



## Parish Council Minutes

[Main Menu](#)

[Home](#)

[Introduction](#)

[History](#)

[Parish Councillors](#)

[Role of PC](#)

[PC Meeting Dates](#)

[PC Minutes](#)

[PC Newsletters](#)

[Community](#)

[Association](#)

[Marigold Newsletter](#)

[St John's Church](#)

[Methodist Chapel](#)

[Political](#)

[Representatives](#)

[Police](#)

[Schools](#)

[Local Transport](#)

[Photo Gallery](#)

[What's On](#)

[Lottery Results](#)

[Local Weather](#)

[Links](#)

Guilden Sutton Parish Council

Minutes of the ordinary meeting of  
the Council held on  
Monday 6 February 2006 in  
Guilden Sutton Village Hall.

Chairman: Cllr P M Paterson

Present: Cllrs P Astbury, R Bayton, D Fisher, D  
Hughes, P M Paterson, J Proudlove.

In attendance: PC M Baker.

Public Speaking Time

Mr M Roberts referred to the amount of litter at  
the surrounds to the Village Hall and children's  
play area, including the adjoining footpath and  
verge, particularly following Friday and  
Saturday nights. Mr Roberts was thanked by  
the Chairman for his attendance.

1 Apologies: Apologies were received and  
accepted from Cllrs Armitage and Young.

Apologies were received from County Cllr J  
Burke, City Cllr B J Bailey and City Cllr J R  
Boughton.

2 Procedural matters.

(i) Declarations of interest. Members were  
reminded that they should declare any personal  
interest which they had in any matter or item to  
be considered at the meeting. Any declaration  
must be made before the matter, or item, was

considered or as soon as the Member became aware a declaration was required. Similarly, if the interest was also a prejudicial one, this must be declared and the Member must leave the room and not seek to influence any decision made. Declarations were a personal matter for each Member to decide. The decision to declare, or not, was the responsibility of the Member based on the particular circumstances.

Cllr Mrs P M Paterson declared a prejudicial interest in application 05/02058/FUL ground floor front and first floor side extensions, 31 Oaklands CH3 7HE for Mr Harding (amended) in that the applicant was undertaking work at her house and would leave the room for any discussion thereof.

Cllr D Hughes declared a personal interest in application 05/02058/FUL ground floor front and first floor side extensions, 31 Oaklands CH3 7HE for Mr Harding (amended) in that the applicant had been a contractor to Guilden Sutton Community Association of which Cllr Hughes was Chairman.

(ii) Confirmation of the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on Monday 9 January 2006. The minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on Monday 9 January 2006 were proposed by Cllr Hughes, seconded by Cllr Bayton and agreed subject to part of minute 7 (ii) (a) Highways, speed matters being amended in part to read `The Clerk was authorised to purchase 50 sets of high visibility clothing for those residents who wished to take advantage' in place of `Further inquiries would be made by the Clerk as to the possibility of purchasing high visibility clothing for those residents who wished to take advantage.' At the request of Cllr Hughes, the Clerk confirmed that details of the agreed budget for 2006/07 and the funding therefor would be circulated electronically in addition to being appended with the minutes.

(iii) Dates of future meetings: 6 March, 3 April, 8 May, 12 June and 17 July, 2006.

(Provisional) 11 September, 9 October, 6 November and 11 December, 2006.

(iv) Quality Parish Council status. (a) approval of bursary. The Clerk reported the receipt, by letter dated

19 January 2006, of confirmation from the National Association of Local Councils that the Council's application for a Clerk's training bursary had been agreed. This was welcomed.

(i) New applications.

05/00971/FUL corn/grain shed, Tile Farm, Wicker Lane, CH3 7EL for Mr and Mrs S Arden. Cllr Hughes. Decision awaited.

05/01976/FUL single storey rear extension, 117 Oaklands, CH3 7HG for Mr and Mrs S Parkyn. Cllr Armitage. An amended application was awaited.

05/02058/FUL ground floor front and first floor side extensions, 31 Oaklands CH3 7HE for Mr Harding. Cllrs Fisher, Bayton. (amended.) In the absence of the Chairman, the Clerk reported the receipt of further amended plans, dated 25 January 2006 which deleted the proposed porch at the front of the property. He further reported the receipt by letters dated 29 January 2006 of further objections from Mr B and Mrs M Clayton, 2 Orchard Croft and C and M Powell, 29 Oaklands.

