

Minutes of the meeting of the Stebbing neighbourhood plan steering group

3rd September, 2018. Friends Meeting House, Stebbing

1. Members Present

John Evans
Christina Cant
Val Stokes
Bernard Bazley
Andrew Martin
Judith Farr
The Secretary

2. Apologies for absence

Jackie Kingdom

3. Approval of Notes of 31st July 2018

In the absence of the Clerk at the last meeting only brief notes were taken, these were agreed at the meeting, Bernard confirmed that they had been uploaded to the website.

4. Public Questions

There were no members of the public in attendance.

5. Regulation 19 UDC Representation

John confirmed that the regulation 19 comments from the steering group were submitted on time, and he thanked Andrew for his input to this. John confirmed that he had received a copy of the Parish Councils comments and these have been circulated. John said that this was the first time that the steering group had made any representations in its own name and at the last working group meeting, surprise was expressed that the Parish Council had not told the group what was being done in relation to their representation given that the group would not want to say anything contradictory to the Parish Council, John asked whether the group felt that there should or could have been more interaction / collaboration between the Parish Council and Steering group prior to their submission. Christina said that she felt it appeared to be criticism of the Parish Council, but it didn't receive a copy of its representation from JB Planning until the Friday before the deadline and that documents don't become public until they have been agreed by the Parish Council. The Clerk confirmed that this was the case and that once the representation had been agreed by the Parish Council on the Monday and submitted to UDC later that day, it then became a public document, a copy was then sent to the Chair of Steering group.

Andrew said that the protocol was frustrating, he felt that informal dialogue between the Parish Council and the steering group may have been constructive, but as it turned out the 2 submissions are different in style and major on different issues and are therefore very complimentary, there was only one minor point raised by JB on the Steering Groups submission that was sorted out. The Clerk re-iterated that the Parish Council did not have sight of the proposed submission by JB until the Friday prior to the submission date and were therefore unaware of its content until that time, the Parish Council does not recommend to JB what it wants to say, it asks JB to recommend to the Parish Council what response should be made. Christina added that asking JB

planning to liaise with the Steering Group regarding the response could have incurred extra costs and this is something that the Parish Council are very mindful of. Christina added that she felt that the 2 submissions are from different angles and are very different. Christina added that the Steering Groups submission was sent to JB planning to check that there were no contradictions.

Andrew said that it was unclear what was happening with the Braintree Plan as Colchester have not made a decision as yet following the last letter from the inspector, which in his reading of it appeared to lean towards option1 which is to delete the garden communities part of the plan which would allow the examination to continue. Braintree and Tendring have made their mind up on their response which is to go with option 2 which is to continue with the plan and plug the gaps in it submission but Colchester is split, The Conservative group want to take option 1 and drop at least one of the garden communities from the plan, but as there is no overall majority of the Colchester Planning Committee, there was supposed to be a meeting 3/4 weeks ago but this was pulled at the last minute and there is no date set at present. The Conservative group takes the same view a Pritti Patel that the plan is too ambitious and at least 1 of the proposals should be withdrawn. Christina asked where this left Braintree as some of their housing numbers were part of the West Tey proposal that comes under Colchester. Andrew replied that it was a mess, if Colchester decided to go with option1, where does that leave the 3 authorities regarding the North Essex Garden Communities consortium, John said that company constitution when he last looked, each had an equal vote. The constitution would need to be altered to enable Tendring and Braintree to continue without Colchester. John added that the government came out with a garden communities announcement last week supporting the concept of garden communities that is supposed to deliver 200.000 homes in 23 sites around the country by the middle of the century, but typically there is no central funding available for infrastructure etc, Andrew added that the only funding available is for the evidence base.

At the last working party meeting Jackie did mention that in the interest of inter-relationship, it might be that Sandi Merifield might like to come along to one of the meetings.

6. Call for Sites – Discussion

Andrew said that now that the call for sites was closed, he needed to catch up with any latecomers, John added that at the last working group meeting he said would create a list of all the sites so these can then be assessed and refer then to locality. The Clerk added that he had received an email asking what the likely timescale for a response to the sites submitted was going to be. John said that when this was discussed previously, it was decided that the group would not be going back to individuals but just seek the advice of the independent consultant one the group had done its own consolidation of views, it was agreed that this position as not changed. Andrew said that there were 19 sites identified by the group plus approximately 5/6 that have been submitted by individuals / companies. John added that he would put some words together to go into the draft plan in relation to what the group has done and the steps that have been taken regarding housing allocation, but without going into quality / assessment. Andrew said that there were guidelines in the locality document that could be used that had been well tested.

7. Locality

Andrew said that he had not spoken to Locality as yet, he was awaiting the consolidation of the groups sites and the ones put forward. He has the form that has to be completed which is 13 pages long and will probably require some input from Francine. Andrew added that we had already passed the first hurdle and identified that we were eligible, we have to complete the 13

page form to assess exactly what technical advice they can give us and the costs. Once the question have been answered, it will go to Aecom who will draft the scope of work that is required. It has already been identified that there may be a conflict of interests with Aecom, so it is likely that it will be passed to another one of the 3 consultants on the Locality panel.

8. Stebbing Summer Fete

John said that the stall was booked and he had spoken to Robert James regarding borrowing his Pergola. We have our own 'skirt' for going round it. John asked if the weather is conducive, would it be possible to borrow Andrews presentation boards, Andrew agreed that subject to them not getting wet, they are reasonably robust.

Andrew apologised for not being able to be at the fete due to a previous arrangement, but he was available in the morning to help setting up. John asked who was available and the group gave their availability or otherwise.

