



*Cheswick Green Parish Council*

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

**CHESWICK GREEN PARISH COUNCIL  
 MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2019 7:30pm Cheswick Green Village Hall**

**Present:**

Cheswick Green Parish Councillors: Margaret Gosling, Sam Sedgley, Jacqueline Sowsbery-Moore and Peter Townsend.

Clerk: Marie Zizzi

2 members of the public

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

226.1 Cllr. Swain had sent an apology, this was accepted.

**227. Declarations of Interest.**

227.1 None.

**228. Dispensations.**

228.1 None.

**229. Public Participation (15 Minutes).**

229.1 One of the members of the public present was from the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE). There were comments about Site 12 in the Solihull Local Development Plan (LDP) review, it was stated that flooding was an issue and it was pointed out that Site 11 drained into Mount Brook.

229.1.1 It was stated that in relation to all the villages in the Blythe area; Cheswick Green, Dickens Heath, Tidbury Green and South Shirley the analysis from SMBCs drainage department was not very accurate. It was suggested that the Parish Council could write to the EA and SMBCs drainage department, to please re-evaluate not only Cheswick Green but the whole of the Blythe area.

229.1.2 There were comments about the drainage report being very inaccurate due to the areas having deep boulder clay, an impermeable surface with soil on the top of rocks and a very high water table.

229.1.3 It was stated that at the cross over on Saxon Wood Road and the Brook the water level could rise or lower very quickly. It was felt this was a very valid planning point, as the river was very flashy.

229.1.4 It was noted that Site 13 had been removed from the LDP and that Site 4 had been reduced from 700 buildings to 350.

229.1.5 It was pointed out that development was supposed to be distributed in the Borough, however the Blythe area was getting about 33%.

229.1.6 It was stated that Cheswick Green had already had 274 buildings at Mount Dairy Farm/Cheswick Place and planning permission had been granted for 750 at Blythe Valley Park, as well as a 200 hotel and a 250 roomed care facility. This meant the parish was more than doubling.

229.1.7 It was stated the CPRE had written to Gary Palmer at SMBC regarding the number of planning permissions in the area and it was 2520.

229.1.8 It was pointed out that Bloor Homes were having difficulty selling the houses, as they were not affordable.

**Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2019**

Signed .....

Date.....