In accordance with the previous minute, the following response had been made to the local planning authority:

*Thank you very much indeed for kindly consulting my Council on this proposal. For the avoidance of doubt, these comments refer to the application dated 20 December, 2005 which includes a 2m setback at first floor level extending to the boundary of the property and a*

*front porch. We are aware there are subsequent plans deleting the porch but wish to address the question of terracing and local distinctiveness.*

*Members are not persuaded to depart from their previous decision to object to the proposal. There are continuing concerns about the potential for terracing and the detrimental impact such a precedent would have on the local distinctiveness of the Oaklands estate. The Council also believes the extension would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity which the occupiers of 2 Orchard Croft could reasonably expect to enjoy.*

*It is understood the application, if recommended for approval, will be referred to the Planning Board. Exceptionally I set out below the Council's argument as to the potential for a fundamental change in the character of the estate should such extensions be permitted at the substantial number of other similar properties which exist.*

*In particular I refer you to previous decisions at 6 Orchard Croft and at 26 Oaklands where proposals for first floor extensions were refused or required significant amendment to overcome their impact on local distinctiveness.*

*The Council recognises the applicant has moved towards the SPG on house extensions. However, the SPG states in paragraph 4.1 dealing with terracing: 'The purpose .....is to protect the street scene and the character of the area by ensuring that areas originally designed and laid out as detached or semi detached development are retained as such.'*

*This part of Oaklands was originally laid out as a detached development.*

*I refer to the appeal decision relating to a two storey extension at the side of 12 Ryecroft in Elton, the file for which the LPA will hold. My note records:*

*`A two storey extension would harm the character and appearance of part of a Chester village estate, a planning inspector decided.*

*Mr Victor Crumley was ruling in an appeal concerning the proposed extension at the side of 12 Ryecroft in Elton.*

*Applicant Mr Jackson turned to First Secretary of State Mr John Prescott when his plans to extend were rejected by Chester City Council.*

*The extension, according to the inspector, would occupy the site of a garage at the property which was immediately adjacent to the garage of a neighbouring semi at No 14.*

*`At present there is a clear view above these adjacent single storey garages between the two storey houses and this maintains a visual separation between them,' suggested Mr Crumley.*

*Mr Jackson's extension would remove part of that separation and if a similar extension was built at No 14 `the appearance of a long terraced building would be created.'*

*This would have a `particularly urban appearance' suggested the inspector which would not be sympathetic to the relatively spacious suburban character of the estate.*

*Although the first floor would be setback slightly to avoid any future terracing effect, the inspector believed there would be an insufficient break to guard against the danger of terracing.'*

*It is difficult to see how the principle of the argument behind this decision to support refusal, albeit referring to semi detached properties, should not apply to the position at 31 and 29 Oaklands.*

*City Council policies require that:*

*Development should only be permitted if it does not have a significantly detrimental effect on the amenities of people living nearby. This is intended to ensure that all development in Chester district safeguards the quality of life for residents of the district.*

*When considering the impact of a proposal on neighbouring properties, the City Council will have regard to any other relevant factor which results in a reduction in quality of life.*

*Any proposal should have a positive impact on the local environment, in particular the built environment in Chester and the villages, by requiring that new development contributes to local distinctiveness.*

*Policies aim to protect the quality of life of existing residents who are affected by development proposals*

*All relevant issues should be taken into account in the decision making process and to ensure that the development can be satisfactorily achieved without harm to the environment and to quality of life.*

*The Local Distinctiveness policy goes further in that it aims to secure a positive contribution to the local built environment.*

*The original design guidelines for development in Guilden Sutton were intended to preserve or improve the environment and ensure a high standard of new development. On this part of Oaklands estate, the feeling of spaciousness has been achieved through a low density of housing and by retaining valuable open views across the roofs of linked single and double garages between individual detached properties. This is the local distinctiveness of the area and applies not only in prominent locations such as the gap between two properties at the head of a cul-de-sac but also between individual properties within the street scene such as No. 31 and No. 29.*

*Should 4.1 in the SPG be followed to the letter, a significant number of properties could potentially be extended to the boundary, albeit with a 2m set back, giving rise to the harm identified by the inspector in Elton. This would be especially harmful where the gap between two detached properties themselves may not be great, of which there are examples.*

*Even with the alternative of a 1m step in from the boundary, a total gap of 2m above garages should both occupiers extend in a similar manner would represent a fundamental design change which my Council believes would be harmful to local distinctiveness.*

*In the circumstances, the planning authority is therefore requested to give careful consideration to the appropriateness of applying 4.1 to this particular proposal and particularly to the cumulative effect should other similar properties be extended in the same way.*

*It is invited to conclude the proposal should be refused.*

05/02071/FUL rear extensions 5 Oaklands CH3 7HE for Mr and Mrs J Parry. Cllr Hughes reported. It was agreed no objection should be raised.

