

# **Minutes of the meeting of the Stebbing neighbourhood plan steering group**

## **29th May, 2018. Friends Meeting House, Stebbing**

### **1. Members Present**

John Evans  
Christina Cant  
Jackie Kingdom  
Andrew Martin  
Val Stokes  
Bernard Bazley  
The Secretary

### **2. Apologies for absence**

Judith Farr

### **3. Approval of Minutes 1<sup>st</sup> May 2018 and Action list**

The Minutes of the last meeting were agreed.

#### **Actions List review**

Action 37 - Complete

Action 53 – will be discussed later under the specific agenda item

Action 54 – will be discussed later under the specific agenda item

Action 55 – Complete and Judith gave a verbal report to the Parish Annual Assembly

Action 56 – will be discussed later under the specific agenda item

Action 57 – Complete

### **4. Public Questions**

There was a question from a member of the public regarding the UDC report for the PPWG, having waded through 1100 odd pages of the report it appears that UDC have a complete disregard for anything that came out of the consultations as the plans look to be exactly the same. Can the Neighbourhood plan include areas identified as local green spaces. John responded and queried whether the question was regarding green spaces or the green wedge, the member of the public clarified the area they were talking about and John responded that this was the green wedge and can be included in the neighbourhood plan so long as it is not inconsistent with the overriding policy of UDC. At the PPWG meeting it was stated that the matters of detail will be dealt with in a development plan, things like density, and precise location will come in at this stage. This then should go out for consultation again to give everyone a chance to comment. The member of the public asked if there was a way of pre-empting this by including the green wedge in the neighbourhood plan. John responded that whatever we include has to be within the structure of the emerging local plan. The local plan is very specific about many things but not generic about the three garden communities, so when it gets to the matters of detail about the West of Braintree proposal, the green wedge / buffer would be a matter of detail. To the steering group it is not considered to be a mere matter of detail, but for UDC it is as it comes in at the stage of them deciding the extent of the West of Braintree settlement and the extent that they will allow for buffering between it and Stebbing Green. The steering group know from the results of the questionnaire that separation from any new development was very important to the local

residents which is why the steering group intend to respond in the draft for the inclusion of a green wedge, but the extent to which it will be acceptable will be a matter that will ultimately be that of the planning inspector when he comes to review and decide upon that particular aspect of the Neighbourhood plan. John continued saying that this was one of the things the steering group learned for the first time at their meeting with UDC on 10<sup>th</sup> May, UDC had seen the recommendations contained in the Landscape Partnership report. but were not in a position at that meeting to commit to precisely where a green wedge might go. UDC agreed that the idea was generally well known and accepted. Andrew commented that neighbourhood plans have to follow the strategy of the local plan, and our neighbourhood plan has to be signed off by UDC, so we can put forward a proposal but it may not be accepted.

John added that the steering group had recently been working on a call for sites for development. Letters will be sent out shortly inviting landowners to submit sites that meet the need of sustainable location and suitable size as reflected in the results from the questionnaire.

#### 5. **Draft Plan v05**

John reported that Rachel Hogger has sent in some comments on v5 of the draft plan. John said that there were a lot of comments and that he hadn't had time to consider them properly as yet. Andrew commented that he had read Rachel's comments and thought that they very constructive. The steering group were aware of some of the gaps in the plan that she has highlighted, but generally speaking it just needs tidying up in places, overall he thought the comments were very fair and enabled the next draft to move forward, all in all they were very helpful. On policies, some of the comments are there for consideration and are not necessarily essential. Christina commented that she agreed, on one part of the plan where we were trying to say that any new affordable housing should be subject to local connection, Rachel has commented saying that Uttlesford may object to this and we should seek early engagement with them, local connection usually only applies to rural exception housing, Christina said that whilst it might be usually, it is not always and she had experience of a percentage of affordable housing being dedicated to local people when she was a District Councillor. Jackie Kingdom added that as a result of the RCCE housing needs survey, the Parish Council have been looking at rural exception sites for 3-5 houses which had been identified by the survey, after an abortive attempt with one piece of land, it is continuing to look at possible sites. These houses remain in the social sector and cannot be sold. Christina added that even with rural exception sites, if a house becomes available, if there is no-one local that is on the waiting list and meets the criteria, it will still go to the person on the top of the list whether local or not. Andrew added that sometimes if there is no-one from the parish, it is then offered next to people in surrounding parishes. Andrew also added that the figures for the 2011 census are very different to the later figures from UDC, he needs to check these. Christina asked whether Lindsell had been included as she had come across this in the past.