- 229.1.9 It was stated that it was very difficult to go through the SMBC website and all the links to find information.
- 229.1.10 It was stated that CGPC needed to think about question 11 in the draft Local Plan supplementary consultation *'Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Blythe, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?'*
- 229.1.11 It was noted that the draft LP supplementary consultation documents included information about public transport services, however it was felt that buses did not go where people wanted them to. It was stated there were to be three new bus routes, but they were not what people wanted.
- 229.1.12 There were comments about the road alterations at Creynolds Lane, it was stated there had been three accidents already. It was suggested the police were notified.
- 229.1.13 It was pointed out that the right turn out of Creynolds Lane had been removed 20-30 years ago, because it was too dangerous and now it had been put back.
- 229.1.14 In relation to the highway improvements in the draft LP supplementary consultation document, it was stated it was all very vague.
- 229.1.15 There were comments about land grabbing, developers contacting residents near the Cross Roads garage, for back garden developments and reference to Amber Sites.
- 229.1.16 It was stated that the draft LP supplementary consultation document may not get through the examination.
- 229.1.17 The representative from CPRE said in another area, the LP had been stopped at the examination stage, as there had been no traffic survey carried out.
- 229.1.18 It was suggested to ask SMBC for its traffic survey.
- 229.1.19 There were comments about sites being analysed without having the appropriate information and SMBC not using its own reports in relation to the LP.
- 229.1.20 It was suggested the Parish Council should write notes before commenting on the LP, that it was not possible to wait until all the information needed was available. It was pointed out that if CGPC asked SMBC for information and it was not received, this could be made known to the inspector.
- 229.1.21 The representative from CPRE referred to the NPPF July 2018; she said in relation to infrastructure and Green Belt enhancements, there was a need for the provision of environmental improvements and compensation. She said they had worked very hard to get Site 13 out of the LP and made into a public space, more mitigation was needed.
- 229.1.22 It was noted that there was only one field between Cheswick Green and Site 12.
- 229.1.23 It was pointed out that in relation to the 5 purposes of the Green Belt, two of the reasons; *were to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another*. It was stated Dog Kennel Lane would have a significant impact.
- 229.1.24 It was noted SMBC had given the Dog Kennel Lane site a 'green', using its 'step 2'; site selection process, which meant *'to be included in the plan as an intended allocation. This will mean the development of the site has either no or only a relatively low impact on relevant considerations'*. It was felt this was nonsense and a contradiction.
- 229.1.25 There were comments about ancient trees and using this argument to reduce one site from 700 buildings to 350; Site 4 had been reduced. The lady from CPRE said they had spent days in Warwick Museum and found lots of hedges in Site 4, this had assisted with the site being reduced, some had been there before the 1600s, this information had been put forward and helped reduce the numbers.
- 229.1.26 There were comments about a Roman Fort being on the site where the Miller and Carter was located. There were comments about no significant historical areas, but to do research. It was suggested CGPC contracted Mr. John Green of the South Solihull Community Group.
- 229.1.27 It was stated that in relation to ancient hedgerows, it was not possible to build 5 meters either side of these, that interconnectivity between local wild life sites in the areas was important. It was stated that badgers were moving and moving.
- 229.1.28 It was recommended that CGPC looked at strategic issues on housing numbers. The lady from the CPRE said in the new NPPF, there was a new method of getting housing figures for an area, she said SMBC was using the 2004 census figures, in 2016 household

**Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2019**

Signed .....

Date.....

figures showed to be lower than 2004, therefore any figures in the LDP should be less. She said if there were exceptional circumstances, they could use the 2016 figures to try and get the numbers down, she added there were exceptional circumstances because it was all Green Belt, anything grade 5 or over should not be considered.

229.1.29 It was stated that the gap between the two settlements was so small it should be a high grade and to look at Green Belt appraisal.

229.1.30 The lady from CPRE said the Inspector would weigh up the arguments purely on planning reasons. It was stated no-one knew what was going to happen in relation to Brexit, and queried whether so many houses would be needed.

229.1.31 It was pointed out that due to the number from Birmingham, it could mean the numbers went up.

229.1.32 The lady from CPRE said a statistician from Birmingham City Council, who had been there 20 years had looked at the figures and found flaws, for example in relation to Multiple Occupation Buildings, he said he thought he could get the figures down by about 10-15%; he was meeting with Andy Street about this.

229.1.33 It was stated if these allocations remained, the areas would be washed over by Green Belt.

229.1.34 A local planning application for 3 bungalows was referred to, SMBC had refused this due to it being in the Green Belt but Dog Kennel Lane was right behind this land. It was suggested that the applicant should wait for the outcome of the LDP, as things could change, to wait 18 months and then resubmit, as if the applicant went to Appeal now, it would not get passed as it was in the Green Belt. However, if Dog Kennel Lane got through, his land would be infill.

229.1.35 There were comments about 2 derelict houses, it was suggested that the applicant could plant hedges to create a natural boundary. It was stated he had planted a number of trees and these had been ripped out. It was noted that SMBC had the authority to serve notices on the owners of the derelict properties, however it was stated this had been done a number of years ago. It was stated if this had not achieved a satisfactory result, it could be done again and the Parish Council could chase this up with SMBC.

229.1.36 It was summarized that the main problems with the proposals for Dog Kennel Lane were, loss of Green Belt, increased traffic, impact of flooding, impact on medical services and schools. It was stated traffic was already dreadful and someone had described Cheswick Green as an island in a sea of traffic.

229.1.37 It was noted the Parish Council had been trying to obtain comments from residents with dates/times and if possible, photographs of their travel issues/delays.