05/02080/FUL conservatory at 38 Cinder Lane CH3 7EN for Mr Shorter. Cllr Hughes reported. It was agreed no objection should be raised.

6/05/02107/CPO rationalisation of depot including construction of vehicle maintenance facility, two mobile office units, provision of CCTV, lighting columns and replacement fencing, refuelling facility, lorry parking bay, office parking, new ramp and roundabout. Cllr Bayton reported. It was noted the revised application did not include any proposals for the use of the rear access. On this basis, no objections would be raised

(ii) Decisions:

05/02071/FUL rear extensions 5 Oaklands CH3 7HE for Mr and Mrs J Parry. Planning permission. Informative that all work should be on land wholly within the ownership of the applicant.

05/02080/FUL conservatory at 38 Cinder Lane CH3 7EN for Mr Shorter. Planning permission.

(iii) General: (a) Village Design Statement/ Parish Plan. It was agreed the proposed pre meeting should be deferred pending the outcome of a meeting which it was understood would be held in Waverton to discuss parish plans. (b) Correspondence per Barrow Parish Council. In accordance with the previous minute, the following response had been made:

*Very many thanks for yours of 17 December, 2005 which has been considered by the Parish Council.*

*A member of the council, Cllr Armitage, and myself have periodically been involved in discussions with the local planning authority over the last 10 years or more as we have been Chairman and Honorary Secretary of the Chester Area Meeting during that time.*

*The discussions arose following widespread concerns which were prevalent concerning relationships between the planning authority and parish councils.*

*The outcome was:*

*(i) Parishes would be provided with copies of reports to the Planning Board where applications were considered by the board and would be notified of the date on which the meeting would take place.*

*(ii) Planning officers would provide a written*

*explanation when the decision of the local planning authority was contrary to the recommendation of the parish council explaining why this was so.*

*(iii) Training visits would be arranged to the various sections of the local planning authority for parish council members and clerks to become more familiar with the system and with the individuals concerned.*

*(iv) Case officers would attend parish council meetings on request.*

*There is no doubt that, overall, there has been a great improvement.*

*However that is not to say concerns do not arise.*

*Guilden Sutton Parish Council is satisfied with the performance of the planning authority in so far as providing planning board reports and training sessions is concerned.*

*The protocol whereby the council would have an explanation of contrary decisions, few though these have been, has been less successful and we would wish this to be taken up.*

*As with many similar issues, it was identified at an early stage that communication was a key aspect.*

*This is particularly important where it is likely that a sensitive issue will be approved.*

*I recall a planning application for a replacement dwelling where amendment followed amendment and the parish council was unable to persuade itself that the basis on which a series of applications was approved demonstrated any consistency.*

*We have a current application which could affect the local distinctiveness of the largest*

*estate in the village and it will be interesting to see how this proceeds.*

*The advice we have always been given is that if the council has a concern it need do no more than pick up the phone and speak to the case officer.*

*In Guilden Sutton's case, this has invariably proved to be helpful even allowing for the turnover of staff where newcomers will be less familiar both with parishes and with the relationships we seek to achieve.*

*We also, of course, keep the ward councillors in touch with contentious matters as I am sure you do.*

*Members understandably have concerns when they feel their views are not taken into account but having attended most of the planning board meetings in the last five years, there is no doubt the views of parish councils are reported in the documents and if necessary are referred to by the senior officer presenting the application or by members of the board who may have been contacted about the proposal.*

*If parishes can provide half a dozen examples of recent proposals where there are concerns which do not appear to have been dealt with satisfactorily, I am sure the Area Meeting would wish to pursue these with the planning authority to identify if there are lessons to be learned.*

*The next meeting takes place on Wednesday 5 April and it was suggested that any examples might perhaps be made available one month before then in order to give the planning authority time to prepare a response.*

(c) County Environmental Planning Service, electronic communications. The Clerk reported the receipt, by letter dated 26 January 2006, of advice from the County Council Environmental Planning Service that consultation had indicated a preference for a range of policy documents to

be made available through electronic communications and CD ROM. This was dependent on recipients being capable of receiving information in that format. Paper copies would be available on request and the Web site would be kept up to date with links made as clear as possible. The Parish Council felt it should not oppose the move although the County Council would be informed that Parish Clerks in general would not have access to the standard of computing capacity usually found in the principal authorities.

