



Goostrey Parish Council

**The Village Hall
Goostrey
Cheshire
CW4 8PE**

01477 535825/07834 230351

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL

HELD ON TUESDAY, 8th APRIL 2014 at 7.30pm IN THE VILLAGE HALL

Present: Cllrs. M^cCubbin (Chairman) (CM^cC), Caulkin (CC), Collins (SC), Craggs (DC), Fagan (VF), Godfrey (PG), Leake (ML), Lenihan (GL), Rathbone (TR), & Salmon (GS)

In attendance: Cheshire East Cllr. Andrew Kolker (AK)
Sharon Jones, Clerk to the Council
11 Members of the Public

04.14.1. Declaration of Interests

None declared.

04.14.2. Apologies for absence

None.

04.14.3. Approval of the minutes

Resolved: The Minutes of the Meeting of 11th March 2014 were accepted as a true record of the meeting.

04.14.4. Cheshire East Matters:

Cllr Kolker mentioned that 11th May will be the grand opening of Dane Meadow Project. It will be a public event and is well worth going to find out what the project is delivering to enhance the valley on Holmes Chapel side. The campaign against the development at Saltersford Corner, Holmes Chapel has been led by two school children who have done an excellent job. At the public meeting in the Victoria Club, the 5 year supply of housing will be reason for refusal. Guidance notes in the NPPF, say that homes for elderly etc are eligible for inclusion into the housing numbers this was not previously known so housing numbers are higher than thought.

04.14.5. Committee Matters:

Finance Committee Meeting

GS has completed a tick back of cheques and paying in book against the bank statements, the internal auditor will complete the audit in May. The audit form can then be approved by the Parish Council and sent to the external auditor. GS ran through the unaudited accounts. He commented that Village Hall lettings were up £500 on last year, Village Hall expenses which include 2012/13 recharge of £13,250.01, were also up. GS further reported that there were a few items to be removed from the asset register ie the tv & dvd as they were no longer required. The

Finance Committee has also agreed to depreciate assets by 33.33% rather than the current rate of 20%. Risk assessment – GS mentioned that this was drawn up years ago, and that it had been agreed by the Finance Committee for this year, but would need to be re investigated this year.

CMcC is booked onto H&S course in May.

PG mentioned that he will attend a meeting with local parishes to discuss sharing a PCSO. PG to report back to the PC. TR requested that the terminology in the annual accounts is changed so that specific reserves becomes accruals, and then keep the terminology for free reserves. Resolved: The PC resolved to approve the accounts for 2013/14.

Amenities Committee

SC reported that at the meeting on 2nd April the Amenities committee decided that for the showing of “War Horse” on 9th May, the doors and bar will open at 6.45pm, and the will film start at 7.30pm, with an interval of half an hour. People can bring own sweets etc but bar will be provided, there will be the forms to order drinks for interval. Posters advertising the film will go up on the Village Notice Board and tickets will be on sale at Mrs Kettle’s, and the Trading Post. There will also be an item in the PC Newsletter which will go out next week. Tickets £5 adults, and £3 children, children under 12 must be accompanied. Children 15yrs and under will qualify for a child ticket.

Rose day – SC said that the whole of gazebo will be dedicated to the Parish Council this year and that the committee were currently discussing ways of make stall more interesting. GL niece, who is a presenter on the Milk Shake childrens’ TV show, will hopefully be able to attend. The Committee are also looking at competitions, such as a free draw, and a game where children can put their house on a map of the Goostrey and surrounding villages. VF suggested a lottery/raffle, suggesting it be called the big Goostrey Raffle, and ask local businesses/people to donate prizes – CMcC said that this should be discussed at the Amenities meeting on 22nd April. CC would be invited to that meeting to discuss the arrangements for the bar at the film show.

