

# Bunbury Parish Council

## MINUTES

of the meeting held at The Jubilee Pavilion, Bunbury, on

**Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> October 2025 at 7.20pm**

**Present:** Councillors: Peter Gorman, Nick Parker, Matthew Randall, Phil Spencer, Richard Slater (Chair) and Mike Thomas.

**In attendance:** Maximilian Clay - Clerk to the Council and 2 members of the public.

### **Oct25-1. Apologies**

Cllr Thomson had submitted apologies. The Clerk reported formally that Cllrs Brookfield and Spencer had both resigned from the Council and the Council expressed thanks for their work on behalf of the village.

### **Oct25-2. Declarations of Interest and Dispensation Considerations**

Cllr Thomas declared in interest in item 7.a.iv due to being a neighbour.

Cllr Slater declared an interest in item 7.a.ii due to being a neighbour.

### **Oct25-3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

In item 9, the phrase 'Core of' was replaced with 'zone across'. Subject to this amendment, the Council resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on the 9<sup>th</sup> July 2025 were a true record and that the Chair be authorised to sign them as such.

### **Oct25-4. Unitary Authority Councillor Report**

Borough Cllr Posnett reported that:

- There had been two major Cheshire East Council (CEC) votes, the first related to support for a devolved mayoral authority to incorporate CEC, Cheshire West and Chester and Warrington. This would come with initial Government funding of £650m and eligibility to bid for further funding. Such funding is already available to existing Mayoral Strategic Authorities (MSAs) and Cheshire is at a significant disadvantage at present because most areas in the North West are already covered by MSAs. B Cllr Posnett voted for the proposals against her party's whip as she believed that they were in the best interests of residents and she had been unwilling to vote against her conscience. As a consequence she is now an un-aligned independent member.

The second vote was on a proposal for Cheshire East to move from a committee system to a cabinet system. Both votes were carried and B Cllr Posnett felt that this would streamline processes and represent an improvement in the efficiency and speed at which decisions can be made.

- The gullies on Bunbury Lane will be cleaned between 3<sup>rs</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> November.

### **Oct25-5. Public Forum**

A member of the public had circulated a diagram showing points in the village where parking would be limited under the no parking within 10m of a junction (about two car-lengths plus a metre) which shows that there are many areas where cars park currently are actually parking illegally. He also thanked the Council for the litter-picking service and for taking action on overgrown hedges.

### **Oct25-6. Members' Reports & Items for Future Agendas**

- Cllr Parker reported that he could organise the Christmas tree for erection on the 30<sup>th</sup> November and taking down on the 11<sup>th</sup> January and could obtain a wreath for Remembrance Day. He had contacted Nick Kirkam on behalf of the Playing Fields committee concerning the gate posts.
- Cllr Gorman pointed out that the two fields either side of Footpath 17 had been put up for sale.

- Cllr Randall reported that the Footpath sign by Roselea had been accidentally cut down; he will be in touch with the Public Right of Way team at CEC to instigate replacement.
- Cllr Slater pointed out that, following recent resignations, there were now four vacancies and he felt that the Council seek to identify suitable people to co-opt as soon as possible. Potential candidates should be encouraged to attend a Council Meeting before applying for vacancies.
- Following reports of large groups of cyclists in the village, and especially at Saddlers Wells, Cllr Thomas reported that he had seen them and that they were mainly very young people below teenage.

## **Oct25-7.Planning**

### **a. Responses to Application Consultations:**

#### **i. 25/2797/HOUS: Cobblestones, College Lane, Bunbury**

*Proposed single storey rear extension and proposed detached garage.*

In discussion it was noted that the building and site had been in a derelict state when the applicants had purchased it and the Planning Authority should be encouraged to allow the site to be made fully workable. Several plans had been submitted and supported by the Council but refused by the Planning Authority. It was felt that this was regrettable and the Council resolved to support the application.

#### **7.a.ii to 7.a.v**

As a pre-cursor to discussion of the following applications it was pointed out that the application was one of several to have come forward from the same applicant, Peckforton Estates, and the Clerk reported that he, the Chair and Vice-chair had attended a meeting with the Agents for Peckforton Estates, at their request. The discussion had seemed constructive and the agents had expressed a wish to bring forward proposals in sympathy with the Neighbourhood Plan, in terms of scale and location.