(iv) Strategic planning. There was nothing further to report this stage.

4 Parish car park.

There was nothing to report.

5 Leisure Services.

(i) Playing Field (a) clearance of ditch. The Clerk understood from the contractor the work to clear the ditch had been completed although some additional cost had arisen. Further inquiries would be made. The highway authority would also be approached as to responsibility for the ditch. Action: The Clerk. (b) Facilities. Cllr Proudlove revisited the intention to renew the goalposts and nets. It was agreed the Clerk should purchase replacement nets and seek estimates for the painting of the goalposts. Action: The Clerk.

(ii) Play Area (a) CCTV protocol. A protocol was being prepared by the Clerk. (b) inspection check list. An updated rota would be prepared by the Clerk. (c) annual independent playground inspection. Further to the previous minute, the Clerk reported the name of the Parish Council already appeared on a notice at the play area and a no dog fouling sign was installed at the gate. Contact details had been prepared by the Clerk for display in the noticeboard at the Summerfield Road shops. (d) benching. A response was awaited from the

suppliers as to the condition of the benches. This would be pursued. Action: The Clerk.  
(e) Chester City Council Play facility policy and strategy consultation. The Clerk referred to this consultation. 05/06 067

The following response had been made to the City Council:

*Thank you very much indeed for kindly consulting my Council on this draft. This is very much appreciated.*

*The scope of the proposal is to be commended as it affords an opportunity for a wider range of issues to be considered rather than the simple provision and operation of a play facility of the best possible standard for local children, far from simple though that is.*

*At this stage, it is difficult to find any particular part of the document which the Parish Council might not wish to support, therefore I simply refer to a small number of detailed points which may be of help.*

*C8 It is clearly not practical to have the same distribution standards in both the rural and urban areas. Please note that at this point in time, no Parish Council controlled land is available within Guilden Sutton for the provision of facilities for youth.*

*C14 It is not clear from this question whether you intend the city council would hold copies of the annual inspection or also of the more frequent inspections carried out by the Parish Council itself. Perhaps this might be clarified. The copying and forwarding to you of 52 inspection reports pa would have administrative implications.*

*C16 The Parish Council very much welcomes the annual inspection service provided by the City Council and would wish this to continue. So far as the more frequent inspections are concerned, the present Council would support*

*option (b) but would welcome the availability of option (a) should this become required due to any change in circumstances.*

*C18 This is an extremely valuable point which had occurred to the Council independently. The majority of smaller parish councils, such as Guilden Sutton, do not have full-time staff or premises but wish to follow best practice. The availability of a service which would enable users to report or record concerns through contact details available at the site would be greatly appreciated. Members of the Council or the Clerk are invariably alerted to problems but this is dependent on them being available to be contacted at the time.*

*A related issue arises as to the City Council providing a pay as you go repair service as part of the arrangements to be made following the retirement of the blacksmith. Such a service was available in the past and would be greatly appreciated as the Parish Council does not have the resources, for example, to secure the urgent safeguarding of equipment which may become damaged and unsafe.*

*C27 Such an approach would be supported subject to prior consultation. Signposting would also make the location of the facility more visible to those intent on antisocial behaviour. A balanced judgment would need to be taken as to the most appropriate means of communication.*

Referring to paragraph C8 of the above response, Cllr Fisher reported that at a meeting of the City Council's Gowy North Area Committee, he had requested information as to the availability of grants for the development of facilities on land where this was not owned by the parish council.