04.14.6. Planning Matters:

29th March & 8th April

14/0971C	38 Brooklands Drive – Object as the garage is too near to the neighbouring property
14/1048C	156 Main Road – No objections
14/1115C	41 Booth Bed Lane – reapplication, PC happy with this version, no objections
14/1300C	The Grain Store, Bridge Lane – Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This development is not included in the 5 year supply of housing land. • The development is unsustainable • The means of access is unsound • The development is near to Jodrell Bank Observatory and may cause interference with the telescope
14/1555C	55 Station Road – No objections
14/1578C	28 Meadow Avenue – Site visit made. No objections
14/1265C	119 Main Road – No objections
14/1077C	21B Station Road – Resubmission after construction, DC has written to CEC Planning and requested that the applicant resupply the drawings with accurate sizes as ridgeline is higher than indicated on the application.
14/0535C	120 Main Road – Object – the new application is larger than the original which the PC deemed to be too large and out of character with its location.

04.14.7. Financial Payments

Resolved: To accept Payment Schedule 04/14.

04.14.8. Clerk's Report

Actions from the last meeting

- a. Clerk to report the broken gate (the Goose Gate) at the Play Area on Booth Bed Lane to CEC.
- b. Clerk to ask PCSO what can be done about the Silver car parked outside the bungalow on the grass verge on Main Road, near Bank View
- c. Clerk to notify BT that the PC does not want to adopt the phone box on Booth Bed Lane.
- d. Clerk to ask CEC to empty dog bin on Wood Lane.
- e. Clerk to check if we still receive the Chalc publication.

Correspondence Received

- a. Letter from Fiona Bruce MP re: NPPF
- b. Manchester Airport re: taxiway reconstruction programme
- c. Cheshire Community Action – Annual Subscription
- d. CEC – Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version - Formal Representation Period 14th March to 25th March 2014.
- e. Chalc Affiliation renewal
- f. COBLEY, Julian RE: Superfast Broadband - Goostrey RequirementsSTUBBS, Peter RE: Direct Billing Mon 16:20 51 KB
- g. Malcolm Iliff Fwd: Business Advertising on Goostrey Village Website
- h. LAWSON, Alan FW: Cheshire East Council Cabinet report re local area working
- i. KELLY, Andrew RE: The Bog Bean, Goostrey
- j. BATEMAN, StuartFW: Goostrey Station Bridge
- k. Fran Langham Local Government Forum - Hear from Brandon Lewis MP
- l. Kerrie Snowdon RE: Parking on Grass Verges in
- m. JONES, Joanne (Property) RE: Gate to the Play Area on Booth Bed Lane Goostrey
- n. Rebecca Kennington RE: Internal Audit
- o. Martin Brown Hermitage Lane Planning Application 14/0081C
- p. COOPER, Lynsey Town & Parish Council Conference 1st May 2014.
- q. Roger Dyke Re: Newsletter deadline
- r. Nicola Clarke, Clerk HC, SIDS
- s. Protect Congleton Planning application 13/3764C 104 houses off Waggs Road Appealed
- t. GRIFFIES, Caroline RE: CEC Policy on Emptying Dog bins
- u. RandMbennett@aol.com Re: WW1 Exhibition
- v. Big Lottery Fund How can we help you?
- w. BEDFORD, KarenRE: Town & Parish Council Registration of Interests
- x. Jane Stubbs Re;Survey form used at recent Public Consultation
- y. Martin Brown RE: Planning Application 14/0081C - Land to the East of Hermitage Lane, Goostrey
- z. Roger Dyke Re: Hedges endangering pedestrians
- aa. Martin Brown Planning Application 14/0081C - Land to the East of Hermitage Lane,
- bb. M de kretser Re: Hermitage Lane Planning Application
- cc. LAWSON, Alan FW: The Prince's Countryside Fund Reopens to Applications (UK)
- dd. Martin Brown Hermitage Lane Planning Application
- ee. Hazel Merrill POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER CONSULTATION MEETING WITH PARISH COUNCILS IN CHESHIRE EAST
- ff. Grice Dean (Holmes Chapel Health Centre) RE: Annual Parish Meeting 29th April 2014

gg. Burgess Hazel (NHS EASTERN CHESHIRE CCG) FW: Goostrey Annual Parish meeting 29th April 2014

hh. Linda Simpson Fwd: Housing in Goostrey

ii. Hazel Merrill Congleton Area Meeting
COOPER, Lynsey Town & Parish Council Conference 2014

04.14.9. Highways Matters

Station Bridge – CEC highways have sent a proposal for traffic lights and a footway. We are awaiting confirmation that this work has been approved by CEC and if so when will it be carried out.

