

Minutes



Local Development Framework Sub- Committee 6th November 2013

Present:

Councillors	Present	Councillors	Present
D L Bebb	Yes	Lady Newton	Yes
G Butland	Yes	W D Scattergood	Yes
A V E Everard	Yes (from 6.42pm)	C Siddall	Yes
M C M Lager	Yes	M Thorogood	Yes
J M Money	Yes	R G Walters (Chairman)	Yes

27 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

INFORMATION: The following interest was declared:

Councillor W D Scattergood declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 4 – Question Time (Site GRM5H, Treeways, Great Maplestead) as she knew the land owner.

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, Councillor Scattergood remained in the meeting when this Item was considered.

28 **MINUTES**

INFORMATION: The Minutes of the meeting of the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee held on 24th July 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

29 **QUESTION TIME**

INFORMATION: There was one statement made. Details of the person who spoke at the meeting are contained in the Appendix to these Minutes.

Principally, these Minutes record decisions taken only and, where appropriate, the reasons for the decisions.

30 **LOCAL HERITAGE LIST FOR THE BRAINTREE DISTRICT – DEVELOPMENT**

Mr Michael Bardell, President of Braintree and Bocking Civic Society, attended the meeting for the consideration of this item and he assisted Tessa Lambert, Development Manager, with the presentation of the report.

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a report on the possible development of a Local List of buildings of historic interest.

The report set out information on the role and value of Local Heritage Listing, how a Local List might be developed for the Braintree District and possible selection criteria for inclusion in such a List. It was proposed that Parish Councils and amenity societies across the District should be consulted to establish the degree of support for the development of a District-wide List and to seek views on selection criteria.

It was noted that English Heritage encouraged Local Planning Authorities to develop Local Lists of Heritage Assets and had published a Good Practice Guide. Whilst such assets had historic significance and/or associations locally, they were not assets which met the criteria for statutory designation in accordance with the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The inclusion of a heritage asset on a Local List did not change existing planning controls applicable to the building, but it could influence planning decisions in order to conserve and enhance local character. In some cases, Local Lists could be developed as Supplementary Planning Documents, subject to a statutory process being followed.

Following discussions with representatives of Braintree and Bocking Civic Society and Essex County Council's Historic Environment Service, a set of criteria had been proposed for the selection of heritage assets and these were set out in the Agenda report. If supported, the Council would be required to publicise and promote the development of a Local List; to introduce a system to record nominations; identify and consult owners; co-ordinate nominations for consideration by an assessment team; to collate reports for ratification by the Planning Committee; and to publish the List

Members acknowledged that specialist advice would have to be sought from Essex County Council and / or by utilising specialist knowledge and skills within the community to determine whether specific assets should be included on a List.

Members noted that this project was still at the design stage and that following consultation a further report would be submitted to the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee recommending the selection criteria; the proposed management arrangements; and indicating the resource implications associated with the project.

DECISION:

- (1) That the proposed project to develop a Local Heritage List for the Braintree District be supported.
- (2) That the Agenda report be circulated to Parish Councils and appropriate local societies in order to understand:-
 - i) the level of interest in the project;
 - ii) whether these groups have members who would be interested in being part of an assessment team; and
 - iii) their views on the draft selection criteria.
- (3) That the selection criteria, as identified in the report, be noted.

31 **WITHAM RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK – TRAFFIC IMPACT REPORT**

INFORMATION: At the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee meeting held on 11th July 2013, Members had considered the representations submitted in respect of policies in the Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. These included Policy ADM49 - New Road Schemes which proposed that a second road access into Witham railway station car park from Station Road should be safeguarded from development. At that meeting, Members had requested further information on whether an entrance and exit could be provided at both the new and the existing access points to the car park instead of one way in and one way out as suggested by Essex County Council Highways.

Essex County Council Highways had undertaken a study into the potential impact of proposed additional commuter car parking at Eckard House, Easton Road, Witham and revised access arrangements to Witham railway station car park. The findings of this study entitled 'Proposed Changes to Witham Station Car Park Traffic Impact August 2013' were set out in the Agenda report.

It was considered that the allocation of land at Eckard House as a car park and the principle of a second road access to Witham station car park from Station Road would not have a significant adverse impact on traffic flows in the vicinity of Station Road or Avenue Road, Witham.

DECISION: That Essex County Council Highways 'Proposed Changes to Witham Station Car Park Traffic Impact August 2013' report be added to the evidence base for the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.