229.1.38 It was stated that if Dog Kennel Lane went ahead, there would probably be a school.

229.1.39 There were comments about the pressure on drainage and if the area was a Zone 1 or 2, it should not be built on, even if flooding measures (Sustainable Urban Drainage - SuDS) were included. It was stated these did not work, there was no technical way round this, vegetation was needed.

229.1.40 It was concluded that this proposed site would result in the lack of a defensible boundary, loss of wild life and inconnectivity. There were comments about there being some soft and some hard constraints and not being able to mitigate many things.

229.1.41 It was suggested Councillors went and looked and took photographs, in relation to TPOs, old trees and hedgerows. These could be sent to Jenny Blakemore at SMBC, any evidence should be sent to her and she would record this, if there were ancient trees, then no road improvements could be made.

229.1.42 It was reiterated to look at the strategic side as well to get the numbers reduced, the broader strategy, to get the overall numbers down for the Blythe area and not just Cheswick Green.

229.1.43 It was stated that the existing new development and the development at Blythe Valley needed time to settle in, as this was already a lot for this area.

229.1.44 There was then a discussion about the proposals for 2 Motorway Service Areas (MSAs), it was suggested that a decision on junction 6 on the M42 needed to be made first. It was stated that this work was costing £248 million.

229.1.45 There were comments about HS2 and plans for the 'Garden City' near the NEC, for 5000 houses, it was suggested that a MSA could be incorporate at this area.

229.1.46 It was stated that there was growing opposition to HS2, it would only reduce the journey time by 15 minutes and it could not be linked to Central London.

229.1.47 It was noted that CGPC was developing a Neighbourhood Plan, it was stated these carried a lot of weight, as they had evidence from the results of the surveys.

229.1.48 It was stated there was historical background regarding flooding and to share what was being said with other Parish Councils, so they were all saying the same thing as this would carry more weight.

229.1.49 It was suggested the draft NP could be sent to the lady from CPRE, to see if she could help. She was thanked for attending and left the meeting at 8:15pm.

### **230. To discuss the War Memorial opening ceremony event.**

230.1 It was agreed it had been a very good event. Cllr Gosling thanked all those that had helped.

230.2 It was noted that transfer of the land to the Parish Council, was now being dealt with by solicitors.

### **231. To discuss the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).**

231.1 It was stated a meeting was taking place on Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> February, to discuss the NDP.

### **232. To approve the Minutes from the meeting held on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019.**

**Resolved;** proposed Cllr. Sedgley, seconded Cllr. Townsend; that these should be signed as a true and accurate record.

**Resolved;** Cllr. Gosling proposed agenda item 10 was moved forward.

### **233. To discuss co-opting new members and elections.**

233.1 Jacqueline Angela Sowsbery-Moore had submitted an application form to be considered for co-option as a member of CGPC, she was present at the meeting.

**Resolved;** proposed Cllr. Sedgley, seconded Cllr. Townsend; that she should be co-opted.

233.2 A declaration of acceptance of office and code of conduct were signed. Cllr. Sowsbery-Moore joined the meeting.

### **233. To receive a report on the finances of the Council and to approve any payments made since last meeting and any payments to be made (issued to Parish Cllrs with the agenda).**

#### **Payments to be agreed from Co-op acc Exercise Class Feb 2019 PC meeting**

100147 Exercise class instructor for January 2019 £108.00

#### **Chgs/Electronic payments/transactions to be approved Feb 2019 PC meeting**

<b>Payee</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>VAT</b>	<b>Net</b>
Meadowfields GM	Clear up sand from grit	£ 42.00	£ 7.00	£ 35.00
Meadowfields GM	Empty new litter bin	£ 48.00	£ 8.00	£ 40.00
Meadowfields GM	remove branches at the Mount	£ 48.00	£ 8.00	£ 40.00
Meadowfields GM	Lay 3 2x2 slabs in play area	£ 54.00	£ 9.00	£ 45.00
Sydney Michell	Money 'on account'	£ 500.00		
Solicitors	to proceed with transfer of land for War Memorial			
SMBC	Christmas lights 2018	£1433.52	£238.92	£1194.00
Marie Zizzi	Renewal of Microsoft office 15/03/2019 for one year	£ 59.99		

More in confidential section

It was noted that there was £87.60 petty cash as at 6<sup>th</sup> Feb 2019; however, the Clerk had since spent £30 on ink.