04.14.10. Speed Reduction Measures

SDU's working now, move one unit to New Platt lane next month. New Speed gun session, Chair suggested school might be interested to participate. ML to contact the school. ML has sent has provided requested information to HC Parish Clerk.

04.14.11. Newsletter

Clerk has articles from the Footpaths Group, an advert for "War Horse" Film, and War Exhibition. **Action:** Clerk to ask Christina Burgess from the Archive Group, for an article and PG to write on the Local Plan.

04.14.12. The War memorial

RBL & Church have had a survey done on the war memorial and have applied for a grant to complete the work. The cheapest quote for cleaning and minor repair quote is £743. If grant is refused will PC contribute to the costs? Check to see if it is on PC list of responsibilities. PC decided to wait to find out if the grant is approved.

04.14.13. FOGS

CC attended a recent partnership meeting. FOGS is currently renovating the Manchester bank. He indicated there would be a lot of nice things happening in the near future. The water supply is still an issue, and is holding up other activities. CC has spoken to a National Rail representative to expedite the supply.

CC has also asked for more clarity regarding the regularity of trains stopping at Goostrey.

04.14.14. Goostrey Archive Group

GL had attending a meeting in April. The Archive Group has received the gift of photocopier which will be installed at the Blackden Trust. Interviews are going ahead for the oral histories and anyone can make an appointment to tour the Blackden Trust, on Wednesdays. The AGM is on 19th May in the Crown.

04.14.15. Youth Facilites Update

The Chair asked for debate on TR report, with a view to come back in May with resolutions for the PC to vote on. She asked for all questions to come through the Chair.

The options discussed in the report are listed below (the full report is included in Appendix A).

- a) Construct new Youth Facility on site of existing Youth Centre (Existing Site)
- b) Incorporate new Youth Facility in potential residential development site at The Grange, Station Road (Grange)
- c) Construct new Youth Facility adjacent to the drive to Swanwick Hall at existing Boothbed Lane play ground. (Play ground Swanwick Drive)

- d) Construct new Youth Facility at Northerly end of the existing Boothbed Lane play ground. (Play ground North)
- e) Extend and modify existing VHPFF pavilion at Boothbed Lane (Extend Pavilion)
- f) Construct Scout HQ on one half of existing Youth Centre site; sell other half for a plot for single residential dwelling. Upgrade VHPFF pavilion. (Scout HQ & Pavilion upgrade).

The PC debated the advantages and disadvantages of each of the three options that may be viable. Councillor Caulkin suggested that the working party were best placed to make a recommendation to the council of what they believe to be the best option. Also that further meetings were needed with the scouts and VHPFF. DC asked for a valuation of the part site, Chair agreed to follow up. Chair declared that decision needed to be made by end of this council's term next year and that doing nothing was not an option.

04.14.16. Local Plan – Update – Nothing to report. Remove item from next agenda.

04.14.17. Bloor Homes Planning Application – Update from CW&C Planning Committee Meeting on 20th March 2014

PG reported that despite gallant opposition, CW&C approved the application. He felt the process suffered because it was between two borough councils and that the judgement was wrong when it said access did not need to be considered as CEC has total authority and responsibility for the access. It had been a difficult case, no satisfactory answers. CW&C claimed all the s106 money for facilities in CW&C that will not be used by the residents of the new houses as the same facilities located in Goostrey are nearer. The PC have written a letter to Fiona Bruce warning her about its concerns. The 20 day review of the complaint at CW&C will be reviewed before the next Southern Planning Committee on 7th May CEC (check week before).

04.14.18. Land off Hermitage Lane – Update from the Northern Planning Committee Meeting on 19th March 2014

The application was refused because CEC has an established 5 year supply of housing land, and because of objections from Jodrell Bank.

