

Appendix C UCPC Notes for R002v1 - Statement of Common Ground - including appendices

These notes refer to the page (PP...) and Paragraph/Section of the document provided by Pegasus Group under R002v1 - Statement of Common Ground.

They provide the perspective of Utkinton and Cotebrook Parish Council after extensive discussion with: Residents, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and the 'Utkinton Green Space Action Group.

It is a moot point that the original document relates to 'Common Ground', as the Parish Council or other groups have not been consulted by either the Applicants or CWaC in relation to these.

1. **PP4 a** Whilst this was the original intention, it ignores the other properties along Northgate (lower) – Beam End Cottage (No. 7) and nos. 12 & 14 that are of a similar vintage. It should be noted, too, that there are other properties (Quarry Bank cottages, Ardern Cottage, Northgate House) on Northgate (upper) that contribute to the heritage of Utkinton.
2. **PP4 Agreed Matters b** This has been discussed at length and, as yet, Utkinton is proposed as a LSC by CWaC and UCPC dispute thus and have added their points of view and argument (focused on the availability and proximity of a regular public transport service).
3. **PP4 Agreed Matters c** Here too, there is a disagreement with respect to the proportions of Market vs Affordable by numbers the proportion of Market Housing is 35% by numbers of dwellings and 65% by footprint.
4. **PP4 Agreed Matters d** The Arc4 survey was undertaken in May 2016, it was disputed and found flawed by UCPC, then revised after consultation by CWaC. There is a more recent one by UCPC undertaken by Cheshire Community Action between January and April 2018. The Arc4 HNS accepted that 'Affordable Housing' should relate to 1 or 2 bedroom dwellings and these are not represented in the application as put forward.
5. **PP4 Agreed Matters e** There is little evidence of either the cost of affordable housing or how it will be managed – no Registered Housing Provider has been appointed and the current provider in the Parish (Weaver Vale Housing Trust) who are responsible for an overall 11% of the housing stock in Utkinton (15.5% of the Parish) was unaware of the Application.
6. **PP4 Agreed Matters f** It is the contention of the Parish Council that this development does neither. It cannot conserve or enhance an agricultural field that existed as such long prior to the 1838 Tithe Apportionments and it cannot enhance that field by building on it – by simply covering it with houses and roads.
7. **PP4 Agreed Matters g** The PC do not understand this comment, the residential amenity rests with the householder who currently owns it and the properties that abut, surround or overlook, the site in question. The field in itself is not in the public domain and is rented for grazing from the current owner by Rose Farm – a long established farm (c. 200 years +).
8. **PP5 Consultation Comments a** Whilst there was no objection this only came following intense scrutiny of the flawed Arc4 Housing Needs Study that was found to have miscalculated the requirement by a factor of 15 – 16 dwellings. The impact on

the village and its landscape was never considered or consulted upon with the Parish Council or the community at large

9. **PP5 Matters Disputed a** Given that there are, in reality, multiple parties to this application – CWaC, the Applicant and the residents and Parish Council of Utkinton and Cotebrook (who have not been a party to any consultation). It would seem reasonable that the views of those most likely to be affected by this development – the residents, are taken into account. Neither of the latter two have been consulted with by the Applicants on any of the three Applications that they have submitted for this same parcel of land.
10. **PP5 Matters Disputed b** The Parish Council contends that this development will neither preserve or enhance but will it do harm to the ASCV. It cannot be ‘in keeping’ with the local landscape setting when it will cover an extant open field that is enjoyed by residents and visitors alike.
11. **PP5 Matters Disputed c** Following extensive surveys from the Applicant and the Parish Council, it is broadly agreed that there is little evidence of GCN but this doesn’t mean that there might not be in the future.
12. **PP5 Matters Disputed d** Whether Utkinton is designated as a LSC under CWaC LP2 is a moot point as that decision has not been decided and the rationale is being questioned by the Inspector thereof.

Francis Tunney
Chair – Utkinton and Cotebrook Parish Council
12 September 2018