### **Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2019**

Signed .....

Date.....

**Resolved;** proposed Cllr. Townsend, seconded Cllr. Sedgley; that all payments as listed were approved.

**234. To resolve to have Peter Davidson's name removed as an authorised signatory on all CGPC bank accounts.**

**Resolved;** proposed Cllr. Sedgley, seconded Cllr. Sowsbery; that Mr. Davidson's name was removed from CGPC bank accounts.

**235. To discuss any issues that relate to the Recreation Committee; land owned by the Parish Council, grounds maintenance.**

**235.1 It was stated that the Recreation Committee recommended the Parish**

Council extended the existing grounds maintenance contact due to end 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 for 2 years, if the contractor would continue at the same cost or with a small increase.

**Resolved;** Cllr. Gosing, Sedgley and Townsend were all in favour; of extending the existing grounds maintenance agreement for 2 years.

**236. To discuss what to spend remainder of Tesco Bags of Help funding money on.**

236.1 Cllr. Sedgley said with Cllr. Swain, she had looked at the surface in the children's play area, there was a lot of moss, the whole area needed to be replaced as it was unsightly. It was stated this was not a H&S issue and it had not been picked up in the annual RoSPA inspection.

**Action item: Clerk to obtain a quote from the company that installed the wet pour surface underneath the large swings.**

**237. To consider planning applications and local development including progress at Mount Dairy Farm/Cheswick Place and Blythe Valley Park/IMP.**

**PL/2019/00218/TPO;** 90 Creynolds Lane Cheswick Green Solihull B90 4FB - 25% crown reduction and dead branch removal on 1 No. Oak tree

237.1 Members queried why the application was for a tree sited at 90 Creynolds Lane, but the applicant was from 88 Creynolds Lane.

**PL/2019/00241/TPO;** 11 Chartwell Drive Cheswick Green Solihull B90 4JZ - T1

Sycamore - reduce crown by 2-3 metres to suitable growth points. Crown raise to 4 metres and remove ivy to give more light to garden and lawn area.

237.2 There were no comments to be submitted.

**PL/2019/00316/PPRM;** Parcels J, K And M1 Blythe Valley Park Blythe Gate Shirley - Reserved matters for Parcels J, K and M1: 169 dwellings (comprised of houses and apartments), internal estate roads, car parking, landscaping, SuDS and associated ancillary infrastructure.

237.3 It was agreed to request more time to respond to this as the date to submit comments by was 1<sup>st</sup> March 2019.

237.4 It was agreed that the Clerk could respond to Mr. Dean Standley regarding his planning application, as per information provided by the lady from CPRE.

237.5 In relation to Mount Dairy Farm/Cheswick Place; it was stated the path from Saxon Wood Road was being used and this had resulted in people walking across a local resident's front garden, the resident just wanted their front garden fenced off, to prevent this.

**Action item: the Clerk was asked to chase this matter up with Bloor Homes.**

237.5.1 It was stated that there was extra tarmac from people creating patio's, this produced even more hard standing, impermeable ground, three had been done already.

237.6 It was stated work had now started at Blythe Valley.

**238. To discuss the template presented by CSW for an Emergency Plan.**

238.1 Deferred.

**239. To discuss the party in the park.**

239.1 It was stated that the new form for events involving the Recreation Ground should be sent to the lady that did the Village Hall bookings.

