

INGOL AND TANTERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Parish Council Meeting of Ingol and Tanterton Neighbourhood Council held on **Wednesday 13th June 2012 @ St Margaret's Church Hall Ingol**

Present: Cllrs Anderson, Brookes, Dodd, Ellison, Roskell, Speakman, Soole, Thompson and Wright.

6 members of the public were present

16/12 APOLOGIES

Cllr McGrath

17/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

18/12 MINUTES

It was resolved that the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 9TH May 2012 should be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

19/12 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The meeting was adjourned

A resident mentioned the issue of dangerous dogs which had been raised at the recent PACT meeting and was currently being followed through by that group.

It was suggested that should the Neighbourhood Council decide to enlist the services of a lengthsman that such a person might be able to be nominated as an official authorised to carry out enforcement of the PCC dog control orders.

It was mentioned that the last remaining PCC dog control order relating to 'dogs on leads' would likely be published shortly. It was suggested that members should read the dog control orders so as to understand their ramifications and areas covered.

Mention was made of the Ingol Ward Profile Document which had been produced by PCC in the past. It was suggested that this document might be useful to the Neighbourhood Council in undertaking and producing a locality/action plan for the neighbourhood. It was noted that PCC were no longer updating the document which was perhaps something the Neighbourhood Council might consider as part of the overall exercise.

It was mentioned that grass cutting on verges was felt to be poor and that the local County Cllr had been asked to look into the issue.

It was mentioned that some improvement works had been undertaken along the canal by Haslam Park as part of the tidying up for the Guild celebrations. It was noted that parts of these areas were actually within this NC catchment area.

The meeting was reconvened

20/12 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Members noted that applications 2012/0359 and 2012/0373 had been dealt with under delegated authority standing order number 40 and that no representation was made. There were no applications for consideration at this meeting.

21/12 PAYMENTS

It was resolved that the under mentioned payments should be authorised:

300001	Zurich Municipal	Insurance	225.00
300002	W V Mcennerney-Whittle	Salary & Expenses 1/4 to 30/6	1060.06
300003	Inland Revenue	Tax deductions 1/4 to 30/6	670.00
300004	Viking Direct	Stationery	219.97

22/12 LENGTHSMAN

Members had been asked to consider the appointment of a lengthsman following compilation of a list of identified work and job description from other local councils in the area as per reports enclosed with the agenda

It was resolved that a lengthsman should be appointed on a service contract for the 9 month period 1/7/2012 until 31/3/2013 on the basis of an average of 6 hours per week at a rate of £12.50 per hour with reviews taking place at such time that the Precept budgeting process was undertaken later this year and then shortly before the expiry of the contract itself in March 2013.

It was then further resolved that Peter Greenwood (lengthsman to Lea and Cottam) should be appointed since he already possessed the necessary experience, skills, equipment, risk assessment knowledge and flexibility to meet this Council's perceived needs.

23/12 PROJECTS

Members had been asked to consider and approve that project work previously done under neighbourhood management or PACT should now normally be routed through the Neighbourhood Council and if so consider compiling a data base of potential projects.

It was resolved that project work previously done under neighbourhood management or PACT should now normally be routed through the Neighbourhood Council and that members should now advise the Clerk of potential projects so that a data base of works could be compiled for consideration.

24/12 WORKING GROUPS

Members had been asked to consider the appointment of working groups for the following purposes:

- To investigate the number, siting, type, procurement and cost of notice boards and provide recommendations for consideration at the next meeting

It was resolved that Cllrs Ellison and Dodd should comprise this working group

- To investigate the frequency, editorial, compilation, printing, cost and delivery of a Neighbourhood Council newsletter for consideration at the next meeting.

It was resolved that Cllrs Roskell and Speakman should comprise this working group

- To investigate the procurement, cost and compilation of a web site for consideration at the next meeting.

It was resolved that Cllrs Brookes and Ellison should comprise this group

- To investigate the location, procurement and cost of signage at the entrances to the Neighbourhood Council area for consideration at the next meeting.

