

**628**  
**MINUTES of THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**  
**in PICKMERE VILLAGE HALL**

**3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017**  
**AGENDA PART A**

- |    |                  |  |
|----|------------------|--|
| 1. | <b>Present</b>   | <b>AS (Chair), CT, PG, AB, SR, SF, DH, Cllr O Hunter</b> |
|    | <b>Apologies</b> | <b>IK (Work responsibilities)</b>                        |
|    | <b>Public</b>    | <b>None</b>  |
|    | <b>Police</b>    | <b>None</b>  |

**2. Minutes**

**2.1 Approval of Minutes** – the minutes of the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2017 were approved, with the replacement of the word “architect” in minute no. 8.2 by “adviser”.

**2.2 Matters arising from Minutes –**

4.2 – No feedback has been received from the Police following their intended visit to the Spinks Lane site after the last Council meeting.

9.10 – Cutting of verges – the Clerk reported that the contractor who had enquired about the possible cutting of roadside verges/hedges, supplementary to the one cut per season service provided by CE Council, had responded and that a possible price had been suggested. Members noted this response.

**3. Declaration of Interests – nil**

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

**4.1** Nil

**4.2** Nil

- 5. Report from Cllr O Hunter** – Cllr Hunter reported that the parking problem in relation to nos. 100-118 Pickmere Lane had been discussed with colleagues and Mr S Wallace of CE Highways. A possible scheme has been mooted, for provision of an enlarged service road to these properties which would allow direct access from that service road to individual curtilages, without each crossing the grass verge. The cost would be significant and there is no commitment from CE to fund such a scheme. Further consultations were going on within the Council. A discussion is to take place with interested residents.

Cllr Hunter has requested that planning application no. 17/4264M (Residential development of the Elms PH site, Park Lane) be called in for member decision. She currently awaits the decision of the Chair of Committee and Chief Planning Officer on her request.

## **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 External Audit** - The Chair allowed discussion of the following item as an urgent item, bearing in mind the need for the results of the external audit of the Council's accounts for 2016/7 to be published as soon as possible. The external auditors' report had been received by the RFO. The accounts had been approved by the auditors with two minor comments – one relating to the suggestion that the Council's VAT returns be completed regularly, and the second making reference to a minor error in the presentation of the accounts. Members were minded unanimously to accept the audit report; the RFO suggested that the VAT return be carried out each October, and will proceed to do so this month. The necessary documents are now available for public inspection and appropriate notices will be posted. Council also noted the required payment of the auditors' fee of £130 plus VAT.

**7. Planning** – the Clerk referred to a current application – 17/4507M – an application to vary the s106 agreement that relates to the previous construction of dwellings at Thistle Close. The matter was highly technical and the Clerk had sought clarification on its implications from planning and legal officers of CE Council, but such clarification had been refused. The application related particularly to no. 4 Thistle Close (though if approved it may affect other properties in the same development). The original s106 agreement required 3 of the dwellings of this development to be erected as 'affordable' dwellings – that is dwellings to be sold at 75% of their normal market value, and with CE's Housing Officer playing a role in seeking suitable potential purchasers. It seemed that the application sought to relax this requirement, although CE's officers had not clarified this point. Allowing the application would, it was felt, reduce the stock of 'affordable' dwellings in the village and was to be resisted. This was consistent with the Parish Council's views on 17/4264M (see above). In view of the officers' unwillingness to confirm the key contents of the application, members agreed unanimously that an objection to the application should be urgently submitted, (in view of the consultation deadline) on the basis that it would reduce the stock of 'affordable' dwellings in the village, contrary to CE's adopted Local Plan Strategy.

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

**8.1 Funding Sub-Group** – nil to report – awaiting progress on other aspects.

**8.2 Planning Sub-Group** – AS reported that following the previous meeting with a planning officer from CE as part of the pre-planning application procedure, the officer's initial written comments had been received, and the Clerk had responded to that communication. The officer had pointed out the planning policy hurdles to be overcome, but his stance was not overtly objectionable. The officer's formal response was now awaited, following which members could then decide whether to proceed with a formal planning application.

### **8.3 Asset Register Sub-Group**

**8.3.1 Cheshire Railings** – reference was made to the work that had been done by volunteers during the summer, which had been hindered by poor weather. The suggestion was made that some of the work at least might be professionally done, perhaps with assistance from Community Group funds. In the first instance the Clerk was requested to seek appropriate price quotations.

