

## **CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the **Advisory Panel - Places**  
Held on Monday, 22nd September, 2008 at The Capesthorne Room - Town  
Hall, Macclesfield

### **PRESENT**

Councillor J Walton (Chairman)  
Councillor Mrs E Gilliland (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors H Davenport, D Hough, J Macrae, A Martin, A Moran, B Moran,  
D Neilson and C Thorley

Apologies

Councillors D Bebbington, B Silvester and Mrs J Weatherill

### **8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

A number of Councillors who were existing County Councillors, Borough Councillors and Town and Parish Councillors declared a personal interest in the business of the meeting en bloc.

Councillor Barry Moran declared a personal interest in respect of all the agenda items, by virtue of the fact that he was the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development and in accordance with the Code of Conduct remained in the meeting during consideration of all the items.

### **9 PUBLIC SPEAKING TIME/OPEN SESSION**

There were no members of the public present who wished to address the Panel.

### **10 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2008 be approved as a correct record, subject to the correction of Councillor G M Walton's initials.

### **11 TRANSPORT INNOVATION FUND (TIF) IN GREATER MANCHESTER (INCLUDING PROPOSED CONGESTION CHARGING).**

Following Government's approval of Greater Manchester's TIF proposals for Programme Entry Status, a consultation exercise had been launched to test whether the plans were publicly acceptable. The deadline for comments was 10 October 2008. The Panel was requested to consider the report on the TIF consultation exercise and, subject to any changes as a result of

comments received, recommend that Cabinet approve it as the basis for the Cheshire East Council's response, details of which were set out in the report.

A number of schemes which would benefit Cheshire residents, should congestion charges be introduced, had been identified and these were set out in an appendix to the report.

It was noted that Sir Howard Burnstein had suggested, as part of the public consultation exercise, that a mobile exhibition be used to promote the TIF scheme, which could be made available for use in neighbouring authorities. Arrangements were now being made to ensure that the exhibition was made available at a number of locations in Cheshire and it was proposed that this would include Poynton and Wilmslow. A short newsletter had also been prepared by GMPTE and had been made available to neighbouring authorities, to distribute in libraries and information points, as well as publication on websites. A copy of the leaflet was appended to the report.

In considering the report Members of the Panel raised the following issues:

- (i) Concern was expressed that no real consultation had taken place with Macclesfield Borough Council or the Cheshire East Shadow Council and it was considered that, as traffic would come from the Cheshire East area, the Greater Manchester area could not be considered in isolation.
- (ii) It was queried why the mobile exhibition could not go to other areas, including Disley. It was reported that the exhibition had only been offered for two days and there was no opportunity for it to go to other areas. It was noted that GMPTE had published a list of all the exhibition dates, however, all others were within the conurbation.
- (iii) The proposal to improve the rail service, including improvements to some stations, was welcomed. However, it was queried how some of the small stations would cope with this. It was reported that, whilst there were limitations as to what could be achieved, there were a number of initiatives through the community Rail Partnerships, some of which could be realised, if the proposals went ahead. In addition, a study of the Manchester Rail Hub was taking place, which would try to achieve capacity improvements on the rail network. The study was vital in that it set out areas of improvement to the rail service connectivity for Cheshire East.
- (iv) Reference was made to the inadequacy and congestion on the rail service from Buxton to Manchester.
- (v) Concern was expressed that the proposals were not supported by all AGMA authorities and that they did not accord with the

work that DEFRA had been carrying out relating to economic activity, particularly in rural areas. It was considered that the proposals would significantly disadvantage the surrounding areas of Greater Manchester, including the Cheshire East area. It was felt that the consultation had only taken place because of public pressure and that the response to the consultation should be as strong as possible.