(iii) Public Footpaths (a) (i) Footpath No. 7 public inquiry. A copy of the Inspector's decision had been forwarded to Cllr Hughes by the Clerk. Cllr Hughes described the process as an

appalling waste of public money. Notification was awaited of the proposed modifications to the order. A response was awaited from the Public Rights of Way Unit to the Clerk's request for the Council to be involved in any survey of the route by officers to determine the extent of any work which might be necessary, including the removal of stiles and fences Action: noted. (ii) application for traffic regulation order. The Clerk reported that at a meeting of the Highways and Transportation local joint committee for Chester held on 26 January 2006 Cllr R E Parkin, Mickle Trafford and District Parish Council, had used public speaking time to request the committee to make representations that a traffic regulation order should be in place to ensure the routes in both Mickle Trafford and Guilden Sutton were not used inappropriately. County Cllr J E Burke had requested a report should be presented to the next meeting of the committee. (b) replacement signs. The Clerk was ascertaining the cost of the replacement posts and signs required at Oxen Bridge, the Bird in Hand and Guilden Sutton Lane which the Council had agreed to fund. (c) Footpath Group. Cllr Hughes regretted to report the Footpaths group was and had been faltering for some time. Stocks remained of the Parish Footpaths map and he suggested these should be distributed to each house in the village. Members agreed to undertake this task and Cllr Hughes was thanked for this very worthwhile suggestion. (d) draft rights of way improvement plan 2006 - 2011. The following response had been made to the Rights of Way Unit:

*My Council is most grateful for having the opportunity to comment on this draft plan.*

*The Council fully supports the view that a safe, well maintained and attractive public rights of way network is necessary to provide for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and to enable people to benefit from the quiet and peaceful enjoyment of a healthy physical activity.*

*The Council believes that rights of way should be maintained to an appropriate standard although it is accepted this will vary according to the location.*

*The network includes public footpaths adjoining residential development which are surfaced, for example Guilden Sutton 2 and these must be swept on a regular basis to keep them clear of accumulations of litter and leaves in order they may be available for use by people in everyday footwear, perhaps with a push chair or in a wheelchair. It is also important that vegetation adjoining such lengths of path is also trimmed on a regular basis to avoid encroachment onto the route.*

*In the rural area, routes should be well sign posted and free from all obstructions such as barbed wire and impassable crops in order to encourage casual use by people of all ages.*

*The Council would wish to see the development of circular routes, improvements to existing paths, better links between rights of way and public transport, improvements to routes used to get to shops and schools, the development of key fully accessible routes, the removal of barriers across the network, developing and improving routes, improving the general condition of the network and involving land owners and parish councils as a priority.*

*Councillors are disappointed that the Parish Paths Partnership, which enabled parish councils to work in partnership with the County Council, has not continued. It should be re-established as a matter of urgency. Parish councils have an important role to play in bringing matters to the attention of the Rights of Way Unit where these require action and in making helpful and constructive suggestions. The scheme also engendered a genuine feeling of partnership between parishes and the County Council. With more regular, informal contact between parishes and the Rights of Way Unit, partnership working perhaps enabled difficulties to be avoided which a more formal, legalistic*

*approach would exacerbate to the serious detriment of relationships between the County Council, the parish council and the community.*

*The Parish Council believes the bridleways network should be extended, particularly where these are available on the fringes of urban areas in order to provide young people with a safe route off the highway.*

*The proposal (ref 363) that the multi user route on the former railway line from Chester to Deeside should be extended to Mickle Trafford and Guilden Sutton is strongly supported and the County Council is asked to ensure this is achieved as soon as possible.*

*The Parish Council has paid particular attention to issue SOA19 and the references to byways open to all traffic. It is noted there were no responses from groups representing vehicle users at an earlier stage which perhaps puts the matter in perspective. Although the document suggests that if managed correctly, the use of the countryside by motorised vehicles can be achieved without causing conflict and can assist in route management, the County Council is asked to ensure that particularly where such a route might be close to residential properties or have substandard access to the road network, or could be used by young horse riders or as a safe route to school for children, appropriate measures, for example pre-emptive traffic regulation orders, are available and in place to deal with the difficulties which might arise. The Parish Council further notes the comment that work to create such routes is done with minimal intervention by the County Council. This is welcomed.*

*The accompanying leaflet seeks peoples' views on a range of priorities including involving land owners. This should also include, as suggested above, a reference to including the parish council in an appropriate manner at an early stage. The County Council's corporate consultation arrangements with parishes are clearly laid down. It should not be overlooked*

*that in many instances the parish council will be the most local, most informed, fully representative and democratically accountable body able to give a view on any proposal which may come forward and would be more than willing to do so.*

(iv) Grounds Maintenance: contract. The Clerk reported that following discussions with the City Council he had been advised several cases similar to that appertaining in Guilden Sutton were in the process of being resolved. An amended invoice would be furnished.

(v) Public Seats. Extensive damage was reported to the public seat on Guilden Sutton Lane. Estimates would be sought by the Clerk for a suitable replacement. Action: The Clerk.