#### **ii. 25/3507/PIP: Land West of A49 Whitchurch Road, Bunbury**

*Permission in principle for erection of up to 3 No. dwellings and associated infrastructure works.*

(Cllr Gorman in the Chair)

In discussion it was pointed out that the application is acknowledged by the applicants to breach several planning policies but that it had been submitted following the Government's increase in the Housing Land Supply targets and the consequent under-supply in Cheshire East's housing land plans. It was noted that a proposed new town within Cheshire East at Adlington will provide 14,000 houses and is being brought forward under the New Towns Programme - this would more than address any housing land supply issues. It was also noted that:

- Despite the putative housing land supply shortage, plans should still be considered against these policies because it is only the *balance* of considerations that is tilted in favour of development, rather than a blanket and automatic approval.
- Bunbury has experienced significant aggregate development over the past ten years with well over the originally anticipated number of homes being built and significant out-standing approvals.
- The proposed development is neither infill nor affordable housing but is outside the settlement boundary *and* in open countryside. This means that it breaches the need for such applications to be either infill nor affordable housing.
- While the tilted balance may militate towards approval, the impact on the road infrastructure must still be considered and several village roads already struggle to cope with the existing demands made of them (for example, Bunbury Lane, the Triangle and School Lane).
- Whilst many day to day needs can be met within the village (although there is no butcher as claimed in the application) there is very little employment in the village. In this context it is difficult to justify development as sustainable.
- The access road is narrow and it seems that there would be no way of widening this to an acceptably safe level, given the surrounding building.
- The proposed development would overlook smaller neighbouring properties to an unacceptable level.

The Council resolved to object to the application and to request that B Cllr Posnett call-in

the application.

**iii. 25/3508/PIP: Land Off College Lane/Vicarage Lane, Bunbury**

*Permission in principle for demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 5 No. dwellings (C3) and associated infrastructure works.*

(Cllr Slater resumed the Chair)

In discussion it was pointed out that the application is acknowledged by the applicants to breach several planning policies but that it had been submitted following the Government's increase in the Housing Land Supply targets and the consequent under-supply in Cheshire East's housing land plans. It was noted that a proposed new town within Cheshire East at Adlington will provide 14,000 houses and is being brought forward under the New Towns Programme - this would more than address any housing land supply issues. It was also noted that:

- Despite the putative housing land supply shortage, plans should still be considered against these policies because it is only the *balance* of considerations that is tilted in favour of development, rather than a blanket and automatic approval.
  - Bunbury has experienced significant aggregate development over the past ten years with well over the originally anticipated number of homes being built and significant out-standing approvals.
  - The proposed development is neither infill nor affordable housing but is outside the settlement boundary *and* in open countryside. This means that it breaches the need for such applications to be either infill nor affordable housing.
  - While the tilted balance may militate towards approval, the impact on the road infrastructure must still be considered and several village roads already struggle to cope with the existing demands made of them (for example, Bunbury Lane, the Triangle and School Lane).
  - Whilst many day to day needs can be met within the village (although there is no butcher as claimed in the application) there is very little employment in the village. In this context it is difficult to justify development as sustainable.
  - Although the applicant states that they will address matters relating to Heritage at such time as a Stage 2 application is made, the Council considered it important that the impact of any development on the built heritage of the village is considered as a matter of principal.
- The Council resolved to object to the application and to request that B Cllr Posnett call-in the application.

**iv. 25/3510/PIP: Land Off Saddlers Wells, Bunbury**

*Permission in principle for the erection of up to 2 No. dwellings (C3) and associated infrastructure works.*

In discussion it was pointed out that the application is acknowledged by the applicants to breach several planning policies but that it had been submitted following the Government's increase in the Housing Land Supply targets and the consequent under-supply in Cheshire East's housing land plans. It was noted that a proposed new town within Cheshire East at Adlington will provide 14,000 houses and is being brought forward under the New Towns Programme - this would more than address any housing land supply issues. It was also noted that:

- Despite the housing land supply shortage, plans should still be considered against these policies because it is only the *balance* of considerations that is tilted in favour of development, rather than a blanket and automatic approval.
- Bunbury has experienced significant aggregate development over the past ten years with well over the originally anticipated number of homes being built and significant out-standing approvals.
- The proposed development is neither infill nor affordable housing but is outside the settlement boundary *and* in open countryside. This means that it breaches the need for such applications to be either infill nor affordable housing.
- While the tilted balance may militate towards approval, the impact on the road infrastructure must still be considered and several village roads already struggle to cope with the existing demands made of them (for example, Bunbury Lane, the Triangle and School Lane).
- Whilst many day to day needs can be met within the village (although there is no butcher

as claimed in the application) there is very little employment in the village. In this context it is difficult to justify development as sustainable.

The Council resolved to object to the application and to request that B Cllr Posnett call-in the application.