- (vi) It was noted that businesses would be making decisions as to where they would be located for the next five years and the proposals would have an impact on this. It was felt that it also needed to be recognised that people commuted out of, as well as into Greater Manchester. The proposals would have an effect on the Council's policies and the consequences of this needed to be understood. However, it was felt that these issues needed to be addressed at Central Government level.
- (vii) It was considered that there had not been enough consultation in respect of the proposals.
- (viii) Reference was made to paragraph 7.2 of the report, which referred to improvements to the local transport networks and it was considered that these improvements should be in place before the congestion charge was implemented.
- (ix) Reference was made to bullet point 3 of paragraph 7.10 of the report, which referred to new heavy rail rolling stock for all major routes into the regional centre cross charging routes, alongside a programme of station improvements, and it was considered that this should include Crewe.
- (x) It was noted that a lot of people from the Congleton and Holmes Chapel areas commuted into Greater Manchester and it was felt that strong representations should be made to state that the consultation should have included these areas and that they should also be included in any future referendum. In addition, rail links needed to be improved in these areas and not reduced, as was currently proposed.
- (xi) It was suggested that a formal report should also be submitted to the Cheshire West Council requesting them to make representations.
- (xii) It was also suggested that strong representations be made to the Government Minister in respect of this matter.
- (xiii) As there were only limited numbers of the newsletter available, it was suggested that a press release should be issued and published on the various Council websites.

- (xiv) It was considered that it needed to be accepted that there was no Authority for the sub-regional structure and if Manchester was to be the centre of the sub-region, there would have to be improvements to Public Transport Services.
- (xv) Reference was made to the list of transport schemes/initiatives for Cheshire and the proposed rail scheme passenger improvements on the North Staffs line (Stoke to Crewe via Alsager). It was felt that consideration needed to be given to car parking costs, where people had to drive by car to another station when travelling by rail.

## **RESOLVED**

That Cabinet be recommended to approve the recommended Cheshire East Council response to the TIF proposals, as set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report, subject to the final bullet point being included as the first sentence of the response.

## **12 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

Consideration was given to a report relating to a draft Local Development Scheme for Cheshire East and to consider any comments that Members of the Panel might wish to make to Cabinet when consideration was given to this matter. The Cheshire East Draft Local Development Scheme was attached as an appendix to the report.

In considering the report, Members of the Panel raised the following issues:

- (i) The Portfolio Holder referred to paragraph 12 of the draft scheme and requested that the conclusions from the formal marking and ranking assessment of risk which had taken place, be included in the document. This was agreed.
- (ii) Reference was made to the new PPS12 and Regulations, which allowed Local Authorities to agree strategic sites in their core strategies and it was agreed that this should be made more explicit in the document.
- (iii) It was noted that Congleton Borough Council would be considering this matter, at its Council meeting in October and would be making a representation on the document, in terms of the content of some of the plans, subject to Council approval.
- (iv) It was noted that there were a number of typographical errors, which would be corrected.

## **RESOLVED**

That Cabinet be recommended to agree the submission of the draft Local Development Scheme to GONW, subject to the above comments.

### **13 FEEDBACK FROM TASK GROUPS**

Feedback was provided in respect of the Task Groups, which had been established at the previous meeting. It was noted that it was proposed, in future, to circulate the minutes of the Task Groups to all Members of the Panel.

#### **Car Parking**

The first meeting of the Car Parking Task Group had taken place on 27 August 2008 and issues discussed had included progress to date and key issues prior to Vesting Day, the need for a decision within Congleton Borough for enforcement of both on and off street parking, funding for bringing existing town centre car parks up to necessary standards, the urgent need for Cheshire County Council to develop and adopt residents parking and civil enforcement policies, consultation on residents parking permit schemes and discussions regarding consistent policies. It was noted that the next meeting would take place on Wednesday 8 October 2008, at 10.00am, at Pym's Lane Depot.

