

**MINUTES OF ORDINARY MEETING OF BUNBURY PARISH COUNCIL  
10 MARCH 2021**

**This was a remote meeting.** *Councillors and the Parish Clerk participated from their homes by joining a virtual zoom call. Members of the public were able to observe the meeting and participate in the Local Forum*

**PRESENT:** Councillors M Ireland-Jones, Chairman, P Brookfield Vice Chair  
Councillors, N Parker, M Thomas, G Griffith, and L Gregory

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Marilyn Houston, Clerk to the Parish Council, members of the public, Sue Briggs-Harris(Press) and CE Cllr S Pochin.

**OPEN FORUM**

**Isobel Noonan spoke on behalf of** a number of residents who are concerned by a potential new planning application on one of the fields on land West of Bunbury Lane that had a planning appeal dismissed in October 2016. She read out the text of an email she had sent to the parish clerk. " I was involved in that Appeal as was Ron, Nick and Andrew Thomson on behalf of the PC. The field in question is behind Parkside Bungalow and runs directly along the back of the houses on Bunbury Lane. It was one of the fields that formed a larger site application for 52 houses that was originally refused by Cheshire East in 2015. Part of the reasoning for dismissal of the Appeal was that the 'development would detract from the spacious and rural character of the area when approaching Bunbury village along its southern gateway. The proposed development would also be visible in the gaps between dwellings that form the linear development on Bunbury Lane leading towards the village centre. This would detract from the spacious pattern of development that contributes to the rural character of the Lane. The Appeal proposal would therefore be significantly harmful to the rural character of Bunbury in this respect. 'Furthermore, the edge of the proposed development runs alongside the Oak Garden development built in 2010 which in turn will abut with the now approved further Oak Garden development in the field on the other side thus co-locating three developments together in the Neighbourhood Plan period. It appears that an application for 15 houses will be forthcoming with access from knocking the bungalow down. Should a planning application be submitted the number of houses already built or approved in Bunbury may be something residents ask the Parish Council to consider. As you know Policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that planning permission will be granted for a minimum of 80 houses to be built in Bunbury in the period from April 2010 to March 2030. The PC has also received information about the Cheshire East Local Plan, Site Allocations and Development policies recommending 105 houses for Bunbury and that Bunbury already has **107** houses built or proposed. I should point out that 45 of these are all in close proximity on Bunbury Lane, hence further concern from residents along Bunbury Lane. No formal application has been made at this stage, but the landowner has confirmed that he is in the process of putting one in."

Cllr Ireland- Jones explained that the PC cannot speculate but if it comes to the PC as an application to comment on the PC will discuss it and if it is a large development could decide to have an extra ordinary meeting.

A Resident asked the PC to contact Duchy Homes and explained the incidents that were causing a nuisance. These had been mentioned in an email to the PC and included – 10 wagons parked on a narrow part of the lane for 4 to 5 hours, unloading heavy plant and machinery in the layby next to the elderly people's houses, constant noise, stench of diesel, unloading and the too early start times, they should not be before 8am. The resident had previously claimed against another developer due to problems of no foundations in such an old property, damage was caused by hydraulics and pumping out of spring water Residents don't want to lose the character of this heritage area. Also, the road is being left in a mess and with loose chippings.

Another resident pointed out that locals have had years of disturbance by developers and have had enough. Delivery lorries are coming via School Lane which they are not supposed to. Cllr Thomas had seen these. Cllr Brookfield added that the problem with delivery lorries arose before and signs were put up. It would be appropriate to correct the wording on the signs.

Cllr Pochin felt it was important to approach the developers first. Cllr Ireland-Jones will send the email detailing complaints onto Cllr Pochin and they will take this up with the developer.

A resident of School Lane spoke on behalf of residents who have objected to planning application 21/0344N Trigfa, School Lane. He explained their objections as detailed in their responses on the CE planning website. The Chair said that the PC will note these comments and refer back to them when discussing this application later on the agenda.