04.14.19. Annual Parish Meeting

Action: Clerk to contact all presenters to ensure they are still coming to the APM and to find out about their requirements presenting ie projector, flip chart etc. Clerk to send out invitations with newsletter

04.14.20. Minor Items for the next agenda

- The Chair confirmed that Fiona Bruce MP had agreed to meet with the PC to talk about planning issues and we are currently awaiting a date for the meeting.
- The Chair asked Cllr Kolker if he had heard anything about the possibility of residents being asked by CEC to pay for the emptying of Brown Bins, as it used to be £20 a year when they were first introduced.
- She also mentioned that on the Bogbean there is a 50 year old oak tree planted commemorate the death of Winston Churchill. In 1965 Goostrey PC planted the oak tree on the Bogbean, a resident has sent a press cutting to her, has asked if the PC wants to have a plaque or stone for 50th anniversary. The Chair suggested that the Amenities Committee to take this on board.
- ML – asked if Goosfest can loan the PC display boards in October.

- PG mentioned that there are still 50 houses not currently connected to faster broadband.
- He also said that the Church warden had approached him to ask if the PC would accommodate the spoils from the graves on the land owned by the PC, and when it accumulates they will have it removed. The PC approved the suggestion.
- Recharge – GS has requested that CEC provide fuel oil bills directly to the PC. CEC has replied stating that this is not possible, but GS will pursue this further.
- Chair announced that this would be her last meeting as Chairman of the Parish Council as a new Chairman would be elected at the May meeting.

04.14.20. Next Meeting- The next meeting will be on 13th May 2014 at 7.30pm

04.14.21. Close the meeting- The meeting closed at 9.40pm

Public Forum

A resident referred to the CW&C Planning Committee Meeting regarding Bloor Homes Application, he remarked that 4 letters of complaint about the meeting and the decision had been sent to CW&C asking for it go to committee again regarding the failings. These letters accidentally went onto the web site, they had originally been sent to the Head of Complaints, and the Head of CW&C.

Resident remarked that they were delighted to see PC is going for the new youth facility – asked if anyone had experience of running a Scout Troup and that the idea of a Scout Troup and a house on as site the size of the old YC is a recipe for disaster. However, they commented that working with VHPFF was an inspired idea, and that with the latest engineering technology hopefully it will be acceptable to the owner of the wayleave.

Chairman of the scouts spoke about the pipelines which belong to the MOD, and the sale of these are not part of the anaerobic digester plant. He also commented that the e-mail re the planning application was born out of frustration as the PC had offered no response to proposal the Scouts made last November. He had asked to meet PC but had not been taken up on the offer. The Chair agreed to arrange a meeting with the scouts.

These minutes will be submitted for approval at the next meeting. Until then they are draft minutes.

APPENDIX A

Goostrey Parish Council Youth Facility Project – April 2014

1. Background

Goostrey Parish Council has consistently affirmed the commitment to provision of a new Youth Facility for Goostrey to replace the existing derelict unit opposite the Crown PH. The “do nothing option” has been examined and dismissed as the need for a Youth Facility has been recognised and repeatedly confirmed going back at least as far as the last Village Plan (2005?). The What, Where and How has been the subject of much debate without reaching any meaningful conclusions which might permit implementation of a project. This paper sets out the currently identified options and assesses the benefits, risks and issues.

2. Options

Options are listed below and are not in any order of priority. Options generally include a building approx 30m x 15m comprising:- Vestibule, Main Hall, Committee Room, Toilets, Kitchen, Storage all with access for the disabled, car parking and landscaping. Published estimating data bases give cost ranges of £800 and £1,000 per square metre (building only). This results in an estimated cost range of £360k to £450k. These figures may well be high as a “Design and Build” contract or selection of appropriate scale contractors (local) may produce a significant reduction in estimated cost, but this cannot be confirmed with the level of detail currently available.

Funding of any option is a very major issue. Sale of the existing Youth centre site with a valid Planning Approval for construction of one residential dwelling is the one source of significant funding currently available to GPC. This would be expected to raise approx £250k. The Section 106 Agreement with the Planning Approval has a condition requiring most of the money released by sale of the site to be invested in a Youth Facility and for best endeavours to be applied for the Youth facility to be completed within two years of completion of the sale. PWLB loans are available to GPC eg £125k over 25 years would require repayments of approx £8k pa. No attempt has been made to identify possible grants which may be available. Grant applications typically require a well advanced project with planning approval and a good knowledge of estimated cost and demonstration of how the total cost will be met.