#### **Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership**

The first meeting of the Task Group had taken place on 17 September 2008. The Terms of Reference for the new Crime and Disorder Partnership had been agreed. It was noted that there were three separate documents for each of the three Districts and it was proposed to link these documents and to use the current expertise from each of the Councils. There would be one voting representative on the Crime and Disorder Partnership and two further non-voting Members from the other Districts. A number of visits had also been agreed, including the police headquarters and Styal Prison and it was also proposed to contact the Magistrates with a view to arranging a visit. The Task Group had also recommended other areas for consideration, including CCTV and facial recognition software.

#### **Local Development Framework**

The first meeting of the Task Group had taken place on 9 September 2008. Terms of Reference had been agreed and an update given on transitional LDF Regulations and the draft Local Development Scheme. Consideration had also been given to the Statement of Community Involvement, whereby it had been recommended to wait until the Planning Bill Regulations were in place before the new Authority started work on the combined SCI. Discussion had also taken place in respect of LDF Members' training needs and it was considered that the PAS Member

training package should be made available, as soon as possible. The next meeting would take place on 23 October 2008 at 2.00pm, at Westfields.

### **Strategic Development**

The first meeting of the Task Group had taken place on 17 September. Terms of Reference had been agreed. Andrew Ross had attended and highlighted all the current strategic highway projects/issues. Andrew Farrow had attended and outlined matters concerning minerals and waste. Paul Irwin had attended and discussed detailed matters in connection with the Regional Spatial Strategy Partial Review. David Sparkes had attended and discussed the review of the North West Regional Housing Strategy and the Cheshire Sub-regional Housing Strategy 2008 to 2012, together with the future of the Housing Corporation. It had been suggested that a Manchester Airport Sub Task Group be formed to discuss an important range of issues requiring early resolution. Alan Millington and John Knight had attended to outline major projects across the area of the new Authority. The next meeting would take place on Wednesday 22 October 2008 at 9.30am, at Westfields.

The Portfolio Holder for Prosperity noted that since the meeting of the Task Group it had been confirmed that the Regional Spatial Strategy would be formally adopted on 30 September.

### **Tatton Park**

It was noted that this Task Group had not yet met, but it was recognised that the wider implications of tourism and the visitor economy of Cheshire East, should be included within the remit of the Task Group.

### **Waste Collection and Disposal**

The first meeting of the Task Group had taken place on 8 September. Terms of Reference had been agreed. A tour of the Pym's Lane Depot had taken place. A paper relating to all the issues surrounding the disparities between the services currently provided by each of the three District Councils within Cheshire East had been discussed and specific topics for discussion at future meetings had been agreed. The next meeting would take place on Friday 24 October, at 10.30am, at Pym's Lane Depot.

## **14 ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW TASK GROUPS.**

It was recognised that there was a need for the establishment of new Task Groups for the areas of Development Management and Energy Efficiency. As previously referred to, it was also proposed to establish a Manchester Airport Sub Task Group. It would be necessary to appoint Members to these Task Groups at some point in the near future. It was noted that there was a shortfall of representatives in some of the geographical areas and it would be useful to appoint two Members from each of the current

District Councils. It was agreed that the Chairman would contact the Leaders of the respective District Councils, where appropriate, to identify representation, where there was a possible shortfall. It was noted that representatives did not have to be a Member of the Places Advisory Panel.

It was agreed that Councillor Derek Hough be appointed as a representative on the Waste Panel.

## **15 ARRANGEMENTS FOR SITE VISITS**

Arrangements for site visits were noted as follows:

Congleton - 26 September 2008  
Crewe & Nantwich - 1 October 2008  
Macclesfield - 10 October 2008

A further reminder would be sent to all Members of the Panel, to include joining instructions.

## **16 DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Future meetings would take place as follows:

Wednesday 5 November 2008, at 2.00pm, in Sandbach  
Tuesday 16 December 2008, at 2.00pm, in Crewe  
Tuesday 27 January 2009, at 2.00pm, in Macclesfield  
Wednesday 11 March 2009, at 2.00pm, in Sandbach  
Tuesday 21 April 2009 at 2.00pm in Crewe

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 3.20 pm

Councillor G Walton (Chairman)  
CHAIRMAN