



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 25th April 2018 10am Cheswick Green Village Hall**

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

Mr. Piers Cockroft and Mr. Peter Davidson

2 members of the public (*Mr. Paul Vernon, Chairman Illshaw Heath RA and Mr. Mike Cox, member of Illshaw Heath RA*)

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

97.1 An apology was received from Cllr. Sam Sedgley, this was accepted.

98. Declarations of Interest.

98.1 None.

99. Dispensations.

99.1 None

100. Public Participation (15 Minutes).

100.1 The members of the public said they were here to observe.

101. To discuss the War Memorial and a notice board at Cheswick Place.

101.1 Deferred until representatives from Bloor Homes could attend.

102. To resolve to accept the Minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 7th March 2018.

Resolved: proposed Cllr. Gosling, seconded Cllr. Swain – that these were accepted as a true and accurate record.

103. Update on funding for the plan.

103.1 It was noted that funding not spent by 31st March 2018, had now been repaid, as required.

103.2 It was agreed that it would be necessary to resubmit an application for further funding, to think about obtaining a quote from Mr. Neil Pearce of Avon Planning Services and to discuss this with him as soon as possible.

104. To discuss the NP survey results.

104.1 Cllr. Bruce said they needed to publish the results of the survey on the website, as soon as possible.

104.2 Cllr. Bruce referred to clear patterns emerging from the results. Many residents had moved into the Parish because of its rural nature and the demographic profile of the respondents, and other factors suggested a tendency for both them and their families to remain resident in the Parish.

104.2.1 It was noted that only one or two people were happy to build on greenbelt land and felt that building was more important than keeping the greenbelt.

104.2.2 It was stated that from the majority of responses, the scale of the number of buildings showed that only very small developments should happen, using infill and for

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday 25th April 2018 at 10am

Signed

Date.....

10-15 houses. It was pointed out that on this number, there would be no affordable housing requirement.

104.2.3 It was stated that two thirds – a significant majority of responses - showed that people had lived here for a long time and that they owned their own houses. It was stated that there was quite a strain on families whose children wanted to live here, it was clear a lot of people had grown up in Cheswick Green.

104.2.4 Various statistics from the results were mentioned. It was agreed that there had been a very good response rate, especially from Illshaw Heath including Warnings Green, but mainly from the center of Illshaw Heath.

104.2.5 It was noted that the Clerk had printed out the 83-page document - the literal responses for the part 2 questionnaire. One of the resident's present offered to arrange to have this ring-bound and returned to Cllr. Bruce for circulation to members of the Planning Committee.

104.2.6 Mr. Davidson spoke about the possibility of obtaining statistics on age groups for educational purposes.

104.2.7 It was agreed that members needed time to digest all the results, that the information needed to be put on the website, with notices advising residents that it was there.

104.3 Cllr. Swain referred to the timetable, he said the next item was an exercise for potential allocation of land for development.

104.4 There were comments about the number of houses to be built at Blythe Valley (BV) Park, the number of houses on Cheswick Place and the proposals for Dog Kennel Lane. It was stated that there was some support for development at Dog Kennel Lane, but that most people felt that the whole area was being seriously over-developed.

104.4.1 It was stated that the Planning Adviser had said he had never seen a parish so small with such a large number of developments being proposed.

104.4.2 There were comments about a group that was trying to work together, to possibly respond as a single group, which included some local residents and representatives from Cheswick Green PC, Dickens Heath PC and Tidbury Green PC as well as representatives from the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE).

104.5 There were comments about HS2 and development by the NEC.

104.6 Cllr. Gosling said Borough Cllr. Ken Hawkins had been upset about Creynolds Lane junction, he had said there was a need to make sure the planners consulted with the transport people and that some conditions should be mandatory, not advisory, for example working hours, dust and noise, as these were fundamental things that should be agreed. It was stated that the BV application was a reserved matters application.

