

MINUTES OF MEETING OF PRESTBURY PARISH COUNCIL

AT PRESTBURY VILLAGE HALL

Tuesday 11th October 2018 at 8.30pm

Present: Councillors: L. Burns , G. Clewley, A. Dicken, V. Herbert (minute taker), T. Jackson, M. Leather, J. Martin (chairman), , K. Miles, K. Podmore, Cheshire East Councillor P. Findlow

Item		
	Meeting opened at 8.45 pm.	
105	Apologies for absence	
	D. Foden, J.Hallowell, S. Kirk	
106	Declarations of interest	
	nil	
107	Public participation	
	30 members of the public were present to discuss the Cheshire East Local Plan	
108	Cheshire East Local Plan	
	<p>Cllr Burns gave a short introduction to what has been proposed in the draft consultation including comments that vehicular and pedestrian access issues to the Prestbury Lane sites are now acknowledged and that the junction with London Road has the worst accident rate in Prestbury. The fact that there is no direct access to the Castle Hill site from Castle Hill has meant that this site will now have to be reconsidered. The closing date for comments on this consultation to Cheshire East is 22nd October 2018. "Not in my back yard" comments would not be appropriate as Prestbury is one of the 13 service centres. Members of the public were asked to copy Prestbury Parish Council in responses. The next consultation of a revised plan will be in 2019.</p> <p>The following questions/ comments were raised by members of the public Responses/ comments from councillors are indented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the timescale and what will happen at the end of 2019? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There will be one more public consultation mid 2019 with completion 1Q2020. No-one can make developers build • When were pieces of land made available and would compulsory purchase be involved to give access to Castle Hill? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Call for sites finished in 2017 ○ The site off Castle Hill may be excluded or access considerations may be solved ○ Not aware of any compulsory purchase considerations • What kinds of objections have been upheld in the past? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cheshire East have recognised that people and vehicular access is important. This is the first local plan that Cheshire East has produced (previously Macclesfield Borough Council had done so). Comparison with the density of adjoining properties would be appropriate 	

- No obvious place for a footpath between Meadow Drive and Prestbury Lane
- Do Cheshire East have knowledge of the land e.g. flooding issues at the bottom of Meadow Drive (no.47) especially since the Tytherington mains was incorporated?
 - FD40 on the website gives a traffic light system
 - Red = no mitigation
 - Amber = mitigation possible
 - Green = no issues
 - You can respond – “this is what you say, this is what we say”
 - The junction of Prestbury Lane and the A523 is the main accident spot
 - Landscape, greenbelt, quality of life and wildlife impact can all be used in arguments
- Isolated from the village; how would development at Prestbury Lane benefit the village? Comments could be made about disabled accessibility, the fact that the snicket is almost vertical at one point and that there is no access to public transport
 - The green belt is divided into parcels viz. makes a major contribution, a significant contribution, a contribution, no contribution. In Cheshire East there are no parcels of land, which make no contribution. Those that only make a contribution were therefore looked at first.
- Crossing Heybridge Lane is an issue
- Potentially there would be a further 100 cars per morning and evening plus the extra cars linked to the Kings School relocation
 - The Kings School has planning approval. Traffic is a planning issue and doesn't mean that they have necessarily followed through the additional impact
- Which sites were dismissed?
 - FD 40 will tell you
- Looks as though people looked at a map and backfilled
- Are there any landbanks in Prestbury?
 - We don't know necessarily
- What about affordable housing?
 - A percentage has to be affordable but doesn't apply if small numbers are involved and can be offset
- Re the Castle Hill site – how can the boundary be ignored?
- Won't necessarily be low density housing at Castle Hill; Castle Hill could become greater density housing than the surrounding area
 - 20 = a guide; we don't think it would be more
- How can we get a louder voice than sending an e mail?
 - Cheshire East have to read all comments received
- Would we put forward a different site(s)?
 - We will be surprised if the second draft looks the same as the first
- Is greenbelt an argument?
 - All remaining sites are greenbelt and therefore they have put forward those sites which only make a contribution but can still be challenged
- Can the Rugby Club site be readdressed because it would solve

	<p>the issue and the impact on traffic would not be too great?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Decision on the recent planning application was that building here would join Macclesfield to Prestbury which is not desirable – this could be appealed or an alternative application brought forward but that is a matter for Macclesfield Rugby Club ● Have all sites been visited? <p>Members of the public left. Borough Councillor Findlow remained. (Two members of the public had left before the end of this session)</p>	
109	To approve the minutes of last meeting on 11th September 2018	
	<p>The minutes was accepted with the following corrections Item 99 Councillor misspelt Item 104 – the first line should read Dissatisfaction.....will be made known. Proposed (with typos agreed) by Cllr. Burns Seconded by Cllr Miles 8 in favour, 1 abstention.</p>	
110	Accounts for payment and financial matters	
	<p>Cllr Podmore explained the following monthly expenditure items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Virgin media contract runs out on 20th October 2018. ● Two adverts were placed for the Parish Clerk – Fish4.co.uk – the Macclesfield Express ● The VAT reclaim up until last year has been received (approx. £5K) <p>Cllr. Herbert proposed acceptance of the accounts Seconded by Cllr. Clewley All in favour.</p> <p>5.1 Precept recommendations Cllr Podmore has to receive all proposals by 31st October 2018</p> <p>5.2. Insurance renewal Quotes from another broker will be obtained for next year because of the poor performance of Came & Co this year</p>	All
111	Submission of the external audit report	
	<p>The report has now been published and was put before the Parish Council. No questions were raised in the report. The noncompliance of risks is now clear</p>	
112	To receive the report from the Planning Committee meetings on 12th September and 3rd October	
	<p>Both reports were headed 3rd October. The report, which included Fairways, should be headed 12th September. This will be corrected</p> <p>Lilac Cottage – concern was expressed by one councillor that the Parish Council was not supporting local businesses – the proposed development at the back should have been discussed with the conservation officer</p> <p>Yew Tree Barns was called in but was rejected because it was out of time. Borough Councillor Findlow was asked if he could advise Prestbury Parish Council when planning applications were being called in. However he doesn't know in advance of the agenda being published – this is available on line one week before the meetings and the dates of the meetings are known one year in advance so the Parish Council can obtain</p>	JM