Christina added that on page 19, Rachel had commented regarding the development limits, we had said in the draft that we more or less condoned building outside of the development limits, did we really want this. Policy SP10 of the emerging local plan defines land outside the development limits as countryside, would it be better to say within development limits or allocated sites. Andrew commented that this policy actually comes from the Lavenham neighbourhood plan, it wasn't supposed to allow a general free for all, but that all sites should be considered, but agreed that we needed to be more specific. John asked whether considering the short amount of time the group has had to consider the comments, should we come back to this. It was agreed that this would be a good idea. John asked whether it would be helpful if he

accepted the changes that we have already made before Rachel's comments to a version 6? It was agreed that this should be done.

**6. Call for Sites - Discussion**

There was a discussion at the last working group. It was agreed that an updated format was needed to include detailed comments from locality and some comments that might be applicable having spoken to an inspector. Catherine who works for Andrew is working on this currently. Val asked where the call for sites has been advertised, Bernard said that it was put on nextdoor, the facebook page, the website and will be included in the Stebbing scene that is due out at the weekend.

Andrew added that locality use Aecom and at the meeting with Rachel given that Aecom are involved with the West of Braintree proposal and there would be a possible conflict, we were going to check whether they had other consultants that they can use because he was thinking that it would be useful to have an independent audit of the housing allocation to ensure that we have been totally transparent. John agreed that we should do this as we have done for heritage, archaeology etc. Andrew said he would check who was on the panel apart from Aecom.

John added that while looking at funding, the locality grant is exceeding complicated. If we are going to require an independent review on housing allocation we either need more funding or something that locality can provide free of charge. John added that looking at the finance spreadsheet, Andrew said that he could ask for the possible costs involved for an independent review of the housing allocation. John said that Francine has included the possible future grant of £5200 from locality in the figures that shows we have £6800 in actual fact all we currently have agreed is approximately £1500. We need all the funds we can for future printing etc so he doesn't feel that locality will be a source of funds for an independent review, we need the free help of a consultant from locality rather than going out and finding our own, any other grant available will be needed for other expenditure later.

**7. Reg 19 Draft Local Plan**

John said that he had included this item as a result of attending the recent PPWG meeting. The regulation 19 document is now due to be put forward to the PPWG meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> May, John said he had only glanced at the document but had noted that heritage and neighbourhood plans had been 'beefed up' and wondered if there was anything that anyone wanted to comment on. Andrew said that he too had not had a chance to read it thoroughly but he will be looking at it before Thursday in more detail. Andrew added that as already noted, there has not been any great changes other than changes to the number of houses the type A villages need to supply which in the regulation 18 document was very low. The document also shows that there is no change in relation to the West of Braintree proposal. John added that at the meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> May with UDC that it was stated that there was to be no specific number of houses to be provided by Stebbing. Andrew added that regulation 19 is the last chance for comments to be made, no further comments can be made to the inspector after regulation 19.

**8. Consultees**

John has drafted a letter that would go to the list of consultees and asked whether anyone had any comments upon it. The consultees would be the Uttlesford list plus others as suggested by RCCE. John asked whether this could be sent now? The general consensus was that it could now be sent. Andrew said that it may be useful to add a map of the neighbourhood plan area. John

asked whether the secretary would be prepared to do the admin relating to the sending out of the letters to the consultees. The secretary said that he would be prepared to do this.