(vi) Landscaping, Fox Cover. This was said to be in a very good condition.

(vii) Provision for youth. The Council was pleased to hear the club proposed by Mr Spencer and Mr Dacre was taking place on Thursday evenings between 7.30 pm and 9pm. Inquiries had been made by the Clerk as to any appropriate support the Council might be able to give and Mr Spencer would be advised. Action: The Clerk.

6 Public transport. (i) ChesterBus (a) 0900 to Chester. There was nothing further to report at this stage.

(b) alighting/boarding Oaklands. Further to the previous minute, the managing director of ChesterBus had been informed the Council would hope that drivers would continue to use their best endeavours to park as close to the kerb as possible in order to assist elderly and infirm passengers (c) Consultation on a proposed bus strategy for Cheshire. The following response had been made to the County Transport Coordination Service:

*Thank you very much indeed for kindly affording my Council the opportunity to comment on this document.*

*The Parish Council welcomes the production of a strategy to improve bus travel and help achieve the County Council's overall transport objectives.*

*The fundamental issue in tackling congestion is seen as providing regular, reliable, clean and modern transport served by shelters and appropriate real time information of a high standard. Services must take account of peoples' transport needs.*

*If this is done, but only if it is done, will more people be willing to leave the car at home, thereby reducing congestion.*

*Accessibility to jobs and services would be best improved by having a more frequent service within a reasonable walk.*

*In response to point 3 of your document, improved bus stops and shelters by themselves are not sufficient. They must go hand in hand with improved services and modern high standard vehicles.*

*If money is limited, the County Council should make decisions based on which services would offer the greatest benefit to the largest number of people. The prospects of these services encouraging long term modal shift away from car travel should also be considered.*

*Thinking out of the box and considering post buses, taxi services, circular hail and ride services, modern yellow school buses - which could provide stage services in down time - and the use of computer technology is also essential.*

*My Council would be grateful if the Transport Coordination Unit would also take on board as a matter of urgency an investigation of bus*

*services in villages such as Guilden Sutton where there is a demand for transport to the urban area and where present services preclude the use of public transport for anyone holding a full time job with shop or office hours.*

*At present, although it is possible to travel into Chester from Guilden Sutton by early morning bus, the last return journey is at 1705 from Foregate Street, compared with 1740 from the Bus Exchange not too long ago. This clearly cannot be considered by anyone whose employment requires them to remain until 1700 or more usually 1730.*

7 Highways:

Highways

(i) local matters: (a) speed matters: speed indicator device, Community Speed Watch, Set the Pace, Western Rural NPU trailer. Further to the suggestion by Cllr Proudlove that a publicity campaign should be launched in the winter term through the school, with the assistance of PC Baker, to raise awareness of speed issues, inquiries had been made by the Clerk as to the material and advice which might be available from the County Road Safety Unit. An extremely helpful and detailed response had been received and this would be progressed. A site meeting would be held with County Cllr J E Burke as to the suggestion by Cllr Hughes that the 30mph signs at the approach to the parish playing field should be replaced by signs with a yellow border in order to reinforce the limit. (see further beneath.) Cllr Hughes was considering the possibility of the Council supporting the Community Speed Watch and Set The Pace campaigns and would report further to a future meeting. It was not yet known if the Western Rural NPU trailer would be deployed within the parish. The Clerk would progress the purchase of high visibility clothing for those residents who wished to take advantage. (b) Wicker Lane. (i) The completion of the proposals for lining and signing from the vicinity of Cinder Lane to Station Lane was awaited. (ii) condition/

provision for pedestrians. Continuing efforts were being made by the Clerk to secure a dialogue on the issues referred to during public speaking time and a helpful response had been received. This would be progressed. The measures to which Cllr Proudlove had drawn attention which had been taken elsewhere in the country would be revisited at a future meeting. (iii) Complaints by Mr Fenwick. There was nothing further to report at this stage as to the outcome of the promised inquiries by the highway authority into the planning position. (iv) boundary sign. A response was awaited to the Council's offer to the highway authority to meet 50% of the cost of a village boundary sign towards the A51. (c) gateway treatment, Guilden Sutton Lane - red patch SLOW marking, high visibility 30mph signs. A site meeting was now to be arranged following the approach to County Cllr J E Burke on the basis the scheme at Wicker Lane would protect two of the three principal approaches to the village, leaving Guilden Sutton Lane less protected at the approach to the playing field.(d) Condition of the footway. The concerns expressed at the condition of the footway at two locations on Oaklands and Hill Top Road would be revisited at a future meeting.

