

## **11.**

### **Minutes of Norley Parish Council Meeting of 19/10/16 7pm Norley Methodist Hall**

#### **41. Apologies**

Councillor Harvey, Councillor Ford and Cheshire West & Chester Councillor Oultram sent their apologies.

#### **42. Present**

Councillor O'Connor, Councillor Stockton, Councillor Sturt, Councillor Querelle, Councillor Crawford, Councillor Wild, and Councillor Fayle attended the meeting.

#### **43. Declarations of Interests**

No declarations of interest were made.

#### **44. Public Speakers**

Phil Gifford addressed the Council on behalf of Norley Wildlife Group explaining proposals to extend wild flower areas at WWI Site. The Council requested that the group look at the possibility of extending the flowering period but had no objections to the group's proposals. Phil was asked to liaise with Alan Davies who maintains this area of land and put these proposals in the Norley News to consult with villagers.

#### **45. Approval of the Minutes of Norley Parish Council Meeting of 12/09/16.**

The minutes of Norley Parish Council Meeting of 12/09/16 were approved subject to the following amendment:-

- Minute's number 37 should read Councillor O'Connor not Connor.

#### **46. Matters arising from the minutes of Norley Parish Council Meeting of 12/09/16**

(i) Councillor O'Connor provided an update following the Highways meeting with Mark Jones. The double yellow lines at Hatchmere look like they will go ahead without the cost needing to be met by the Parish Council. Highways are looking at designs to slow traffic down at this junction. Speed restriction on Blakemere lane is going forward but this is likely to happen next year. Mark explained the process involved to have signs replaced in the village, signs have now been replaced on Maddocks Hill. Email received from Mark asking will the Council support speed reduction costs with Delamere, Oakmere & Sandiway Parish Councils for Stoneford Lane. The Council agreed.

(ii) Partner Construction will not allow Parish Council to take responsibility for the green area at the development on School Bank.

(iii) Marston's have agreed that the Council can take over responsibly for the green triangle outside the Tigers Head. Clerk instructed to draft and issue letter to Marston's to confirm this.

(iv) Advert for Clerk post has been drafted. This will be advertised when the next issue of Norley News is due, to allow this to be seen by villagers.

(v) The Common Land in the village still has 'No known owner' and as such remains the responsibility of the Parish Council & Cheshire West & Chester Council. Clerk had arranged a site visit with CWAC and members of the Council to assess Knotweed at Breech Moss. Clerk to ask CWAC what their proposals are with these problems?

## 12.

Council agreed for Councillor Ford to attend a meeting with CWAC legal team to obtain advice on infringement of Common Land.

(vi) Clerk instructed to contact enforcement at CWAC to ask that they investigate possible planning breach at Oak Tree House.

### 47. Planning Applications

Delamere Forest 16/03550/FUL

Firstly, in relation to the Visitor Centre and Parking:

- The Council is not against the sensible development of the leisure aspects of the forest and has no significant concerns about the proposed development of the Visitor Centre. There was a general feeling that the proposal for the new centre was possibly rather large. The Council recognises the importance of the forest paying its way in order to help ensure it remains sustainable.
- The Council do object in principal to the proposed parking restrictions on Ashton Road. The restrictions seem unnecessary given the large number of lay-bys situated off the road causing no obstruction to traffic. These lay-bys are well used by local people, often several times a week and it was certainly a common view that forcing locals to pay for parking when there is 'safe' off-road parking of this type seems very unreasonable and would be a source of significant resistance if it were to form part of a formal proposal.

Secondly, the proposed Forest Lodge development. The debate and objections centred around three key areas – Size/Scale, Access and Location – and it is fair to say that the comments below are representative of the feelings of all the councillors:

- The sheer scale – 67 cabins, 19 hectares – proposed is totally disproportionate to the size of Delamere Forest. This is a HUGE number of people and cars to put in this area – equivalent to the size of the nearest village! The Council would very much like to see a detailed breakdown of the business case that supports the claim that 67 cabins per forest are required to make these projects economical.
- The claim from Forest Holidays that people do not use their cars once on-site is not credible, because there are no local amenities within walking distance of Kingswood. If the statement is true, then their other claim that the cabins will make a significant contribution to the local economy must therefore be untrue. The Council would like to see a detailed breakdown of the calculations of the projected benefits to the local economy as there is little in the current documentation to justify confidence in the claimed local economic benefits.
- Current Forest Holiday sites provide a bar, cafe, shop and laundry. Why are these facilities not shown on the draft Delamere Forest plans? How much of the projected spend of the cabin guests is likely to go into these facilities rather than into the local economy?
- Has an assessment been made of the impact on wildlife in the area? With the huge influx of people and cars proposed, and the need to fell so many trees, it seems likely that the habitats of many animals will be seriously disturbed. As far as the Council can tell, there have been no Environmental Impact, CO2, traffic impact or wildlife surveys carried out.
- The point of entry requires a long road to be driven through the forest, changing its nature and opening up users on foot and horse riders to a significant traffic hazard from potentially hundreds of cars per day. It cannot

### 13.

be guaranteed (as Forest Holidays claim) that parallel walking tracks maintain safety and, more importantly, walkers / runners / horse riders / cyclists / etc. should not have to be restricted this way in a forest.

- Given the level of development / construction work through the forest required for access, it was not clear why the proposed access point was not from North of the forest, along Waterloo Lane, which would presumably be far less destructive.
- Kingswood and its immediate surroundings is currently the only area of the forest that remains untouched – everywhere else has some sort of associated development or activity. This should be preserved. Any development that has to take place should be kept to the area south of Ashton Road, with the area to the north left untouched. It is nonsensical to spread development throughout the whole forest.
- The Council have concerns regarding the sheer scale of this development, the impact on wildlife and loss of amenities and think that as Kingswood and its immediate surroundings is currently the only area of the forest that remains untouched, this should be protected.

### 48. Correspondence

(i) Email received from Norley C of E School requesting a copy of the Norley Parish Council Insurance Document to check cover regarding hiring school hall. Copy provided and confirmation email received from the school that cover is adequate.

(ii) Email received from Cheshire Police explaining that Phil Brandeth is moving areas and they will provide the names of the new officers covering Norley as soon as possible.

(iii) Email received from Councillor Wild raising concerns over verge and vertical paving stones at Pytchleys Hollow. Clerk had reported these concerns to Highways and they have replied explaining it was Cheshire West & Chester who had undertaken this work.

(iv) Temporary Road Notices received for High Street & Fingerpost lane to allow for carriageway improvements.

(v) Council discussed Community pride Competition following Councillors Wild's email informing members that Norley was unsuccessful this year. The Council agreed to make this a priority for 2017.

(vi) Planning Protocol information received from CWAC Planning.

(vii) Email received from R Scot requesting information on whether any correspondence had taken place between Ineos and the Parish Council. Clerk had replied that none had taken place.

### 49. Accounts

(i) Rose Rowland Salary Fees £96.00 approved for payment

(ii) BDO Audit Fees £120 approved for payment

(iii) Mr A Davies £70 Grass Cutting approved for payment

(iv) Cheshire Association of local Councils Map £6.00 approved for payment.

(v) HMRC Tax for September 2016 £70.20 approved for payment.

(vi) Mrs M Rosney Salary September 2016 £280.60 approved for payment.

(vii) BDO had completed external audit with no issues raised for concern. Clerk explained that due to council asking for deadline to be extended this had been raised in BDO's comments.

**14.**

(viii) Clerk explained that the computer she purchased on behalf of the Council was not what she had expected when it had been delivered. She had decided to keep this for her own use and had purchased another laptop for the Council at £304.49. The clerk did not want reimbursing for the additional £4.48p. See Min number 40 (iii) to which this relates.

(ix) Clerk received permission to obtain up to 5 hours training for website management.

**50. Any Other Business**

(i) Council is considering the benefits of allowing developers to speak to the Council prior to formal applications being submitted. Clerk to obtain a disclaimer contract and circulate to members to allow them to consider using this to protect themselves from being misquoted if they decide to carry this matter forward.

(ii) Councillor Wild promoted 2 events due to take place at the Village Hall.

(iii) Copies of the cheques made out to JNCOT which they stated they had not received had been obtained from the Parish Council bank and have been forwarded to JNCOT; hopefully this will resolve this misunderstanding.

(iv) Councillor O'Connor to take forward the clarification of housing allocation in the village with Cheshire West & Chester Council.

**The Meeting finished at 8.40pm**