The Chair of Bunbury Tennis Club had sent emails via the clerk regarding small business grants so was following that up and asked is there any timescale for information on whether the grant received by the playing fields would be shared with them and with other sport clubs.

The LTA had confirmed that grants were not available direct, and Cllr Pochin confirmed that a second grant should be available to the Playing Fields. Cllr Ireland-Jones said the PC was aware of this but was not sure if funds can be given out to others. The LTA had informed the tennis club that some other clubs have received these funds. The playing fields are looking into this. The PC will get back to the tennis club.

Sue Briggs Harris said that some of the parents, whose children play football regularly, say they have seen people exercising their dogs on the playing fields and despite telling them they are not allowed, they don't leave. Sue is keen to do a bigger story in next month's edition of "The Paper" about the problem and how the council can enforce the ban on dogs. There are obviously those very clear signs but what powers do you have etc? Do you want people to start taking pictures etc?

Cllr Ireland-Jones confirmed that indeed the PC as the landowner can ask the police to enforce a fixed notice penalty. There is a risk in asking the public to approach other members of the public, so the PC does not want to do that. The PC will continue to liaise with the police and would be grateful for information in The Paper that encourages dog owners acting responsibly.

Sue Briggs Harris also asked about the bins on the playing fields. Could they be replaced with bigger bins? This was to be covered in the agenda.

#### 10.03.01 APOLOGIES

Cllr, L Potter and L Davies. Cllr G Melia would join as soon as he was available.

#### 10.03.02 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST/REQUEST FOR DISPENSATION

Members were invited to declare any personal interest (non-pecuniary) or disclosable pecuniary interest which they had in any item of business on the agenda, the nature of that interest, and in respect of disclosable interests, to leave the meeting prior to the discussion of that item.

None

#### 10.03.03 MINUTES

##### (PARISH COUNCIL ORDINARY MEETING ON 10 FEBRUARY)

The Chairman asked all Members if they accepted the minutes.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting on 10 February A hard copy will be signed by the Chairman at a future date when safe to do so.

#### 10.03.04 BOROUGH COUNCILLOR'S REPORT – Cllr Pochin had emailed a lengthy report with items of general interest to all Ward PC's which had been circulated to councillors.

In response to the residents' concerns regarding the speculation on a development she responded that any developments have to come through the Planning process. Bunbury has a robust Neighbourhood Plan and a good level of housing supply so is in a good place to rebut further housing.

Cllr Pochin had met with Carter Lister the new developers for a new development outside the surgery. They are going to submit new plans and house numbers are going down She just listened with the Chairman and he made some references to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Cllr Griffith asked why the road sweeper had only done one side of Bunbury Lane as the other is dirty. Cllr Pochin will check and will send an email to the Clerk.

Cllr Pochin left Cllr Melia joined the meeting.

#### 10.03.05 PARISH COUNCILLORS' REPORTS

The Chairman invited Members to give a brief report on any matters they were aware of, not covered by the agenda. He read out a report from Cllr Potter At long last Brantwood the house

in the middle of the village is being renovated. Tilly's are now offering take away food. The Vicar and Beth have organised an act of kindness for Lent and villagers are producing some fantastic, decorated Easter eggs on display outside their homes.

Cllr Brookfield reported that there had been no communication with police. The responses from the Cheshire East area to the Chalc speeding survey were mostly that this was a high issue and other issues were potholes, gullies, parking, footpath repairs and in addition, anti-social behaviour, litter, dog fouling and the lack of provision of youth facilities.

Cllr Parker reported that he had a phone call with the Lengthsman regarding the state of bins on Playing Fields and will be meeting with him and Cllr Ireland-Jones to look at replacing them.

The two Euro bins in the car park now seem ok since Cllrs Ireland-Jones and Brookfield helped with signs.

## 10.03.06 PLANNING MATTERS

### 10.03.06.1 Planning applications, reserved matters and discharge of conditions applications received from Cheshire East since last meeting.