- a) Construct new Youth Facility on site of existing Youth Centre (Existing Site)
- b) Incorporate new Youth Facility in potential residential development site at The Grange, Station Road (Grange)
- c) Construct new Youth Facility adjacent to the drive to Swanwick Hall at existing Boothbed Lane play ground. (Play ground Swanwick Drive)
- d) Construct new Youth Facility at Northerly end of the existing Boothbed Lane play ground. (Play ground North)
- e) Extend and modify existing VHPFF pavilion at Boothbed Lane (Extend Pavilion)
- f) Construct Scout HQ on one half of existing Youth Centre site; sell other half for a plot for single residential dwelling. Upgrade VHPFF pavilion. (Scout HQ & Pavilion upgrade)

3. Assessment of Options

Option	Planning	Risks & Issues	Deliverable	Comments
a) Existing Site	Planning not tested, but approval might reasonably be expected	Requires funding of entire building approx £400k, No sources of funding identified	No	Recommended for dismissal due to being unaffordable
b) Grange	Not known if CEC will allocate this site for residential development. Possibility of Jodrell Bank being a show stopper.	Despite plans exhibited by Agent. Not known what might be on offer to GPC, Site? Site and building? Timescales completely unknown. All very tentative, but could possibly, ultimately result in a Youth Facility at no cost to GPC	No	Recommended for dismissal due to the many uncertainties
c) Play ground Swanwick Drive	Not tested. Possible issue re existing covenant. Probable neighbour objections	Funded in part from sale of existing YC site May require GPC to take responsibility for whole playground with high on-going costs. Traffic issues due to proximity with Swanwick Hall drive. Would require close liaison with owner of Swanick Hall. Could lead to conflict of interest in respect of current and future planning applications at Swanwick Hall. Requires GPC to manage construction (or pay someone else to do so).	Possibly	Recommended for dismissal due to complex issues with Swanick Hall drive
d) Play	Not tested.	Funded in part	Probably	Recommended

ground North	Possible issue re existing covenant. Probable neighbour objections	<p>from sale of existing YC site</p> <p>May require GPC to take responsibility for whole playground with high on-going costs.</p> <p>Probably less contentious than c)</p> <p>Requires GPC to manage construction (or pay someone else to do so).</p>		for detail investigation and submission of Planning Application. Also consider contacting Michael Jones to ask if CEC will either <u>give</u> the freehold of the YF building site and car park to GPC or lease on 125 year lease both with CEC retaining responsibility for play ground
e) Extend Pavilion	Planning not tested, but approval might reasonably be expected	<p>Funded from sale of existing YC site. Probably sufficient money available including GPC retaining some for other projects.</p> <p>Benefit of not creating an entirely new asset.</p> <p>Wayleave on existing oil pipelines is still in place and it is not known if there is sufficient space to extend pavilion. VHPFF is an independent charity and GPC would have to donate whole cost to VHPFF.</p> <p>Need to ensure Youth groups get adequate access to building.</p> <p>Construction managed by</p>	Possibly, but complex negotiations would need to be completed	Recommended for further investigation in respect of feasibility due to proximity of oil pipelines. Review after this feasibility is resolved

		VHPFF.		
f) Scout HQ & Pavilion upgrade	Planning not tested. GPC PC might be expected to object due to over development of site and potential formation of "terrace" on prominent Main Road site	<p>If the two halves of the site are valued at about £125k each, this may be seen as a £125k donation to a single group?</p> <p>Challenge for Scouts to fund HQ.</p> <p>£125k possibly donate part to VHPFF and retain some money for other GPC projects</p> <p>"Easy" option for GPC – construction managed by Scouts and VHPFF.</p>	Possible?	<p>Pre-application discussion with CEC Planners would establish if this option can meet planning requirements.</p> <p>Some people may have concerns about disposal of GPC assets in this manner</p>

4. Marketing of Existing Site

There is currently no certainty that any of these options is deliverable. Marketing of the existing site is therefore premature and should be deferred until a deliverable option has been identified.

Submission of a new planning application for the dwelling on the existing site would be expected to achieve removal of the existing Section 106 agreement requirement. This would provide GPC with greater flexibility regarding use of monies raised and may have a positive impact on the value of the site.

5. Recommendation

The Youth Facilities Working Party should continue to explore three of these options d), e) and f) and report back to the May GPC Meeting.