104.7 Cllr. Brown suggested that the Parish Council should appoint a planner to assist. Cllr. Gosling said that there was insufficient time before the comment closure date. Cllr. Brown suggested seeking an extension. Cllr. Gosling replied that the Council had sufficient understanding of the situation to develop its own response in the time available.

104.8 Cllr. Bruce said there were conditions in the original application regarding the use of the Kineton Lane access, being the main concern, and these were being monitored by the Residents' Association as well as the traffic mitigation works in Illshaw Heath, primarily the roads, they needed to make sure conditions were adhered to.

104.9 There were comments about the Section 106 Agreement, planning applications and possible conflicts. It was stated that the Section 106 Agreement was specific and legally binding, if SMBC chose to enforce it. It was stated that it was possible to have variations, that were not consulted on and that there could be a threat to SMBC of not getting 750 houses and this opening the flood gates.

104.9.1 Cllr. Bruce said the Section 106 Agreement was very specific, with details about payments and how the Section 106 money was spent, for example in relation to medical services, it was £34.61 per person, which amounted to around £90,000, or possibly £100,000 if allowance was made for 250 persons in the care facility. He added that more money was for buses and cycle lanes than anything else, although Mr. Cockroft cautioned that the agreement could be enforce only if SMBC was prepared to fund action against any infringement.

104.10 Mr. Davidson queried whether there had been any discussions with the local doctor. Cllr. Bruce said there had been. Mr. Davidson said it may be possible to talk to the local Commissioning group.

104.10.1 There were comments about it being impossible to get a doctor's appointment, about the possible threat of the Village Surgery closing, about buses and access to other surgeries and about limits and controls on pharmacies.

Action item: Mr. Davidson to draft a letter to be sent to the Clinical Commissioning Group, seeking their input and advice on how best to proceed.

104.11 Mr. Cockroft referred to the survey and the likelihood of any consultants going through it all, including the literal comments, to answer specific questions, as an aid to developing the details of the final Plan.

104.11.1 Cllr. Bruce said that the engaged consultant expected this Committee to examine the survey results and draw our conclusions, which he would then advise on how they could best be used in developing the final Plan.

104.11.2 Mr. Cockroft queried whether there was any problem publishing the results and he said people could read things differently. He commented about having an independent report on the findings, to use that instead.

104.11.3 Cllr. Bruce said he thought the consultant would do that.

104.11.4 Cllr. Swain said they needed to move on and get the consultant involved, to ask for a quote and to reapply for funding.

104.11.5 It was queried whether it was possible to claim retrospectively for funding, if something was paid for before an application was made.

104.12 Mr. Vernon said over the last few months, the effort made by the Planning Committee had been exceptional. It was noted that both residents in attendance had completed their surveys. Mr. Vernon said Cllr. Bruce had tried really hard and the Illshaw Heath Residents Association had tried to support him. It was noted that it had not been necessary to send any reminders in Illshaw Heath.

104.12.1 Cllr. Bruce said sending the reminders had really helped, as there had been a sudden surge in responses.

105. To discuss any planning applications received.

PL/2018/01057/PPRM - Blythe Valley Park, Blythe Gate, Solihull; Erection of 170 residential dwellings with parking, internal access roads, landscaping and all other details required by condition No. 3 relating to the reserved matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping pursuant to planning permission reference PL/2016/00863/MAOOT.

105.1 Cllr. Bruce said he would be responding to this as an individual, especially in relation to mandatory conditions, and was encouraging local residents to write also.

105.1.1 Cllr. Gosling said that Borough Cllr. Ken Hawkins had spoken to Cllr. David Bell, the Chairman of SMBCs Planning Committee, about the lack of enforcement measures available, as a result of the Planning Conditions being advisory, rather than mandatory. She referred to the meeting that had taken place with one of SMBC's traffic engineers, at the junction of Creynolds Lane, she said planning officers needed to liaise with traffic engineers, and that this should be included in the PC's response.

