

Minutes of on-line Heritage Meeting, Monday, January 11th at 2.00pm

1. In attendance: Helen Fuller, Chris Jackson, Maureen Hassell, Ray Hassell, Drew Bellis Apologies from Andy Ankers
2. Both sets of minutes from the last 2 meetings (30/11/20 and 21/12/20) were agreed.
3. The draft "Summary of Special Interest" and CAA documents were commented on.

The SSI had a few minor alterations: 1. The Church Field mentioned is in fact the Parish Field 2. There are 2 working farms not 3 3. Hall Farm is not yet listed 4. More support is needed for Green spaces within the document.

The CAA document was commented on next. Chris pointed out that there were several alterations /additions to be considered:

P1 Photo of Anvil Lodge to be redone (Chris will send Jeannie a replacement)

P2 Suggested remove the word **Extensive** from the line "extensive modern buildings to support their use ". It was mentioned that apart from one or two new additions to the farms it could not considered to be extensive additions.

P3 Ad text in yellow: including the former village cricket pitch, **owned by Peel, and rented by Cranks**, partly enclosed by stone walls.

P5 The village Hall was gifted to the village in the last century so the line:

"It has only recently been passed to the village in trust, following suffering a period of neglect." Needs to be removed and the following added- **"The village hall was given to the village in trust during the last century but has now been passed on to the Parish Council who has planned an extensive programme of maintenance for it.**

P5/6 The mention of concrete post which "should be avoided" is perhaps true but in the case of Badger Cottage there was a gate where the posts were, and the retaining wall has been left in place. The fence is for privacy. Could more be made of the fact that this wall continues along The Greenway and around to Kinsey's Lane (North) showing that the village was once surrounded by a wall. It is the aim of the parish to re do the wall, where possible, to recreate the circular theme of the original design. It is also the aim that any remaining walls are listed.

The Beeches is **Beech House**

P13 add **weddings and gatherings**

Refer to Ince Park as **Ince Hall Park** as Ince park is now the name given to the industrial part of the marshes.

Remove "Dominated by powerful landowners" as we need to work alongside industry (although we like the term) rather than upset them too much. Add **"It is perhaps fair to say that the predominant landowners, unlike those of the past, have a limited common interest with the village or in maintaining its special interest. They do, however, help to support and fund Parish Council projects.**

P14 No 7 is best referred to as **Beech House**

P15 The reservoir **is part of the Mersey Forest** but owned by CWaC

Remove and training horses as the tenant only does this for herself.

Add **facilities of Ince Hall which included beautifully set out gardens and tennis court as well as a fishing lake.**

P16 could a reference be made to the document on Green Spaces (yet to be finalised) here.

Add to section on footpaths "some have been lost including their interconnectivity due **to industrial development. These have been well used in the past by walkers, cyclists, and horse riders alike and it would be beneficial to have them reinstated as far as is possible.**

Reference is made to Cycle route 5-Add **horse riders** to list of users. Reference to poor condition, although correct, is not directly due to lorries crossing as it is a restricted byway and only farm tractors and maintenance vehicles have limited access which is seldom used. It would be better to add **that it is poorly maintained** (throwing the responsibility on to Peel and CWaC). We need to accurate about access here.

P17 Add reference again to Views Document (yet to be completed)

P18 Add to Important views into the Conservation area

View south from Fens Wood towards village with church in the background

Add to Important views out of the Conservation area **View from Kinsey's Lane (North)over the fields adjoining the North Hills towards the estuary**

View from The North Hills extensive views of the estuary and Liverpool Cathedrals

View from the Cricket field towards the estuary

P18 no building at risk

P19 Can we tone down negative aspects i.e.

Similarly, the introduction of contemporary fence panels and concrete posts is negative, even intrusive, as it is suburban rather than rural in character (remove highlighted section)

The area of private land enclosed by Ince Manor, Monastery Cottages and Park Cottages provides vehicular access and parking for these dwellings. but it has the character of a service yard, with several temporary structures, which also screen the historic structures.

Remove underlined text and add This area could be improved for its historic character to be maintained.

The owners are very much in support of the NPlan and would be very upset by the former comments.

Mention of development opportunities Add Also to the north which has well utilised agricultural land as well as having beautiful views.

P20 highlighted area is fine

P22 The Cottage

P23 Chez Nous

We need to add The North Hills here, particularly as it has the Roman Fortlet. Mention needs to be given at some point to the use of the North Hills as a Shooting Club (over 60 members). Is it possible to stretch the Conservation area to the two fields opposite Wood Farm field (due to views and important agricultural land)? The fortlet is not mentioned at all and is important. The Gun Turret is on the North Hills and is not down on items to be listed or considered for Non designated items.

Wherever recreational aspects are mentioned we need to ensure it is walkers, cyclists, and horse riders.

Helen mentioned that she needed to check the list of heritage assets as she thought there might be some missing-the Roman Fortlet is not mentioned.

Also the gun turret is not on the list of Non-designated assets and we had suggested that it should be listed .

Drew mentioned that there was an old iron gate above the abutments of the bridge over Water Lane but not sure how old it is . He also mentioned the "beacon" on the canal but no one seems to be able to say what exactly it is.

There were no further comments to make about the CAA document but as Drew had not yet read it (due to his PC being unavailable) he would do so and let us know if he had any further comments to make. These would be needed by the week end as there is a further meeting on Monday 18th with Jeannie , Chris and Helen to discuss the document .

4. The Non -designates assets tasks were next reviewed. The list is not yet finalised due to Drew's PC having problems. It was decided that any remaining items should be sent to Helen to pull together .This includes:

*The Village Hall-Maureen to do (Chris to send info that she has on hall)

*Decoy Wood-Chris

*Big Wood-Chris has info but no photos

*Ince Hall Park field-Chris

*Badger Cottage -Maureen

These to be sent by end of week .

5. The final Green Spaces Document and the Views Document have yet to be finalised. Drew has put them on Google (public doc) for team to comment on. Chris will pull these together as documents by the week end .

6. **AOB** Chris mentioned the Lost Footpaths and Bridleways document that she sent out to the Heritage group. This will be sent out to the rest of the team and discussed at the Steering group meeting on the 25th January.

Helen wanted verification of the TPOs on the Cricket field and Drew was able to show a map with this on.

We need to check with Jeannie what protection Big Wood has on it . It appears that Decoy Wood does not have any protection but this again needs checking (ask James Dixon)

Tasks from last meeting -all have been completed except *contact with Liverpool University (due to Lockdown) *not all photos have been scanned on the map (due to PC breakdown)

7. Date of next meeting was set for February 15th at 2.00pm

The meeting finished at 3.25