

**631**  
**MINUTES of THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**  
**in PICKMERE VILLAGE HALL**

**13<sup>th</sup> February 2018**  
**AGENDA – PART A**

1.     **Present**            **AS (Chair), CT, AB, SF, PG, DH, IK, SR, Cllr O Hunter (OH)**  
      **Apologies**       **None**  
      **Public**           **4 members of the public**  
      **Police**           **PCSO Emma Darroch (ED)**

2.     **Minutes**

2.1    **Approval of Minutes** – the minutes of the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017 were approved.

2.2    **Matters arising from Minutes –**

5.       100-118 Pickmere Lane – CT asked Cllr Hunter (OH) if there had been progress regarding discussions over a possible new access / parking layout for these houses. OH said that there had been discussions with CEC officers and a report was due to go to CEC Highways Committee on 15 March on the matter.

7.       Planning Application 17/4264M – Erection of houses on the site of The Elms P.H., Park Lane – OH reported that the application was to be considered by CEC Northern Planning Committee on 14<sup>th</sup> February, following the committee visit to the site on 9<sup>th</sup> February (which was attended by AS and the Clerk). OH would attend the Committee meeting and AS asked if she would reiterate the points made in the Parish Council's objections to the scheme. IK asked OH if she would make reference particularly to the tree outside the site that had been removed without the owner's consent.

8.2      Planning Sub-Group – DH asked whether Council had in fact made a decision to submit an outline planning application for a replacement village hall on the IROS site adjoining the Pavilion. AS confirmed that such a decision had been made at the Council's May 2016 meeting and this had been noted at other Council meetings during 2017. DH and others expressed concern about the timing of the submission and felt that such a key decision should have been put to Council again before the application was submitted. This matter was further discussed at 8.2 below.

3.     **Declaration of Interests – none**

4.     **Open Forum (Including PCSO)**

**4.1.1** A resident wished to present to the Council a suggestion for an initiative in the village to counter and reduce the use of plastics. She made reference to another parish (Aberporth) which had become plastic-free and asked why this could not happen in Pickmere. It would be helpful to have the PC's support, or it could become a PC-led initiative. The resident made reference to a series of slides and asked if the PC was willing to become involved. Members thanked the resident for her presentation and asked the Clerk to include the topic on the March Council agenda, including the slides discussed here in the agenda papers for that meeting.

**4.1.2** Two members of Pickmere Methodist Church attended this meeting in response to the PC asking the Methodist Church whether it wished to be involved in the Annual Parish Meeting to be arranged on March 10<sup>th</sup>. The residents said that they would be pleased to do so and further they offered the use without charge of the Methodist Church premises for the event, since it was larger than the Village Hall. Members were grateful for the offer of the Methodist Church and will take it up. SR/SF will liaise with the Church representatives.

**4.1.3** A resident wished to express concern about an aspect of the submission of the village hall replacement outline planning application referred to above and in 8.2 below. He had been contacted by several residents to ask for information about it. The resident requested that the PC consider the perception of the application and the Parish Council that had been offered because of this and asked that the PC ensure residents are properly informed. See 8.2 below.

**4.2 Report from PCSO** – ED said that she did not have anything specific to report in terms of recent crime events in the Parish. She made reference to the fact that at the moment there are only 2 PCSOs in the Police area, meaning that her area is approx. 74 sq miles in area; thus, whilst she will do what she can, her time is spread very thinly. Members thanked her for her help.

**4.2.1 Request from Cheshire Police for prioritisation of concerns** – in response to this request, PG mentioned the continuing issue of HGVs using Pickmere Lane, and IK referred to speeding issues. It was agreed that members would respond individually to the Police's request for priorities. The Clerk was asked to include the question of the 7.5 tonne weight limit and its signage on the agenda for the next Council meeting.

## **5. Report from Cllr O Hunter**

OH mentioned the review of bus services in CEC, that the local bus service through Pickmere and other parishes is extremely important and that she is pursuing this topic and doing what she can to support the retention and enhancement of local bus services. AS reinforced their key importance to some members of the parish community.

## **6. Finance**

**6.1 Current financial position** – the monthly financial summaries were noted.

**6.2 New payments** - the schedule of payments was approved.

**6.3 Purchase of accounts software** – the report was noted.

## **7. Report from Planning Committee**

**7.1 Spinks Lane – Report back from meeting with Rt Hon E McVey MP** – AS reported on the meeting held with the MP. His impression was that she was very supportive of the PC's position and was concerned that CEC appeared to have no plan for action. She had agreed to refer the problem to the Secretary of State. In the meeting, AS also raised the issue of the Sunnyside site, where some local residents had directly consulted the MP. As a result of a request from the site owner, AS and the Clerk had met him on-site (and separately two of the neighbours) and as requested by Ms McVey, the results of these meetings had been reported back to her. The site owner had been advised that the only way to seek to progress the question of whether further development at Sunnyside was possible (in part in his terms to resolve the problem of the currently vacant site containing two vacant mobile homes) was to submit a planning application. AS had informed the owner that any planning application would be considered by the Parish Council and that he could not predict what the comments of the PC might be were such an application to be submitted. Finally, with Ms. McVey, the issue of the proposed Parliamentary Constituency Boundary Review was mentioned. Ms McVey said that the issue of constituency boundaries needed to be discussed and agreed in the House of Commons rather than within committee as now. She was hopeful that our boundary would not need to be changed as a consequence of this current review.