The comments from the public on the website and in the local forum had been noted.

#### **RESOLVED:**

Bunbury Parish Council objects to the application having noted the large number of objections from residents and being in agreement with the comments made.

In particular the Parish Council agrees with comments made by the resident at Hopwood House that "Scale and Size The proposed development is totally disproportionate in terms of size and scale. The proposed development fills the plot, its size is out of proportion to the other properties in School Lane and contrary to the guidance published by the government on 9 June 2010 to protect gardens and remove the classification of gardens as 'Brownfield' sites. The scale and size of the proposed development also conflicts with the Bunbury Village Design Statement and the Bunbury Neighbourhood Plan. Appearance The houses in School Lane are mostly a mix of Victorian cottages, Edwardian Villas. The proposed development is completely out of character with these existing properties and is more suited to a suburban estate. Height of the Proposed Design. The three storey design that has been submitted is not in keeping with the style of housing in School Lane. The Bunbury Village Design Statement indicates that any new, three storey development would be out of character and should be avoided\*.

Also the Parish Council is in particular agreement with the resident of 9 Willow Drive that "My concerns relate to the size of this dwelling would be totally out of scale and character with the adjoining properties and the other dwellings along School Lane which in the main is characterised by cottage type development. The scale of the proposal is suburban and totally out of character and larger than most of the properties in the village. The applicants are proposing to erect a 3 storey 5 bed roomed house on the site of a single garage between an existing semi-detached cottage and a recently built 4 bed two storey dwelling. It would be extremely obtrusive, cramped and highly visible, overshadowing and dominating the properties on each side. The proposed scale and design of the new house has no regard to the street scene along School Lane or the adjoining properties. The application as submitted totally ignores the guidance contained in the Village Design Statement, the community feedback received in response to the neighbourhood plan - 'to encourage sensitive development which protects and enriches the landscape, character and built setting of the village' and, the guidance set out in the Cheshire East Design Guide. Paragraph 130 in the NPPF states; Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development. Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used). It is quite clear that the scale and design proposed does not 'improve the character and quality of the area and it clearly does not take account of any local design guidance, planning policy or design clues from adjoining dwellings. The proposal as submitted is also contrary to Policy SE1 in the Local Plan Strategy which states that development proposals should make a positive contribution to their surroundings in terms of sense of place; Managing design quality and; sustainable urban, architectural and landscape design. This proposal fails on all counts and should therefore be

refused as it does not meet the requirements of this Local Plan Policy. The proposal is also contrary to Policy GEN1 in the emerging Sites Allocation Development Plan Document which will require development proposals to 'contribute positively to the borough's quality of place and local identity through appropriate character, appearance and form in terms of scale, height, density, layout, grouping, urban form, siting, good architecture, massing and materials. Development that fails to take the opportunity to support the quality of place of the local area will be resisted. This proposal clearly fails this policy test and should therefore be resisted. . The Government recently published National Design Guidance which makes clear that creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. The guide refers to 10 characteristics including context (enhances the surroundings); identity (attractive and distinctive); built form (a coherent pattern of development); as well as movement, nature, public spaces, uses, homes and buildings; resources and life-span. It is my submission that this proposal has no regard to the context of the site, its surroundings and the existing built form of development. The Building Better Building Beautiful Commission published its report in January 2020 and had 3 primary aims; 1. To promote better design and style of homes, villages, towns and high streets, to reflect what communities want, building on the knowledge and tradition of what they know works for their area. 2. To explore how new settlements can be developed with greater community consent. 3. To make the planning system work in support of better design and style, not against it. It is quite clear from the plans submitted and the absence of street scenes and sections through the site, that the proposed scale and design of the dwelling does not promote better design, reflect what either local residents or the Parish Council want and the application as submitted is out of scale and character with the adjoining properties and the surrounding area. It is an urban development in a rural setting totally out of character with anything else in the village and contrary to national and local design guidance. Significantly, on the 17th February 2021 Housing Secretary Robert Jenrick said 'The Government supports enabling communities to set their own rules for what development in their areas should look like, ensuring that they reflect and enhance their surroundings and preserve our local heritage'. This proposal does neither."