John said that he had conversation with Historic England and has written to Debbie Priddy. John read out the letter. John had received a response giving the name of the person responsible for neighbourhood plans and had had a conversation with them. John would be getting back to them with what we have archaeology wise.

#### **9. Oral report of meeting with archaeologist Chris Going**

Jackie reported on the meeting with Chris Going. Chris published papers years ago which support intensive possible sites on Stebbing green. Chris has also done a great deal of Aerial photography. Chris came up with a number of points, he felt that the very strong case put by Chesterford makes great emphasis on an area that is already known about and won't be touched by the proposed housing so it's a weak case. He feels that the 2 sites at Stebbing Green, one at Boxted wood and the other in the region of Porters Hall are a much stronger case. He suggested that we may want to contact 'Rescue', who look into protecting sites and helping with them, we should also look at the report that was produced at the time of the construction of the new A120 called 'A slice of Essex' which refer to the sites at Stebbing Green. Christina added that Chris said that there was a lot know about the archaeology at Chesterford due to the chalk composition of the soil that makes it easy to see crop marks. The composition of the soil at the sites in Stebbing Green is such that it is not easy to see crop marks although we know that there is archaeology there, Christina said that he felt this needed to be emphasised strongly to UDC. Jackie added that she took along a copy of the Stebbing footpaths map. Chris drew an area on the map where he felt that there was a notable settlement where he felt that the romans had settled an existing earlier, possibly Saxon area. Chris felt that this was worthy of further investigation. It is therefore imperative that we make a strong enough case for further investigation.

John said that the Insall draft report that was included in the PPWG meeting the previous week and the place services report stated that within 2km of each of the proposed 3 garden community sites, at Andrewsfield there are 310 heritage assets, at Great Easton 184 and at Great Chesterford 152, these include listed buildings. Christina added that in the Insall document for both Great Chesterford and Great Easton, it shows the listed buildings on the map, but not for Stebbing Green, also the map for West Of Braintree is shown in a different scale so that the village of Stebbing is not shown at all, it appears very biased to not have treated the sites equally.

#### **10. Skate Park / Activities**

Bernard handed round some examples of youth shelters, the size we would need probably would be in the region of £5000-6000 plus VAT and installation. There are optional extras such as solar lighting and wifi etc. Skateparks are more difficult as it depends on the size of the site etc. Bernard handed round some examples, the cost of the smaller one is in the region of £40,000. Jackie asked whether it was possible to start off with a smaller installation and then expand it at a later date, Bernard said that he thought this would be possible. Bernard said he had emailed Great Dunmow Council asking how much theirs cost and how well used it was. Bernard asked whether he should progress it any further regarding costs etc. It was agreed that a shelter was probably more important than a skatepark. It was agreed that Bernard should continue to progress costings for both the shelter and skatepark.

**11. Photography**

Bernard met with Clare, she is happy to help and is aware that there is no money involved but that she would be given acknowledgements wherever her work was used. Bernard has given her a list of possible sites for photographs, these include all the green spaces, some of the newer developments and the green wedge. Bernard asked people to contact him if there were any other sites that should be photographed. Timescales are about 4 – 6 weeks. John said that we had previously mentioned having photographs of village activities, also of the scarecrows and gardens in the up-coming weekend event. Jackie said that the first poppies are coming out in the fields and thought that this would make a good picture

John asked about social media, Bernard said that we have had a facebook site for some about a year. Emma on the Parish Council had also put it on parent mail and since then the facebook site has had more ‘likes’. It was agreed Instagram was not suitable for what we are doing.

**12. Thoughts re “wish list” as derived from QQ**

This was covered in the item regarding skatepark / activities

Val agreed to put the ‘wishlist’ in a spreadsheet or document and circulate

**13. AOB**

Andrew said that the secretary had send round the consultational local heritage list that open for comment until 1<sup>st</sup> November, the only 2 entries that appear for Stebbing.

John added that should we think about including a proposal in the neighbourhood plan to designate Stebbing Green as a conservation area. It was agreed that it should.

The meeting closed at 9.35pm