**v. 25/3509/PIP: Land East Of Wyche Road, Bunbury**

*Permission in Principle for Erection of up to 2 no. dwellings (C3) and associated infrastructure work*

In discussion it was again pointed out that the application is acknowledged by the applicants to breach several planning policies but that it had been submitted following the Government's increase in the Housing Land Supply targets and the consequent under-supply in Cheshire East's housing land plans. It was noted that a proposed new town within Cheshire East at Adlington will provide 14,000 houses and is being brought forward under the New Towns Programme - this would more than address any housing land supply issues. It was also noted that:

- Despite the putative housing land supply shortage, plans should still be considered against these policies because it is only the *balance* of considerations that is tilted in favour of development, rather than a blanket and automatic approval.
- Bunbury has experienced significant aggregate development over the past ten years with well over the originally anticipated number of homes being built and significant out-standing approvals.
- The proposed development is neither infill nor affordable housing but is outside the settlement boundary *and* in open countryside. This means that it breaches the need for such applications to be either infill nor affordable housing.
- While the tilted balance may militate towards approval, the impact on the road infrastructure must still be considered and several village roads already struggle to cope with the demands made of them (for example, Bunbury Lane, the Triangle and School Lane).
- Whilst many day to day needs can be met within the village (although there is no butcher as claimed in the application) there is very little employment in the village. In this context it is difficult to justify development as sustainable.
- The lane is extremely narrow and close to junctions, making this a dangerous and unsuitable location for further housing.
- The site falls partly in the conservation area and although the applicant states that they will address matters relating to Heritage at such time as a Stage 2 application is made, the Council considered it important that the impact of any development on the built heritage of the village is considered as a matter of principal.

The Council resolved to object to the application and to request that B Cllr Posnett call-in the application.

**b. Updates on Application Consultations considered previously or other planning matters.**

**i Heath House, Whitchurch Road, Bunbury**

- *Proposed removal of a later post-war lean-to extension and replacement with reconfigured single-storey rear extension - NMA.* This application had been refused but it was understood that a new application (in substantive form) had been submitted and the Council resolved to delegate a response to the Clerk.

- *Proposal to convert a paddock into part of the curtilage of the house (garden).* This application had been refused.

**Oct25-8. Training**

The Council resolved to approve the attendance of Cllr Slater at a ChALC training event on Meetings and Procedures, at a cost of £25. It was noted that new Councillors should be encouraged to undertake the training for new councillors run on-line by ChALC.

**Oct25-9. Traffic Management Working Group Report**

- a. 20mph Zone** - The Clerk reported that he had eventually received a response to the Council's own response to the refusal to agree the change of speed limit but that this had also failed to respond to the actual points made. It was resolved that the Clerk would send all the correspondence to date to the Head of Highways and ask for re-consideration of the matter.

- b. Leaflets** - Cllr Gorman asked whether Members were happy with the presentation of the leaflets relating to parking on pavements and parking in inappropriate places (the texts had been agreed at the previous meeting). The presentation was agreed to be satisfactory and, following discussion about the use of the leaflets, it was resolved that they would be trialled by the Council for a month but that the leaflets would not be made available for use by the public at this stage. It was further resolved that the focus would be on the main routes through the village and the results would be reviewed at the following meeting; 200 of each leaflet would be printed professionally, on shiny paper, and distributed to Members.

#### **Oct25-10. Clerk's Report**

The Clerk reported that:

- Christmas arrangements (already planned and budgeted for) would need to be organised. It was agreed that Cllr Parker would organise the tree and that the Clerk would book Crew Brass Band for Christmas Eve, as normal. A new Megaphone had been acquired last year and it was suggested that it could be tested for efficacy at the next meeting.
- There had been a problem with the emptying of the large hopper-bins at the car park and he asked that Councillors keep an eye out on any traffic blockages that would prevent the bins being emptied.
- Bunbury Lane will be closed between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> November for the jetting of gullies.

#### **Oct25-11. Newsletter Content and Planning**

As the meeting was running late it was resolved to finalise content by email.

#### **Oct25-12. Finance & Governance**

- a. Insurance** - The best quote had been for renewal with Hiscox at a cost of £4,260 (previous year £4,179). The Clerk also recommended that we renew on a three year agreement as the current three year agreement had come to an end. The Agreement guarantees no increases beyond the CPI indexed increase (other than changes to the policy instigated by the Council) and had saved money in the past. The Council resolved to renew with Hiscox on the three year agreement.
- b. Receipts and Payments** - Members received the schedule of receipts and payments and approved the payments and that the outgoing Chair be authorised to countersign the payments on behalf of the Council.

#### **Oct25-13. Items for the WhatsApp Bulletin**

It was resolved to include tree of the month, planning issues and councillor recruitment.

**The meeting closed at 9.44pm**

*Signed as a true record by authority of the Council*

*Chair:*

**Date: 10<sup>th</sup> December 2025**