

661
MINUTES of THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING
Held ONLINE

1st December 2020

PART A – PUBLIC AGENDA

1. ATTENDANCE

Present	AS (Chair), AB, PD, SF, SR, CT, Cllr K Parkinson (CEC)
Apologies	HS
Police	Nil
Public	14 members of the public for much of the meeting

2. MINUTES

2.1 Approval of Minutes The minutes of the meeting of 3 November 2020 were agreed.

2.2 Matters arising **2.2 – Matters arising** – the Clerk noted that no reply had been received from CEC to the Parish Council's letter about the Spinks Lane situation.

2.2 – Reopening of Village Hall – the Clerk noted that through the work of Cllr Bold, the Hall was now prepared for opening when this was possible to achieve. However the Clerk had written to the groups who previously hired the Hall to ask if they were minded to return, and each group said that they did not envisage doing so until at least the New Year.

8.2 – HS2 – the Clerk noted that he had written to HS2, but without response so far on the questions raised.

3. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS CT declared a personal interest in planning application 20/5114M in that both he and the applicants for this proposal are directors of the company that manages the open spaces on the Merehaven Close development.

4. PUBLIC FORUM

4.1 Public Forum No public forum communications had been received.

4.2 Report from PCSO The PCSO had communicated to say that no crimes had been reported in Pickmere in the past month. She had made reference to the Police seeking to organise a dialogue with relevant parties to discuss how the problems experienced in the village last summer could be mitigated this coming summer. The Clerk confirmed that he had responded to say that the Parish Council would be keen to take part in any such discussion.

5. REPORT FROM CLLR K PARKINSON The following matters were discussed:

- Cllr Parkinson stated that she had been liaising with relevant CEC officers to locate the long-established s106 agreement, which also involves CWAC, that governed the access to and use of Pickmere Lake by boats accessing the lake from several of the private ownerships on its

shore. She confirmed that the agreement remains in force. She has requested that a copy of the agreement be sent to the Clerk.

- Spinks Lane – Cllr Parkinson has sought information from senior politicians at CE about the absence of a response to the Council’s letter, but her comments appeared to indicate a misunderstanding of the long history and the current situation regarding the Spinks Lane land. Reference was made in the discussion to the Mobberley Lane situation, where it appeared that CEC had taken very prompt and decisive action. The Chair indicated that what the Parish Council was seeking at this stage was a response to his letter of early October to the Cabinet Member (Communities).
- Yellow lines in the village – Cllr Parkinson has reinforced the Parish Council’s request that the repainting of existing faded lines in the village be pursued. As to the possibility of extending parking restrictions, she made reference to officers at CEC possibly looking at designing a scheme. The Clerk referred to a discussion that had already been held with officers on this issue (in the context of this summer’s parking problems), and emphasised on behalf of the Parish Council that what it sought was to agree informally an initial draft scheme with officers at CEC, on which CEC could then go forward to carry out the various public consultation processes that would be required. What would not be sensible was for CEC to come up with a draft scheme on its own to which the Parish Council would have to object when the formal consultation processes were undertaken.

6. FINANCE

6.1 Current financial position The monthly financial summary was noted.

6.2 New payments The schedule of new payments was agreed.

6.3 Budget and Precept for 2021-22 Following discussion, the draft budget which had been circulated (Appx 1 to the Budget report) was unanimously agreed. Members subsequently unanimously resolved to require a precept of £13650 for 2021-22, the same figure as has been required for the last several years.

A discussion followed about the Contingency sums and Earmarked funds elaborated in the report at Table 1 Column 3. Following a reminder to members that the sum of £9500 described as ‘*Review of assets and possible refurbishment/replacement of buildings including planning, architectural and legal costs*’ had been allocated by Council in recent years specifically in response to its intent to seek long term solutions to the issues presented by the age, layout and physical condition of the Village Hall and Pavilion, it was noted that expenditure of these sums is in the gift of the Parish Council and therefore it is open to the Council to spend such monies in other ways, including on seeking short term asset enhancements. Members also noted an observation that in applying for grant aid to support individual initiatives some expenditure of funds may be required. On this basis the schedule of Contingency items and Earmarked funds to be implemented alongside the budget, as identified in Table 1 of the report, was unanimously agreed.