**10.03.06.2 Decisions made by Cheshire East Council – For information only.**

**20/4897N 05/11/2020**

**Decision : approved with conditions Decision Date : 16/02/2021**

**Location : 26, The Highlands, Bunbury, CW6 9NT**

**Proposal Proposed rear dormer to existing first floor Proposed first floor front gable end extension Proposed side/ rear first floor extension**

#### **10.03.06.3 New Housing Development- Update**

Cllr Ireland-Jones had met with the developers of the proposed development behind the Church and at the new surgery. They are taking on the affordable housing. Cllr Ireland -Jones listened and referred them to the Neighbourhood Plan. The hedge is being cut down to put in access. Brantwood – Cllr Brookfield spoke to the foreman. The hedge taken out opposite the butchers to continue building but will be replaced.

### **10.03.07. PLAYING FIELDS**

#### **10.03.07.01 General update from Cllr Parker**

Cllr Parkert reported that Andy Fairclough has fixed the stonework in the play area and can remove the old bins

Further to what was said about dogs on the playing fields in the open forum, there was further discussion about campaigning to raise awareness.

**10.03.07.02 Any other matters –** Cllr Ireland-Jones had spoken to Dave Evans re LED lights for the bowling green. He has now had £8,0000 quote. It was suggested to put to one side for the moment till the Pavilion plans are progressed further.

**10.03.08. Consultations Cheshire East -**To consider responding to any consultations on the CE website. Nothing of importance to consider.

**10.03.09. Local Policing Issues –** To receive an update from local police if available. None were present.

**10.03.10. Village Maintenance team – update**

Cllr Ireland -Jones had nothing to report apart from the purchase of equipment that is detailed on the agenda in finance.

**10.03.11. Seasonal Events – to receive information on events.**

Village Day met last week and is now scheduled for 26 June when there should be no restrictions under the government pathway so plans to be made as usual and will have contingency plans and comply with the law.

**10.03.12. Correspondence – To respond to correspondence received.**

The Clerk confirmed that all items had been covered.

**10.03.13. The Future of the Pavilion Project – to receive an update.**

There is nothing to report until the full feedback is received from the article in The Paper. There have been twenty email responses received so far.

**RESOLVED:** To proceed to the next stage and put a team together.

**10.03.14. Casual vacancy – To confirm the arrangement for recruiting to a vacancy.**

A notice will be prepared and posted on the website. Subject to the notice period having completed without a call for an election, applications from candidates seeking co-option will be considered.

**10.03.15. Finance Matters:****10.02.15.1 Approval of payments: -****10.03.15.1.1 To approve payment of invoices received.**

No invoices received.

**10.03.15.1.2 Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses.**

Mark Ireland-Jones for purchasing wheelbarrow (£79.96) and shovel (£18.17) = Total £98.13 for use by Duke of Edinburgh award student to top up bark on play area. Receipts received.

**RESOLVED** to approve.

M Houston, Clerk Expenses Oct 2020 to March 2021. The Claim for one return journey to collect paperwork had been circulated.

**RESOLVED** approved.

**10.03.15.2 Proposal to improve budget/finance reports****To note information circulated to Members on current finance procedures.**

Had been circulated to Members and comments invited.

**RESOLVED:** Noted

**To receive a report from the Clerk on accounting software/spreadsheets that could be used to produce monthly reports.**

**RESOLVED:** to use an improved excel spreadsheet and review in September .

**10.03.15.3 Annual Review of PC Risk assessment**

Had been circulated.

**RESOLVED:** Approved and will review again in May.

**PART 2. Public and Press to be excluded.****10.03.16.1 Annual Maintenance Contract – to decide which of the three quotations to approve.**

**RESOLVED** To appoint Andy Fairclough, a sole trader as the contactor for financial year 2021/22. To review annually

..... Chairman