It was resolved that Cllr Anderson would undertake this investigation

- To investigate and suggest how a brand logo might be developed for consideration at the next meeting.

It was resolved that Cllrs Roskell, Speakman and Wright should comprise this group

- To investigate the cost and planting arrangements for mass bulb planting on roundabouts on Tom Benson Way for consideration at the next meeting.

It was resolved that Cllrs Brookes, Soole and Wright should comprise this group

- To investigate how this Council might wish to take forward a consultation exercise with its electorate with a view to putting together an action plan / locality plan to inform its policies and actions going forward for consideration at the next meeting. (This was a stated objective of the original Steering Group prior to the formation of this Council – budget provision of £5K has been made within the Precept)

It was resolved that Cllrs Anderson and Brookes should comprise this group

- To establish relationships with the voluntary sector with a view to procuring support for such projects that the Council might undertake from time to time.

It was resolved that Cllr Anderson and Dodd should comprise this group

It was suggested that members who are not part of any particular working group but feel that they have beneficial input to give should contact the working group members so that their ideas may be taken into account in arriving at recommended conclusions.

It was noted that each group should now undertake such investigation as necessary and provide a written report of recommendation for the consideration of this Council at its July meeting or later as practicable.

25/12 LALC

It was resolved that this Council should become a member of LALC from 1st July 2012, the fee for the first year being on a pro rata basis to the normal annual subscription.

26/12 PRESTON AREA COMMITTEE

It was resolved that this Council should become a member of the Preston Area Committee and that Cllrs Brookes and Ellison would be this Council's regular members and would invite one other member to attend along with them on a rotational basis so that all members were given the opportunity to take part.

It was noted that a short report should be provided back to this Council concerning any pertinent points discussed at these meetings which are relevant to this Council. Full minutes produced by the Secretary of the Committee are produced and will be circulated as and when received for information purposes. Items requiring a decision of this Council will be placed to the agenda.

This committee is formed from PCC local councils who wish to attend – the first part of the meeting is open to all local councils whilst the second part of it is only open to LALC members

27/12 LDF SITE ALLOCATIONS PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Members had been asked to consider making representation regarding the LDF Site Allocations Preferred Options Consultation papers details of which had previously been advised to members. A proposed response was enclosed with the agenda (*prepared by working group appointed at the last meeting to undertake same*)

It was resolved that the proposed response provided by the working group should be accepted and forwarded to Preston City Council for their consideration as below:

Local Development Framework Sites for Preston Response to the Preferred Options Consultation Document

The Ingol and Tanterton Neighbourhood Council would respond to the Sites for Preston Preferred Options consultation document as follows.

Background

The Planning Inspector, at the examination stage of the published Core Strategy document required that Preston City Council identify sufficient land for housing such as to provide a supply based upon the former Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) requirement of 507 units per annum over a plan period of fifteen years until 2026.

The published Core Strategy document has identified both Cottam and Higher Bartle as 'Strategic Sites', ie local areas for growth, around which future housing development will be concentrated in the North West of Preston.

The nett result is that a substantial area of what is currently green field, bounded by Lightfoot Lane/Hoyles Lane, Sandy Lane, the M55 motorway and Garstang Road are being promoted for housing development; through the 'Sites for Preston Preferred Options' consultation document. This area is referred to by the generic term 'North West Preston'.

Sites within Ingol and Tanterton

Tulketh High School; site ref: HS1.19

This site has been identified as providing some thirty houses. The allocated area is a former orchard, now a significant green space in the grounds of Tulketh High School. The main Tulketh High School building is no longer in use and is currently mothballed. The future of the school building is uncertain. The site is a highly visible green space as you enter Ingol from the South. The adjacent road network suffers from chronic flooding problems which are as yet unresolved. Schools form part of the overall infrastructure provision. The future provision of some four thousand plus houses in the North West of Preston is to generate a review of the whole infrastructure provision. The outcome of this review is uncertain; particularly in respect of future secondary schools provision. The Preferred Options document addresses primary school provision; it does not address secondary school provision. It has to be demonstrated that the site is surplus to future need.