Members gave consideration to the allocation of so-called ‘windfall’ moneys as identified in Table 2 to the report, and unanimously agreed that schedule.

7. PLANNING MATTERS

- 7.1 Planning application update** The schedule was noted. In respect of application 20/5114M (4 Merehaven Close) a member commented that the submitted plans did not give any indication of the layout of the proposed second floor. Members agreed that that comment should be submitted to CEC and in addition a reminder to CEC that any comments received from neighbours to the proposal should be taken into account.

A member asked when the footpath link through the development at the Elms, leading from Clover Drive through to Park Lane, was going to be reopened, since the development is now (finally) virtually complete. The Clerk was requested to query this with the Planning Department. In addition, the Clerk was asked to write to seek confirmation that Cheshire railings would be erected at the Park Lane development (opposite Frog Lane), as had been shown in the planning application.

7.2 Cheshire East Local Plan – Further draft Site Allocations and Development Policies Document

Council noted the report and agreed to the submission of various objections to the policy boundaries proposed in the draft plan document, as outlined in the report.

8. REPORTS FROM CLERK AND FROM COUNCILLORS

- 8.1 Asset maintenance priorities** After some discussion of this report and in particular the Table appended to it, including clarification that the prioritisation of items in columns 2-4 of the table were yet to be formally discussed and agreed, it was resolved that:

- The items listed in Column 1 of the report's Table (Priority 1 – Quoted) were to be pursued as soon as possible; and
- A working group of members will consider the remainder of the table, together with any other items that are brought forward, so as to maintain a schedule of potential asset maintenance items, and that the group will from time to time bring to Council recommendations for action/implementation.

- 8.2 Clover Drive Play Area** A member noted that while the play area is a village asset, it would be wise, if Council is considering fundamental action in relation to the future of the area, for consideration to be given not only to current usage of the area but to the possibility of accommodating other types of play which are not currently accommodated, for instance sensory play. Members resolved:

- That a scheme of substantial renovation and/or replacement of equipment (including benches etc) at the play area should be pursued further;
- That a working group of members seek potential financial contributions to add to the Council's available funding for such work, and establish a specification for renovation or replacement of equipment, for approval by Council.

- 8.3 Creation of a community garden** SF noted that, in considering various asset maintenance matters, it would be remiss to lose sight of the potential to introduce new elements to the life of the parish. One such idea is a community garden – that is a space that villagers could use and maintain to provide plants of all sorts, acting as a focus of community activity. The Clerk was asked to

introduce such a concept in the asset maintenance table discussed earlier in this meeting. Members noted the point and agreed to this possibility being taken further in the context of the working group referred to earlier.

8.4 Digital Mapping Service Council resolved to authorise the acquisition of and continuing subscription to the digital mapping package 'Parish on-line' at a cost of £70 (excl. VAT) per annum.

8.5 CEC Consultations – Transport and parking The report was noted, as was the ability for councillors or members of the public to take part in this consultation exercise as noted in the report, and explained on CEC's website.

PART B – PRIVATE AGENDA

The Council resolved that members of the public should be asked to leave the meeting at this point to enable discussion of confidential matters.

9. RECEIPT OF QUOTATIONS

9.1 Lakeside platform Authority was given to commission J Moore (Builder) to replace the current platform at the price indicated.

9.2 Erection of lighting Column – IROS parking spaces Authority was given to commission Barlows Electrical to erect a lighting column as described, at the price indicated, and that that company be thanked for their community support contribution to the cost of this item. Further, members resolved that on implementation of these works the black gates should be reopened.

9.3 Day rate Small scale maintenance work Council resolved:

- That this approach to commissioning work be adopted for a temporary period of 1 year, after which if retained it should be incorporated into the Council's Financial Regulations.
- That any job commissioned on the basis of this arrangement be limited to a maximum of 2 person-day's work or £500 excluding VAT, whichever is the greater, and that any such work shall only be commissioned and managed via the Clerk.
- That these offers of day rate help are noted for possible use in future.
- That an appropriate service level agreement be required in connection with any such commissioning.
- That the contractors concerned be requested to supply proof of their public liability cover.