Judith asked what we were going to show / tell visitors to the stall. John said that at the previous working party it was thought that an A5 flyer could be printed to update people on where we are and what is left to go. Andrew said that it may be helpful to have boards showing the sites that have been put forward following the Stebbing Scene call for sites and ask for comments on the sites. Bernard asked whether Val said that the heritage assessment had not been completed at the last public display, perhaps bullet points from this could be included. John added that previously we had put the areas that people had marked on the last questionnaire on display. Andrew asked what the main purpose of doing the boards / flyer, was it to keep people informed of progress or are we asking for further comment? There followed a discussing on the various things that could be included, John offered to draft a flyer ready for the next working party meeting, Val asked whether a flyer was really necessary if we are not going to be looking for comments, most of what we want to say can be on the boards and then on the website. It was agreed that the boards should be drafted and John should draft a flyer that could be done as a flyer or included on the boards. Bernard suggested looking at the monthly updates that he has done as this will give an idea of the progress made since the last Public display.

9. Wish-list and youth facilities / skate park

Bernard said that he had sent a draft email for the proposed youth shelter and skate park, the basis is that the Parish Council set up a project team assuming the plan is agreed at the referendum stage to progress it through to completion. The Clerk queried whether the proposal was for the neighbourhood plan steering group or the Parish Council to implement? Bernard responded that it would be for the Parish Council to implement. The Clerk responded that the wording needed to be very carefully considered so as not to make it appear that this was going to be implemented by the neighbourhood plan steering group or that a skate park or shelter was definitely going to happen if the neighbourhood plan is agreed at referendum as at present there is no funding available from the Parish Council on this sort of scale. John said that we needed to remember that the Neighbourhood plan will be in force for some years to come and even if it is not possible currently, a future Parish Council may want to take the plan forward. It was agreed that this was an aspiration and as such should be included, but needs to be carefully worded to ensure that it doesn't imply that if the plan is agreed at referendum it will be implemented as it can only be an aspiration and will depend on many factors such as funding, positioning and planning approval. John asked whether the group felt that the Parish Council should be asked at this stage whether it would be an aspiration that it would be likely to support. The Clerk said that he didn't feel that there was a need to put it to the Parish Count at present as it was an aspiration

of the group, Bernard said that he would amend the wording and circulate to the Parish Councillors in the group for their comment. There followed a discussion regarding the various ways of raising funds, via fundraising activities, grants etc

John said he wasn't criticising the Parish Council but we and the Parish Council need to put ourselves in the position of the 12-15 year olds of the village as there is nothing for them in the village. The Clerk said that the idea of a meeting place / youth shelter had been discussed by members of the playing fields committee some time ago and was still being looked at. John said that now that the Parish Council own the Mill Lane playing field it was an ideal location. Christina said that whilst we own it, we will be paying for it for the next 25 years. The Clerk also reminded the group of the overage clause regarding increasing the value of the land, although this type of development would come under sport and recreation for which there is an exclusion. Andrew asked whether the Parish Council were able to sponsor fund raising. The Clerk responded that he couldn't see any reason why not, presumably something was done for the Village hall purchase / renovations, Christina said that there was a joint committee for this. The Clerk said that he thought that something similar would be possible. John asked whether we were asking for anything to go to the Parish Council at this stage, would it be sensible to ask the Parish council whether in principle it would support / be part of a fund raising committee/ group. It was agreed that it was too early to be asking

10. Rachel Hogger / UDC involvement / consultation

John asked whether we ought to invite Rachel to come and see us for an update on progress / talk to us. Judith asked whether we had anything new to tell her, John responded only on housing allocation. Andrew said that we have her comments on the draft from the last meeting with her that we are incorporating but he thought it would be best to wait until we have had some response from locality. Judith asked whether it was possible to have Rachel's comments / observations translated into language of implementation / description included as a clean draft rather than as currently. Andrew added that under the NPPF once UDC have decided what they are going to do with their plan, it would be an idea to consult with Rachel regarding her view on the implications for our neighbourhood plan as currently there is no guidance from UDC at present.. If UDC submit their plan in its current state, we are clearly in conflict with it. The Clerk asked why we would be in conflict? Andrew responded that in our Neighbourhood Plan we are recommending a green wedge that is not in the UDC plan as it currently stands, all we have from UDC is a letter dated May saying that they will be taking it into account. Apart from the one meeting and the letter in May that is the only consultation that has to date taken place with UDC.

It was agreed by the group to defer a further meeting with Rachel, but as a matter of courtesy John will update her on our current position.

11. Felsted NP Draft – for consultation

John asked whether the group had a view on the circulated draft. After some discussion it was agreed that this was for the Parish Council to respond to not the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group.

12. RTPI Seminar

John asked whether Andrew would be attending for his company, if so he would probably not attend. Andrew said that he had a prior engagement for the afternoon, but he would check the programme and come back to John as this would save the group money if John does not attend.

13. **AOB**

John said that due to a possible commitment he may have for the next year, is everyone happy to continue having the meetings on a Monday rather than a Tuesday, Val said that she may have dog training on a Monday and would have to come back once it had been confirmed. Most said that Monday was possible but Jackie would need to be asked about her availability also. The Clerk said that the availability of the Old friends meeting house would also need to be checked. It was agreed that the next working party meeting would be at Johns on Monday 17th.

John said he would let the Clerk know about changing the dates of future meetings that are held in public once he had heard from Val and had consulted Jackie.

The meeting closed at 9.05pm