105.1.2 It was stated that the Parish Council needed to respond to this application. Cllr. Brown suggested to possibly copy the response to SMBCs Chief Executive, Nick Page and others at SMBC such as James Carpenter (*Head of Service - Development and Regulatory Management*) and Ashley Prior (*Head of Highway Services*).

Action item: Cllr. Gosling to draft a response and to circulate this for comments.

105.1.3 Cllr. Bruce commented about SMBC not being diligent in pushing Bloor for its Safety Case and Risk Assessment for the Cheswick Place development, he referred to the use of Coppice Walk access in particular.

105.1.4 In addition, it was stated that there seemed to be no requirement for SMBC to notify the Parish Council of any variation to conditions. It was felt that this was not an acceptable situation and that representations should be made to SMBC to modify their procedures accordingly, and that this point should be included in the Council's response to the current application.

105.1.5 It was stated that this needed to be sorted out before the next 3 blocks came forward for development with applications.

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday 25th April 2018 at 10am

Signed

Date.....

105.1.6 The group then considered the detail of the proposed layout associated with the current application. It was stated that it looked like a mini Dickens Heath. It was noted that the main artery into the development would result in triple and quadruple parking. It was stated that those responsible for urban design and highways should comment on these aspects. It was stated that there was a lack of green space, that there were no traditional fields whatsoever and that the developers could argue that the boundary is the green land.

105.1.7 It was stated that some affordable housing in Hockley Heath did not look too bad.

105.1.8 There were comments about the density of the housing in the plan, with the proposed parking arrangements being criticized, there being inadequate provision for storage for recycling collection, and an apparent lack of specific responsibility for maintaining the various alleyways providing access to the rear of many of the properties

105.1.9 It was stated that the developers would possibly not be able to sell the bigger houses and, if this turned out to be the case, there was a danger that they would seek to vary the number, and layout of the properties.

105.1.10 There were comments arising from the survey results where almost half of the respondents considered that there was already insufficient parking in the Parish, particularly when many households owned 3 or 4 cars.

105.1.12 Mr. Cox said he had met with Matt Preece, (*the SMBC planner dealing with the application*), Jon Hallam (*SMBC planning officer*) and Danny Gouveia (*former SMBC Principal Engineer*).

105.1.13 There were comments about a designated site for dumping rubbish, rubbish collections and bins being put in parking spaces, causing people to park on the roads and this causing problems for the residents themselves.

105.1.14 There were comments about roads being adopted by the Council and a second site being released for development now.

105.1.15 It was stated that IMP had claimed it would cost £7 million to get the roads within Blythe Valley to a standard where they could be adopted by SMBC. This had been a major factor in BV being allocated a zero percent CIL.

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

106.1 In relation to Mount Dairy Farm/Cheswick Place; it was stated that the new path was just on the section beside the development. The old section, close to Saxon Wood Road was prone to erosion by Mount Brook.

106.1.1 It was stated that members of the Parish Council, had been informed by a representative from Bloor Homes, in November 2017, that an additional new path was scheduled to be opened in May 2018. However, this seemed unlikely as no work had yet commenced on the bridge to be built over Mount Brook for this path. It was suggested that it would be subject to flooding rendering it unusable for probably, 10% of the time.

106.1.2 It was stated that the public right of way could only be removed after a successful appeal by the landowner. It was suggested that SMBC should maintain the public right of way.

106.1.3 There were comments about the rubbish piling up in the same spot and residents not waiting until the bin collection day to put rubbish out. It was stated that this would cause vermin.

106.1.4 It was noted that there was no update regarding the pylon.

106.1.5 Cllr. Bruce said he had recently walked round the Blythe Valley nature reserve footpaths and the condition of many sections were appalling, it was filthy and covered in mud, and he had never experienced this before.

106.2 In relation to the BV application; Mr. Vernon said from a highways point of view, the last element had come and gone, he was not aware that any major points had been raised since the last notification, work was possibly to commence in May, they were very keen to get going.