239.2 It was stated this form had been based on information provided by SMBC.

**240. To discuss the situation with the car park in relation to part ownership and update regarding height restriction barriers etc.**

240.1 It was noted that further to a meeting with representatives from Enterprise Inns (EI) and the Managing Agent for the shops (SDL), it had been agreed that height restriction barriers would not be installed.

240.2 It was stated the discussion had covered lighting, CCTV and litter, all those involved were to obtain quotes and to look into these issues, to see what could be done to improve the situation.

240.3 It was suggested that the Village Surgery should be sent a copy of the map that showed the various ownership of the car park, as from previous correspondence the Village Surgery had stated it had no responsibility for any of the car park.

**241. To discuss the car park area and litter.**

241.1 Dealt with.

**242. To receive any reports from Councillors and/or the Clerk.**

242.1 Cllr. Gosling said she had not made any progress in relation to the Broadband yet, but she would chase this up.

242.2 There were comments about Ken Hawkins 'In touch' newsletter. It was noted that CGPC had requested to be invited to join him when he met with Highways Officers, however with James Butler he had done this and not involved the Parish Council.

242.3 It was noted that the sessions regarding the LDP were mainly being held in libraries, but queried why no session was being held in Cheswick Green, as SMBC could have used the Village Hall. The Clerk was asked to follow this up.

242.4 It was stated a few messages had now come through in relation to the traffic survey. Cllr. Sedgley said she would put this information together for the NDP, it was an issue for SMBC and they could now provide tangible evidence.

242.5 It was stated the LDP did not consider the flood report.

242.6 There were comments about Ken Hawkins 20mph outside the school proposals, it was noted the Parish Council had said it should be 20mph for the whole of Cheswick Green, not just outside the school. There were comments about the amount of inconsiderate and dangerous parking during school drop off/pick up times.

**243. Update/report from Village Hall Management Committee (VHMC).**

243.1 It was noted the Parish Council had been informed that the VHMC was seeking a number of quotes to refurbish the toilets. These were to be sent directly to the Parish Council in sealed envelopes, which would be opened at the March meeting.

**244. To discuss Mr. Pettinger's draft Cheswick Green the first 40 years.**

244.1 Cllr. Gosling said Mr. Pettinger had obtained a verbal quote, but this was needed in writing.

244.2 It was noted that Cllr. Swain still needed to read this.

**245. To consider and resolve any action(s) in relation to items of correspondence received (issued to Parish Cllrs. with the agenda).**

245.1 Emails from a company call Selectra regarding adding a link to CGPCs website in relation to smart meters information was noted. Members did not wish to endorse smart meters.

245.2 An email from Vision ICT regarding Operation London Bridge was noted, members agreed to go ahead with this.

**Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2019**

Signed .....

Date.....

245.3 An email regarding possibly installing a 'Scope' charity textile bin in Cheswick Green was noted, members did not wish to go ahead with this for a number of reasons.

245.4 The request for a student to have the Parish Councils permission to take photographs on Parish Council owned land for a University project, had now been dealt with.

245.5 Information from WALC regarding £100,000 of National Lottery funding up for grabs to celebrate community spirit in the West Midlands, was noted.

245.6 Cllr. Sedgley agreed to enter the Tesco Bags of Help - Twitter Competition on Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> Feb between 00:01 and 23:59 for the chance to win £100.

**246. To discuss and resolve any actions in relation to the ongoing CGPC action list (issued to Cllrs. with the agenda).**

246.1 Noted.

**247. Agenda items for next meeting.**

247.1 It was stated that the quotes for the toilets in the Village Hall would need to be included.

247.2 It was queried whether there was any scope in putting together a working group from groups across the Blythe Ward for a planning argument. It was suggested there was not enough time.

**248. To resolve that due to the special nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the press and public be temporarily excluded and they are instructed to withdraw.**

248.1 There were no members of the public present.

**249. To discuss and resolve any actions regarding any items of correspondence or matters considered confidential.**

249.1 There were none.

**250. PAYE, payroll and Pension Scheme.**

**Meeting closed 21:10**