(e) markings, Guilden Sutton Lane. It was now known the markings referred to by Cllr Astbury between

2 Guilden Sutton Lane and Heath Bank related to proposed works by the water company. Cllr Astbury understood the Parish Council was to be informed.

(iii) Lighting. (i) A 41. The Council's request for street lighting to be installed on the A41 between the Hoole Hall Roundabout and the existing lighting on the dual carriageway would be referred to County Cllr J E Burke. Action: The Clerk. (ii) School Lane. A gap in the lighting in School Lane would be referred to the lighting authority.

8 Finance:

(i) Income:

Bank of Scotland:

Interest

30 December                      £    20.73

(ii) Payments

Chester City Council

grounds maintenance

(part year)                      £    678.50  
(includes VAT £101.05)\*

Cllr P M Paterson

Voucher re Christmas lights    £    10.00

Devaprint

Newsletters 110, 111              £    90.00

North Wales Newspapers

newsletter distribution            £    20.97  
(including £3.12 VAT.)

Royal British Legion

Poppy Appeal                      £    18.00

Clerk

Newsletter postage                £    6.95

Mileage (Jan)

8@ 40p                              £    3.20



fee (£14) to the Cheshire County Playing Fields Association. Reimbursement was awaited.

(ix) Budget 2006/07. The Clerk confirmed the agreed precept of £12,000 had been requested from the City Council. The agreed budget had been circulated electronically and a hard copy would be attached to these minutes.

(x) Aims and Objectives 2006/07. Cllr Proudlove said she believed it important that the Council should identify the measures it intended to achieve and should report on their progress. Objectives should be set with mechanisms in place to secure action. The Chairman indicated this could be included in any parish plan. Cllr Proudlove felt objectives should be set on an annual basis and the Chairman pointed out the parish plan would be a living document.

9 Environment services: (i) amenity cleansing. The Clerk indicated he had again requested amenity cleansing at a number of locations in the parish including the steps from Cinder Lane to Church Lane, public footpath No 2, the path from Oaklands to Orchard Croft, the path at the rear of Orchard Croft and the accesses either side of the A55 bridge on Belle Vue Lane together with the access to Belle Vue Path. Cllr Astbury referred to quantities of leaves on the footway on Guilden Sutton Lane near the junction with the A41. These would be reported. Action: The Clerk. (ii) dog fouling. (iii) litter bins. (iv) lengthsman. (v) sewers. There were no action items to report under these headings

10 Trees and hedges. (i) Inquiries were being made by the Clerk of Mickle Trafford and District Parish Council as to its procedure for dealing with instances of trees and hedges overhanging the footway. (ii) Black Poplar, Guilden Sutton Lane. Cllr Bayton reported, as Parish Tree Warden, that no action was necessary as to concerns which had arisen with respect to a Black Poplar being felled on land adjoining Guilden Sutton Lane.

(iii) Viewpoint, Wicker Lane. The Clerk reported the receipt of correspondence from the City Council Tree Officer as to proposals for work to unprotected trees and a hedge at this property. This had been referred to the Parish Tree Warden. The Council concurred with the view of the Tree Officer that the best option would be the removal of the trees and hedge, with stumps being ground and their replacement with heavy specimens and a mixed native hedge. (iv) Hedge cutting, Guilden Sutton Lane. Cllr Astbury referred to recent hedge cutting on Guilden Sutton Lane on the Mickle Trafford parish boundary during which the arisings had not been removed from the highway. This was regretted although the improvement to the hedge was welcomed. (v) tree the dell. The Chairman referred to the loss of a tree in the dell. Inquiries would be made by the Parish Tree Warden. Action: Parish Tree Warden.

11 Cheshire Association of Local Councils.  
There were no action items to report.

12 Chester City Council (i) Maintenance of churchyards and burial grounds. The outcome was awaited of the application on behalf of the Parochial Church Council to secure a grant towards the costs incurred by the Parochial Church Council in maintaining the church yard. (ii) Gowy North Area Committee 2 February 2006. Cllr Fisher reported. It was noted the next closing date for applications for grants from the area committee was

21 April 2006. (iii) Emergency information bottles. A supply of emergency information bottles had been obtained by the Clerk for distribution to Members. Their availability had also been publicised in the current edition of the newsletter. (iv) Details were noted of a further community IT course to be held in March 2006 in Saughall.