106.2.1 Mr. Vernon referred to another incident that had happened on Tuesday 24th April involving 2 vehicles, he said images had been sent to James Carpenter and Ashley Prior at SMBC. It was on the junction again. It was stated that the visibility at the junction was very bad.

Minutes of CGPC Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday 25th April 2018 at 10am

Signed

Date.....

106.2.2 It was stated that it would possibly take 6 weeks or more to get the work done in relation to the one-way system and the 20mph. It was assumed that the Kineton Lane access would be opened and Mr. Vernon said at the junction there had been an archeological scrape.

106.2.3 Cllr. Bruce re-iterated that there were conditions in the granted application regarding use of the Kineton Lane access, and that the Residents' Association was monitoring this aspect.

106.2.4 It was stated that IMP was responsible for the highway until the developer moved in and that the IMP's stated policy was to maintain regular contact with the Parish Council and the IHRA as the development progressed, there would be a lot of talk on BV over the next month.

106.2.5 Mr. Vernon said he had attended to speak to the committee last summer, regarding Illshaw Heath RAs meeting with SMBC officers, he said the next phase was to discuss the process about the BV development. He said Anne Brereton (*SMBCs Director for Places*), had called a meeting with James Carpenter and Matt Preece on how they intended to communicate with Illshaw Heath residents, he said he did not know how she proposed to roll this out to Illshaw Heath residents.

106.2.6 There were comments about an email from Hockley Heath PC and about whether Bloor Homes thought BV was in Hockley Heath parish.

106.2.7 Mr. Vernon referred to a flyer produced by IMP, he said he had been disappointed, he referred to opening up discussion on what happened now things were starting, and that people knew about the problems residents had experienced with the Bloor Homes development – Cheswick Place.

106.2.8 It was pointed out that from the onset, Bloor Homes had stated there would be regular discussions and that the Parish Council/residents would be kept aware of what was happening at Cheswick Place – but they had not done this.

106.2.9 It was stated that IMP had consulted with the Parish Council initially, but this was not happening now.

106.2.10 It was suggested to possibly wait and see what SMBC said about the communication process. It was stated that Anne Brereton had said they could not resource 5000 calls coming in a day, regarding roads needing to be swept etc.

106.2.11 It was pointed out that this was SMBCs flag ship development and it was not getting off to a good start.

106.2.12 It was stated that the Bloor office dealing with BV development was a completely separate team to the team at Cheswick Place. It was pointed out that the Regional Director would probably be the same.

106.2.13 It was stated that Bloor Homes was possibly waiting to see what response it had to the application and then it would see how it would work with the local community.

106.2.14 Mr. Vernon said there was a meeting next Thursday and to see what happened. Mr. Vernon was asked to let the Parish Council know the out come of the meeting.

106.2.15 It was suggested to possibly write to Bloor Homes and inform the company that BV was in Cheswick Green parish and to copy this to Anne Brereton. It was also suggested to wait and see what happened. It was queried whether Bloor Homes had been in contact with HNPC.

106.2.16 It was pointed out that IMP had more interest in the whole of the BV estate, more than Bloor Homes or SMBC. That BV was crucial to IMP, but that it was not their only site, however it was their first massive joint commercial residential development, therefore they had worked really hard to be proactive especially with Illshaw Heath RA and there had been a better result than there could have been.

106.2.17 Members said they were aware that some developers were involved in the first bidding phase and it was stated that apparently, for phase one, one developer had come shining through and that had been Bloor Homes. Members discussed expecting Spitfire Properties to be involved.

107. Time and date of next meeting.

107.1 Wednesday 23rd May 2018 at 10am.

107.2 The Clerk was asked to see if Neil Pearce would be available to attend. To also inform the representatives from Bloor Homes that wanted to come to talk about the War Memorial and the lady from Severn Trent.

107.3 Mr. Vernon and Mr. Cox were thanked for attending.

Meeting closed 11:20am