	this information directly if it so desires	
113	Applicability of Application for Article 4 (Conservation)	
	<p>This covers door frames, window frames, colours etc and would have helped with respect to e.g. The Tiffin Kitchen colour. It is however an involved process to undertake.</p> <p>Agreed that the conservation officer, Mr Ramshall, should be asked to attend a Parish Council meeting (preferably in November) to tell the Parish Council about Article 4</p>	ML
114	Christmas lights 2018	
	<p>Agreement was sought to start replacing the 2012 lights, which are coming to the end of their life, in addition consideration given towards the lighting of a permanent tree at the roundabout and adorning the lampposts with wrap around lights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Festoon Lights: The original purchase came with an advertised life span of five years. The Council acknowledge that this is advisory with the lights having been well cared for and stored indoors when not in use, it was proposed the purchase of an additional string would provide a contingency should one fail. It was noted that there is a significant lead time for purchase so failure during use or installation could not be able to be addressed that season. In the interim, the additional set could be used to add further light to New Road. Estimated Cost: £3,360 + VAT • Lights on the pine tree by the sundial: It has previously been noted that there is a large living pine tree at the head of the village. Decoration of such could replace the need to purchase, install, light, and dispose of a temporary Christmas Tree at the Parrott's Field location. This would offer long term savings in addition to an environment benefit while still providing the Village with a traditional Pine Christmas Tree. Estimated Cost: £2,600 + VAT • Lights on the lampposts: Costs were provided for the ability to wrap the lampposts through the village in lights. Permission would be required from Cheshire East and each lamppost would need to have a dedicated socket fitted although four do currently have such. Estimated Cost: £3,200 + VAT <p>It was noted that against the budget there was approximately £6,000 remaining to spend on upgrades this financial year as agreed upon the setting of the 2017/18 Precept. Cllr Martin noted therefore that only two of the three options could be afforded and that there may well be an overspend versus the budget once increased installation costs had been accounted for. The consensus was that there was sufficient money in reserve to fund any reasonable additional installation costs and that without permission from Cheshire East for the lampposts the solution was to pursue the Festoon and Tree lights.</p> <p>Proposal: To grant Cllr Leather authority to purchase the Festoon Lights, Tree Lights, and additional ancillary equipment required for installation. Proposed by Cllr Martin Seconded by Cllr Podmore All in favour</p> <p>Cllr Leather advised that the lights would be installed and switched on the 28th and 29th November, weather dependent.</p>	<p>ML</p> <p>ML</p>

	Proposed by Cllr Dicken Seconded by Cllr Herbert All in favour	
115	Adoption of the Telephone Box	
	The telephone box will be glazed and will then be sold to Prestbury Parish Council for £1 Proposed by Cllr Martin Seconded by Cllr Miles All in favour	JM
116	Poynton Area Community Partnership	
	Again Poynton Area Community Partnership has said that they would like Prestbury Parish Council to be involved. The opinion of Prestbury Parish Council has not changed that the group is not effective and it is therefore not worth spending time on it. Cllr Dicken will respond leaving future membership open	AD
117	Exclusion of Press and Public	
	It was proposed that the press and public were excluded from the next discussion. All in favour. Borough Councillor Paul Findlow left the meeting at this point	VH
118	Correspondence	
	Confidential items of concern to the Parish Council were discussed. This is minuted in Appendix A06/18. Upon conclusion the meeting was reopened to the public.	
119	Part 2 of the Cheshire East plan	
	Cllr Martin summarized the meeting with Cheshire East Planners attended by Cllrs Martin, Burns, Clewley, Herbert, Leather on 4 th October 2018. Cheshire East are of the opinion at this time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prestbury's allocation is not going away on grounds of sustainability • The methodology is not set in stone and there is an acknowledgement of the changing national landscape however it was felt that it was better for the plan to proceed on agreed build numbers with the potential to decrease later. • Every site in the north of Cheshire East is losing greenbelt • Castle Hill and Prestbury Lane x 2 are the three sites on the table at the moment. The land by the cricket club is not greenbelt but there are inaccuracies with respect to access at this site. The boundaries were provided by the developer and are acknowledged by Cheshire East to be incorrect • Additional sites have come forward post the closure of the 'call for sites' exercise and may be included in future drafts. <p>The following were discussed to be included in an appropriate response from Prestbury Parish Council. Cllr Martin will write this response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Safe pedestrian access and adequate road access are required ○ Traffic flow is important and insufficiently developed in the draft documentation ○ Road traffic accidents eg at the junction of Prestbury Lane and the A523 should be taken into account and more details as to mitigation proposed should be provided to allow for evaluation ○ Ease of access to public transport is important ○ Landscape and environmental implications should be minimized 	JM

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ It was not felt appropriate to comment on the potential value of other sites with the universe unknown and thus evaluation impossible <p>The response is public and will be available on the appropriate Cheshire East portal but it will also be published on the Parish Council website.</p>	
	<p>The meeting concluded at 11.15 p.m.</p>	