Until such a review is undertaken it is recommended that the site is not taken forward in the Sites for Preston Preferred Options.

Land North of/adjacent to Tom Benson Way; site ref: HS1.23

This site lies between Tom Benson Way and the Lancaster Canal. The site has its own dedicated access off Tom Benson Way via the UCLAN Sports roundabout. It will also have direct access to the proposed Ingol and Cottam railway station. In the immediate vicinity are the Ribble Link top lock and mooring/turning area, Halsam Park, UCLAN Sports, the potentially re opened Ingol golf course, a proposed Tesco store, a proposed marina and a proposed nature reserve to be allocated as part of that development. There is also the provision of some further four thousand plus homes at Cottam Hall, Cottam Brickworks and 'North West Preston' sites to consider.

There is no objection to the site being allocated for housing. However, it is considered that this site, if allocated for housing, would represent a missed opportunity. The Lancaster Canal currently has no defined end in Preston. There is no 'destination' as such. The extension of the current mooring/turning area to form a marina/boat yard and the provision of a visitor centre on the site would provide such a

destination with a variety of complementary associated activities. It would become a readily accessible destination of choice. There would also be the potential for further local employment opportunities in what is currently categorised as a deprived area.

It is recommended that the site be developed along the lines noted above rather than allocated for housing. If housing is to be taken forward then any 'Design and Access' criteria must take account of the proximity of the Lancaster Canal and Tom Benson Way.

Proposed Ingol and Cottam Railway Station

The 1975 plan for the development of the Central Lancashire New Town included a new railway station at Ingol and Cottam. To date this has failed to come to fruition. The proposal is included in the current Preferred Options document for the period 2018-2026. Its continued inclusion is to be welcomed.

However, the Blackpool to Preston line is currently being electrified as part of the Network Rail 'Northern Hub' proposal. The proposed construction of a new railway station a mere five years after the electrification works are completed is not considered cost effective. Indeed, it might result in extended further delays to the provision of the proposed railway station.

It is strongly recommended that discussions are held with Network Rail, Lancashire County Council and UCLAN as a matter of some urgency such that:

- ◆ either the construction of the proposed railway station is brought forward for inclusion into the current 'Northern Hub' electrification works programme
- ◆ or provision is made in the current 'Northern Hub' electrification works for the ready incorporation of a new railway station.

There are potential cost and delivery implications in not doing so. The timely provision of a new railway station would complement the development of the adjacent site North of Tom Benson Way, reference H1.23, development of Cottam Hall, development of Cottam Brickworks and the UCLAN Sports facility in the manner noted previously.

Area of Major Open Space (principally the Ingol Golf Course)

The designation of the Ingol Golf Course, the adjacent amenity space lands currently in the ownership of HCA and the Tulketh High School playing fields as an 'Area of Major Open Space' is to be welcomed.

Given the proposals to develop Cottam, together with 'North West Preston' as a significant 'Preferred Site', it is considered that there is now an overwhelming case to ensure retention of this 'Area of Major Open Space' in its totality. The level of housing development proposed will increase the need and demand for a readily accessible golf course and also for informal publicly accessible greenspace for walking and informal recreation.

However, the designation of 'Areas of Major Open Space' given in clause EN3 does not reflect the proposed rewrite of Core Strategy Policy 19 as accepted by the Preston LDF planning team and the Planning Inspector at the recent resumed Core Strategy Housing examination. Indeed clause EN3 is currently worded in terms that 'development will be permitted provided that....'. This is contrary to the terms in which all other environmental clauses in the Sites for Preston Preferred Options consultation are expressed. These are generally worded in terms of 'development will be limited to....', 'development will be restricted....', or 'development will not be permitted unless....'. This latter wording might better accord with the 'as published' version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) document in respect of sustainable development and the protection afforded by the 'open spaces' provisions.