32 **NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA – APPLICATION BY CRESSING PARISH COUNCIL**

INFORMATION: Members of the Sub-Committee were advised that the Localism Act 2011 enabled a relevant body, including a Parish Council or other group, to formulate a neighbourhood development plan (NDP) for an area. An NDP set out policies relating to the development and use of land in the whole, or any part, of a particular neighbourhood area specified in the Plan.

As a first stage, the relevant body was required to identify a 'neighbourhood area' and to submit this to the Local Planning Authority for approval. Once the area had been agreed by the Local Planning Authority, the relevant body could begin drafting an NDP. When complete, the NDP would be submitted to the Local Planning Authority which was required to make arrangements for an independent examination. If the independent examiner considered that the Plan met the relevant legal requirements it would proceed to a referendum. If, at the referendum stage, the Plan was supported by more than 50% of the vote, it would come into force.

An NDP had to be in general conformity with strategic policies contained within the local Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. Once complete, the NDP would form part of the formal Development Plan for the area to which it related and it would be used in the determination of planning applications for that area.

The Council had received an application from Cressing Parish Council to designate the whole area of the Parish as a neighbourhood area. The proposal had been subject to a period of public consultation, which had concluded on 27th September 2013, following

which no objections had been submitted. It was considered that Cressing Parish Council's application met the requirements of the appropriate Regulations and should be approved.

In discussing this item, Members of the Sub-Committee queried whether an NDP for Cressing would affect possible development at Twin Oaks gypsy/travellers site, Stisted; the line of the A120; and development at Galleys Corner/Freeport, Cressing/Braintree. In response to reports about the experiences of Thame Town Council, Oxfordshire which had recently introduced an NDP, Members expressed concern about the potential cost of implementing a Plan, particularly the potential costs to the District Council of organising an independent examination and a referendum. It was anticipated that these costs could be significant in view of the number of parishes within the Braintree District. It was also queried whether the District Council could seek to recover part of its costs by adjusting any non-statutory payments that it currently made to Parish and Town Councils seeking to adopt an NDP.

In response, Members were advised that the District Council should not pre-judge the policies and land uses to be included in an NDP. However, the District Council's Core Strategy would take precedence over any NDP, which would have to be in conformity with it. A Parish/Town Council was required to bear the cost of an NDP, but the District Council had a duty to assist with the process and to fund an independent examination and referendum. Whilst some Government grant funding was currently available to both Parish/Town Councils and District Councils, it was not known if this would continue. It was agreed that a written reply should be sent to Members in response to their query about the possible adjustment of non-statutory payments to Parish and Town Councils by the District Council.

DECISION:

- (1) That the application by Cressing Parish Council to designate the whole area of the Parish as a neighbourhood area, as shown on the map attached at Appendix 1 to the Agenda report, be approved.
- (2) That the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government be advised in writing of the Council's concern about the potential and unavoidable cost to the Authority of administering the implementation of neighbourhood development plans, particularly as the District incorporates 54 Parish/Town Councils.

33 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – PROGRESS REPORT

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a progress report on the Pre-Submission Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and the preparation of some further evidence base studies.

The Pre-Submission Site Allocations and Development Management Plan had been agreed by the Council on 23rd September 2013, subject to a number of minor amendments which were being made prior to the document being printed. Following the outcome of the Council meeting and the release of new Government planning guidance, further information and evidence was also being collated to sit alongside the document. In the circumstances, public engagement on the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan had been delayed slightly and it was hoped that this would now commence in late November 2013.

The Equalities Impact Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Appraisal were being prepared for approval by the Director of Sustainable Development in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee.

A Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and an updated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) were also being produced which would inform the review of the Core Strategy and provide an updated evidence base for the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.

DECISION: That the progress report be noted.

Future Meetings

It was reported that the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee meeting scheduled for 8th January 2014 had been cancelled and that the next meeting of the Sub-Committee would be held on 26th February 2014.

Post Meeting Note:-

An additional meeting of the Sub-Committee has been arranged for 19th March 2014.

The meeting commenced at 6.00pm and closed at 7.05pm.

Councillor R G Walters

(Chairman)

APPENDIX

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SUB-COMMITTEE

6TH NOVEMBER 2013

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Details of Questions Asked / Statements Made During Public Question Time

1 Statement Relating to Site GRM5H, Treeways, Great Maplestead

Statement by Mr Keith Brownlie, Godsolve, Church Street, Great Maplestead (Objector)