**8.3.2 Clover Drive Play Area** – SR reported that the Annual Survey Report did not highlight any new matters since the previous report. Various minor cosmetic items were in need of repair/maintenance. The defective rocking horse has been removed pending repair. The Clerk was asked to seek quotations for the maintenance items referred to.

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

**9.1 CE Spatial Planning Update and Consultation on Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule** – Members noted the update and had no comments on the draft Charging Schedule.

**9.2 Letting Policy for hiring of Village Hall** – Members considered the report and resolved the following principles to be applied in Village Hall bookings, in addition to those already adopted on the current Hire Agreement:

- A £50 returnable damage deposit to be required for evening events;
- Playing of music to cease at 10.30 pm, with the Hall to be cleared of persons by 11.00 pm;
- The nature of any music played is to be solely at the discretion of the Council;
- The maximum no. of persons attended shall be set at 50 for the present, though the Clerk is requested to seek Fire Service advice on the safe capacity of the Hall;
- Care must be taken by Hall users to minimise any disturbance to neighbours either during or after the event is ended.

**9.3 Annual Parish Meeting** – The draft letter to organisations coordinated by SR was approved; SR is to supply organisation details to the Clerk who will send out letters. Rural Touring Arts and the RSPB were to be added to the list.

**9.4 Need for maintenance work on the IROS** – PG referred particularly to the area between the first section of the permissive path and the shore. He will reinspect and discuss with SW.

**9.5 Trees in the Parish** – The Clerk is to refer the remaining sycamores on the Elms PH site to CE with a request that they be considered for a TPO. It was agreed that AS, CT and the Clerk will carry out a tour of the roads in the parish to identify trees that make a particular contribution to the public realm. The results will be reported back to Council for a decision as to whether they be referred to CE for consideration of the making of TPOs. CT reported that a hawthorn tree in one corner of the IROS has blown down and needs to be dealt with.

**9.6 Consideration of a Hospitality Register** – it was felt that there should be a formal mechanism for dealing with any gifts or offers of gifts to Councillors. It was agreed that any such offers should be reported to Council for decision and for recording in Council minutes. This excludes those events where for instance the Chair of the PC may be invited to a function to formally represent the Council.

**9.7 Hospitality Register – letter from Manchester Airport** – AB stated that she and IK benefited from such a gift, with the approval of Council, 12 months ago. The Airport has offered two tickets to the Council for one of a series of events at Bridgewater Hall. The list of potential events has been circulated – members are invited to express an interest to the Clerk.

**9.8 Decorative planters** – AB reported that there were many potential suitable locations for planters, should any such be offered by members of the community. Photographs of some of the possible locations had been circulated. There is clearly an issue of how maintenance of such planters would be arranged. No such offers had actually been made to date, so that there is no decision to be made. PG made reference to signs at the main road entrances to the village, and their poor state. Cllr Hunter will enquire of who at CE is responsible for the upkeep of such signs.

**9.9 Manchester Airport – development update** – CT reported on his recent attendance at an update presentation. The Airport are carrying out significant work on air quality issues – rather the impact of the road vehicles servicing the airport, and passenger vehicles, rather than aircraft-generated emissions. The Airport's vehicle fleet are being changed to electric vehicles where possible; aircraft taxiing arrangements are also being changed to reduce emissions. CT also made reference to airspace management matters, where a proposed public consultation on changes is being delayed by issues involving the Civil Aviation Authority and Heathrow Airport. Proposals for the demolition of Terminal 1 and the expansion of T2 are advancing.

**9.10 'Dog Fouling and Dog Control Public Space Protection Order' Consultation** – concern was expressed as to why this additional control was required bearing in mind existing legislation. There were also questions of whether the provisions would apply to the IROS, and of who is likely to be available to police the proposed provisions. In conclusion, the Council considered the provisions to be unclear, an unduly costly exercise, and unenforceable.

## **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. Performance of Cheshire East Council on various matters** – there was discussion of the Spinks Lane situation and other cases where CE had not responded/were not responding appropriately to Parish Council's concerns. Cllr Hunter will convey these feelings further to senior management at CE. The Clerk is to draft an appropriate letter to CE.

**Clerk: Jack Steel**

**Next meeting: 7<sup>th</sup> November 2017**