The designation and extent of the 'Area of Major Open Space' is welcomed. It is recommended that the current wording in the Preferred Options paper in respect of the 'Areas of Major Open Space', Policy EN3, together with Policy EN5 in respect of 'Protection of Existing Green Infrastructure', require to be reviewed and re drafted to to give the degree of protection envisaged in the recently accepted re draft of Core Strategy Policy 19.

Sites adjacent to Ingol and Tanterton

North West Preston; sites ref: HS1.4, HS1.5 and HS1.6

The Public Examination of the Core Strategy has determined that Preston City Council identify sufficient sites for some eight thousand plus houses by 2026. That figure is a given, it is not open to debate. Preston City Council have already identified housing renewals and brownfield sites. This still

leaves what are effectively greenfield sites for the provision of some five thousand plus homes. Current planning permissions/applications at Whittingham Hospital, Haydock Grange, Cottam Hall and Cottam Brickworks will account for approximately half of this total. This still leaves some two thousand five hundred houses. Given the concerted efforts of landowners and developers to put forward land North of Lightfoot Lane/Hoyles Lane, Preston City Council have identified sites reference HS1.3, HS1.4, HS1.5 and HS1.6, identified collectively as 'North West Preston'. These sites are to be delivered in a phased manner, East to West. The 'Sites for Preston Preferred Options' consultation document recognises the importance of delivering the supporting infrastructure in a similar manner, see Policy MD2. However, that supporting infrastructure has yet to be fully identified and costed.

Given the requirements placed upon the City Council planners to provide for some five thousand plus houses, 'North West Preston' is accepted as a Preferred Option, with the proviso that development is phased and that delivery of the supporting infrastructure is also phased to complement the development.

Cottam Hall; site ref: HS1.1

This site is currently subject to a Planning Application by the HCA for some twelve hundred houses. The development would complete the whole of the Cottam site as originally envisaged and promoted by CLDC, predecessor to HCA, some thirty plus years ago. The major infrastructure put in place some thirty years ago by CLDC was intended to complement the completed Cottam development.

The proposals for Cottam Hall are considered acceptable.

Cottam Brickworks; site ref: HS1.1

The site has received planning permission for the food/retail store. Further planning applications for some two hundred houses/apartments and a marina are anticipated to complete the proposed development of Cottam Brickworks. The development is on a brownfield site. The proposals would create some two hundred plus permanent jobs in an area of deprivation. The proposed marina would enhance the leisure use of the Lancaster Canal.

The proposals for Cottam Brickworks are considered acceptable.

Principal Issues

Infrastructure provision

The principal objection heard to any further development in the North West of Preston is that 'the existing infrastructure will not be able to cope'. This comment usually refers to the transport infrastructure but includes the wider supporting infrastructure such as schools, health centres, etc. The requirement to upgrade the existing infrastructure is fully recognised in the 'Sites for Preston Preferred Options' paper. However, assessment of the required transport infrastructure will not be available until September 2012 at the earliest.

The provision of new infrastructure associated with housing, and other development, will in future be primarily funded through the 'Community Infrastructure Levy' or CIL. In respect of housing, the CIL is simply a charge on a developer, payable to the local Planning Authority, calculated on the gross plan area of the houses at a unit rate per square meter. The CIL for any development is payable within sixty days of commencement of the development.

The proposed further development of Cottam Hall (site ref. HS1.1) will effectively complete the works initiated by the former CLDC in the North West of Preston, for which CLDC provided the primary supporting infrastructure. On completion of Cottam Hall, that infrastructure may be assumed to be operating close to capacity, be it roads, schools, health facilities etc. Why otherwise would CLDC provide any more than they reasonably fore saw was necessary at that time?