**7.2 CEC Spatial Planning Update** – noted.

## **8. Reports from Assets Working Groups**

**8.1 Funding Sub-Group** – nothing to report pending progress in other areas (see also 8.2 below).

**8.2 Planning Sub-Group** – Members considered the option appraisal report proposed by the Planning Sub-Group. AS pointed out that in terms of generating any substantial funds to carry out a capital project, the sale of the existing Village Hall site would be crucial. In continuation of some of the comments noted above, some members stated that they were not aware that submitting an outline planning application meant that local residents would be notified and have the opportunity to comment, but that if they had been so aware they would have sought a different approach to public notification. One member commented that the only way the PC can clarify what might or might not be possible is to submit a formal planning application proposal on which the general public can comment. Another member agreed that the decision as to which option to pursue was for the Parish Council to make but was disappointed that the PC has erred by not informing the community more generally of the nature of the proposal, including the fact that the Council had not yet finally agreed to implement it. It was noted by members that there would be a number of hurdles to overcome before such a decision could be made, the question of planning permission being only the first.

The Chair reminded members that in the original public consultation exercise of some years ago, a large number of public responses were in favour of a project on the lines of that now the subject of an outline planning application. In relation to the option appraisal report, members resolved (5 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions) that Option 2 (the construction of a replacement village hall on the IROS) be adopted as the objective of the Parish Council, and also as follows:

- That the Clerk is requested to issue a slight revision of the option appraisal report clarifying the basis for the broad cost ascribed to Option 2 (the construction of a replacement village hall on the IROS)
- Planning Sub-Group to continue efforts to secure outline planning permission for the VH replacement on the IROS as a further step to aid the Council to decide whether to proceed with this project;
- On the basis that redevelopment or re-use of the existing VH site might raise a substantial proportion of the project cost, Funding Sub-Group to undertake a scoping exercise in relation to seeking funding for an amount in the order of say 25%-35% of the envisaged project cost of Option 2 to support such a project, and to make initial approaches to relevant bodies or persons.
- Should outline planning permission be granted for the VH replacement on the IROS, Planning Sub-Group to discuss informally with CEC the optimum approach in relation to seeking planning permission for a re-use or redevelopment of the VH site, with the aim of maximising financial return in the context of seeking an acceptable and appropriate development.
- That a valuation of the Village Hall site be sought, to inform future decision-making.

Discussion continued as to how to approach the issue of public notification of the Council's current intentions, and the reasoning behind the current outline planning application. It was resolved unanimously that:

- A letter be sent to those households notified by CEC of the outline planning application, seeking to apologise for the lack of communication, and setting out briefly the Council's intentions.
- The editor of Pickmere Press be asked to include a similar communication to all residents of the parish in its next issue, for which the copy deadline was 18 February.

## **9. Reports from Clerk and from Councillors**

**In view of the time spent discussing the above issues, the Chair moved and members agreed to consider only the most urgent of the remaining agenda items, leaving the rest to be considered where appropriate, at the March meeting.**

**9.2 Annual Parish Meeting** – the date of Saturday 10<sup>th</sup> March had previously been agreed; it was suggested that the event be held between 2.00 p.m. and 4.00 p.m. at Pickmere Methodist Hall (as discussed above). Arrangements were continuing; the PC will have to decide what it wishes to display. It was agreed that funding be made available for a banner to be mounted on the Red Lion corner advertising the event.

**9.4 Village of the Year (Channel 4)** – SF wished to propose a thank you to all in the village who had helped and supported the filming event for this programme. This was unanimously agreed.

**9.7 Dates for Community Group events 2018 – dates agreed.**

**AGENDA PART B**

In view of the special or confidential nature of the business to be transacted, the remaining item was considered in private.

**10. Painting of Clover Drive Play Area equipment and Clover Drive Cheshire railings –** The meeting confirmed the following appointments:

- Painting of Clover Drive Play Area equipment – Mr G Brannon
- Painting of Clover Drive Cheshire railings – Northwich Decorating Co.

Clerk: Jack Steel  
Next meeting: 6<sup>th</sup> March 2018