13 Cheshire County Council (i) Annual Town and Parish Councils Conference Wednesday 8 February 2006, Tenants Hall, Tatton Park.

Members wishing to attend would inform the Clerk. (ii) Details were received, by correspondence dated 26 January 2006, of the County Council's position regarding consultation on the proposed reorganisation of ambulance services. Action: noted.

14 Cheshire Community Council. (i) Affiliation to Cheshire County Playing Fields Association. (see above)

(ii) Details were received and noted of the Community Pride Competition 2006.

15 CPRE. Details were noted of the CPRE campaign in Chester district in relation to the Green Belt.

16 Health. (i) Consultations: new strategic health authority arrangements for the North West; primary care trust arrangements in Cheshire and Merseyside; boundary changes to Ambulance Service NHS trusts in the North West. It was noted that any response to these consultations was due by 22 March 2006.

17 Policing. (i) Police Community Support Officers. The Clerk reported the receipt, by correspondence dated

11 January 2006, of advice from the Chief Constable as to parish councils contributing, at a cost of £11,000pa, to the cost of providing a dedicated police community support officer for the parish. The Council expressed considerable disquiet that the job description of these officers appeared to replicate that of the police officers appointed under the neighbourhood policing initiative as recently as April 2005 and that the initiative was another example of double rating. It was further noted the cost of such an officer would represent, for many smaller councils, the entire budget. (ii) Police force restructuring. Members noted that It appeared likely any arrangements would be resisted by police authorities and would be imposed by the Home Secretary. A likely

scenario was a merger of the Cheshire and Merseyside forces. Members further noted it was intended the concept of neighbourhood policing was to be retained but were concerned at the possibility that resources and officers would be abstracted from the rural area to respond to the requirements of the larger urban areas in any merged force. The Clerk would seek opportunities for an appropriate response.

18 Newsletter. Newsletter 112 had been issued. The Clerk hoped to issue a further newsletter in the period to the end of the financial year.

19 Memorial garden. There were no action items to report.

20 Bulb planting. There was nothing further to report this stage.

21 Parish ICT. There was nothing further to report at this stage.

22 Primary School. There was nothing further to report at this stage.

23 Maintenance of street furniture. Further estimates were being sought by the Clerk for maintenance to the noticeboards, public seats and shelter seating. Action: Noted.

24 Withdrawal of telephone kiosks. There was nothing further to report at this stage.

25 Twinning. The Chairman would inform the Clerk of possible dates for a meeting with Mr Spencer and Mr Dacre. Members would be advised.

26 Cheshire Fire Brigade: (i) budget consultation 2006/07. The Clerk reported the receipt of correspondence dated 4 January 2006 as to consultation on the Cheshire Fire Service budget 2006/07. It was noted a response was required by Wednesday 8 February 8.

## 27 Members' information items.

Development control, Church Lane. Cllr Bayton referred to an extension proceeding at a property in the Church Lane. Cllr Fisher informed the Council that details of planning applications could now be seen on the City Council web site.

Parking, highways depot. Cllr Bayton referred to a letter received from an occupier raising concerns as to parking at the rear access to the depot. This had been raised with the occupier directly with the County Council's Environmental Planning Service.

The Parish Council had resolved to defer any action on this issue pending the resolution of the initial planning application to which it had objected. The revised application continued to include parking provision within the site and it was hoped this would remove the cause for the concerns. If necessary, an informal approach would be made in the first instance by the Clerk.

Wicker Lane. Cllr Proudlove referred to a major problem following a lorry mounting the verge. it was noted that similar damage occurred throughout the length of the road.

Chairs, Village Hall. Cllr Hughes, as Chairman of Guilden Sutton Community Association, informed Members that a number of chairs were being replaced in the Village Hall. He had thanked the Gowy North area committee for the grant which had been agreed and was grateful to the Parish Council for its support.

## 27 Information correspondence:

Chester City Council: The Key, Winter 2005,  
Council 25 January 2006.

Cheshire Community Council: 2005 review.

Chester in Partnership. Annual event, Chester

Town Hall, Wednesday 8 March 2006, 10am -  
3.30 pm.

Matters considered in the absence of the press  
and public

28 Clerk's terms and conditions. The Clerk was  
reviewing the proposed contract.