The further developments making up 'North West Preston' plus Cottam Brickworks will require to utilise that existing infrastructure. Those same developments will be phased over some fifteen plus years. The required upgrading and provision of new infrastructure will also be phased. There may well be improvements to the infrastructure that are by necessity required early in that process; typically significant improvements to Tom Benson Way/Eastway/Broughton roundabout and also Lea Road. Providing these significant improvements may well create a funding gap between what is raised

through the CIL on the early developments and the provision of the infrastructure improvements; much as per the current scenario with the Broughton by pass and development at Whittingham Hospital. Lancashire CC have difficulty in funding that gap in the immediate future to the extent that it is still doubtful if the by pass will be constructed as envisaged. It is currently under review. Previously, in the development of Preston, HM Treasury through CLDC funded that gap with CLDC also acting as the development agency. In the current proposals, that development agency is not readily identified. It needs to be. The problem arises because Preston CC are responsible for promoting the Local Plan but Lancashire CC are responsible for providing much of the primary infrastructure.

The argument relates to concerns already expressed as to the adequacy of existing infrastructure. This is recognised in the Preferred Options paper. The Preferred Options paper refers to development being phased. What is not discussed in any depth is the provision, phasing and adequate funding of the necessary infrastructure that supports such development. It is noted that the Transport Review is due to be presented in September 2012; some twelve months earlier than initially envisaged. That Transport Review needs to be thorough and comprehensive and include phasing and funding proposals. This is also true for the other primary infrastructure proposals such as schools, health centres, sewerage, drainage etc. Otherwise the required primary infrastructure will not be delivered timeously, if at all, to the satisfaction of the existing and future residents.

Tulketh High School

With the proposed development of some four thousand homes in the North West of Preston by 2026, the provision of sufficient school facilities will be paramount. Expansion of the primary school facilities is identified in the proposals for the completion of the Cottam Hall development. What is not identified in the Preferred Options paper is the requirement for and provision of further secondary school facilities, if at all. Tulketh High School was recently closed and the main building mothballed. Part of the site is proposed for a small scale housing development. It is recommended that with the scale of development proposed for North West Preston that a review of the provision of school facilities is undertaken, particularly in respect of retaining the existing site at Tulketh High School for future use, if not the existing main building.

Area of Major Open Space

It is considered that the current wording in the Preferred Options paper in respect of the 'Areas of Major Open Space', Policy EN3, together with Policy EN5 in respect of 'Protection of Existing Green Infrastructure', require to be reviewed and re worded to to give the degree of protection envisaged in the recently accepted re draft of Core Strategy Policy 19.

Summary and Recommendations

Ingol and Tanterton will be directly affected by the major developments proposed for North West Preston. The timeous phased provision of adequately funded infrastructure will be key to the proposed development.

'North West Preston' is accepted as a Preferred Option, with the proviso that development is phased and that delivery of the supporting infrastructure is also adequately funded and phased to complement the development.

The scale of the proposed developments in North West Preston require the 'Areas of Major Open Space' to satisfy the need for and provide the recreational and environmental open space for the area. Adequate protection of these Open Spaces

in totality is required through both the Core Strategy document, the Preferred Options paper and the Development Plan Documents.

The Tulketh High School site is not taken forward until a review of schools provision has been undertaken.

Construction of the proposed railway station at Ingol and Cottam is brought forward for inclusion into the current 'Northern Hub' electrification works programme or provision is made in the current 'Northern Hub' electrification works for the ready incorporation of a new railway station.

Land North of/adjacent to Tom Benson Way is considered for an extension of the current canal link mooring/turning area to form a marina/boat yard with the provision of a visitor centre/attraction on the site to provide a 'destination of choice'.

30/12 BUSINESS CARDS

Members had been asked to consider whether this Council wished to arrange for the production of business cards for its members incorporating its brand logo once agreed.

It was resolved that the Clerk would investigate the production of NC business cards once a Council logo had been agreed.

31/12 HI VIS VESTS

Members had been asked to consider whether this Council wished to purchase Hi Vis vests for the use of members and officers when undertaking outside research or site visits as part of enhancing the profile of the NC. Costs had been estimated to be in the region of £5.00 per vest including printing 'Ingol & Tanterton NC'

It was resolved that it would be appropriate to purchase Hi Vis vests with the NC name printed thereon.

It was noted that Lea and Cottam will shortly have available blank once used vests which will be surplus to their requirements. Enquiries will be made to purchase these at a reduced cost and local arrangements made to print this Council's name on them.

Chairman