housing.

73.32 Cllr. Swain said they appeared to be overthinking things now.

73.33 It was agreed that there was a need to get on with this. Cllr Bruce said he would redraft the questions for the survey and circulate this as soon as possible and then they

would go with the majority consensus, if it was agreed to send it to Mr Purfield for his opinion.

73.34 There were further comments about including questions about medical facilities and schools, towards the end of the survey, as these were part of the infrastructure.

73.35 Mr. Cockroft queried what to do about children, young people and businesses.

73.36 Cllr. Bruce pointed out that the survey stated there would be help for people complete it, as well as providing additional copies. He queried how they would physically do this. Cllr. Sedgley suggested holding survey sessions at specific times in the Village Hall.

73.37 It was stated that there were not very many businesses and to ask Mr. Purfield about this. Several local businesses were referred to, such as a dog grooming service and bed and breakfasts.

73.38 It was felt that there could be lots of small business that needed an opportunity to complete the survey and as residents they would have the opportunity to complete it.

73.39 It was suggested to put this forward to Mr. Purfield and ask if there needed to be a survey for businesses. It was stated that the group did not want to be in a position where someone said you have not considered this!

73.40 It was suggested to have one separate page for businesses to complete and that the survey must go to the pub and local shops.

73.41 It was suggested to include questions such as, are you a resident who owns a business in the parish or do you operate a business in the parish but are a resident elsewhere, if so how many employees are residents in the parish.

74. To discuss any planning applications received.

74.1 There were none.

75. To discuss Mount Dairy Farm/Cheswick Place and BV applications.

75.1 In relation to MDF; it was noted that Bloor Homes had been informed that the Parish Council was no longer applying for funding for the War Memorial and given the reasons for this.

75.1.1 Cllr. Gosling had sent an email with a photograph about concerns in relation to the footpath between Tanworth Lane and Saxon Wood Road, which is a public right of way. She had walked up there on Sunday 14th January and noticed that the heras fencing had been moved closer to the path whilst work was carried out on and around the new path on site. She said that what was most concerning was the siting of the blocks, which were actually on the footpath for part of the route and as such, were a major trip hazard especially for anyone using the path in bad light.

75.1.2 Cllr. Gosling said she had spoken with two workers, who said they were jet washing the brickwork and they said they would mention the problem. However, she then walked down the path the next day, to see if anything had changed and taken a photo on her way down. She said this path is not easy to negotiate anyway at present due to the volume of mud, which had been made worse by rain.

75.1.3 Cllr. Gosling said she had also observed that the blocks had still not been removed from the brook. She had asked Bloor to do something before someone had a serious accident.

75.1.4 Cllr. Gosling said to date she had received no reply whatsoever.

75.1.5 There were further comments about jet washing taking place on Sunday and this being quite noisy.

75.1.6 It was stated that it was very slippery, very muddy and very dangerous especially in the dark and that if someone had an accident, and took out a claim, Bloor Homes would probably be liable.

75.1.7 There were comments about muck on the road and Coppice Walk entrance being closed before 3pm. It was stated that Noble Way was a sea of mud due to vehicles coming out. It was stated that there was no sanction for Bloor Homes to do anything.

75.1.8 Cllr. Swain referred to being asked to log all these things, but that it would not make a scrap of difference, work would still start before 8am and it was noisy.

75.2 In relation to Blythe Valley - there was nothing new.

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday 17th January 2018 at 10am

Signed

Date.....

75.3 Cllr. Brown said that SMBC was aiming to have the Local Development Plan adopted by the end of the year. It was queried whether this was after the public inquiry etc. It was stated that this meant there was a need to accelerate timescales for the survey and Neighbourhood Plan.

75.3.1 There were some comments about the timetable that had been produced.

75.3.2 It was stated to get on with the survey and noted that there was already a plan in place for distribution.

76. Time and date of next meeting.

76.1 Wednesday 7th February 2018 at 10am

Meeting closed 11:05am