

Minutes

Local Plan Sub-Committee

5th October 2016

Present:

Councillors	Present	Councillors	Present
D Bebb	Yes	Mrs J Money	Yes
Mrs L Bowers-Flint (Chairman)	Yes	Lady Newton	Yes
G Butland	Apologies	J O'Reilly-Cicconi	Yes
T Cunningham	Yes	Mrs W Scattergood	Yes
D Hume	Yes	Miss M Thorogood	Yes

Councillors Bowers and Schwier were also in attendance.

23 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

INFORMATION: The following interests were declared:

Councillor Mrs L Bowers-Flint declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 8 – 'Braintree District Draft Local Plan – Consultation Responses' (Sites COLE186 - Land South of Brook Street, Colne Engaine and COLE187 - Land at Brook Farm, Station Road, Colne Engaine) as Mr G Courtauld, the owner of the land, was known to her as a former elected Member of Braintree District Council and Mr A Butcher, the Agent, was known to her as a former employee of Braintree District Council.

Councillor Lady Newton declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 8 – 'Braintree District Draft Local Plan - Consultation Responses' (Sites COLE186 - Land South of Brook Street, Colne Engaine and COLE187 - Land at Brook Farm, Station Road, Colne Engaine) as Mr G Courtauld, the owner of the land, was known to her as a former elected Member of Braintree District Council and Mr A Butcher, the Agent, was known to her as a former employee of Braintree District Council.

Councillor J O'Reilly-Cicconi declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 8 – Braintree District Draft Local Plan - Consultation Responses' (Sites COLE186 - Land South of Brook Street, Colne Engaine and COLE187 - Land at Brook Farm, Station Road, Colne Engaine) as Mr G Courtauld, the owner of the land, was known to him.

In accordance with the Code of Conduct and for the avoidance of doubt, Councillor P Schwier left the meeting for the consideration of Agenda Item 8 – 'Braintree Draft Local Plan – Consultation Responses' and specifically the discussion and decision regarding Little Maplestead, as he was the owner of a site which had been

submitted for consideration as part of the draft Braintree District Local Plan 'call for sites' and he had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the matter. Although Councillor Schwier was not a Member of the Local Plan Sub-Committee and, as such, he did not have voting rights, he was precluded from taking part in the discussion and decision on the draft Local Plan as a whole based on his Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, Councillors remained in the meeting, unless stated otherwise, and took part in the discussion when the Item/sites were considered.

24 **MINUTES**

INFORMATION: The Minutes of the meeting of the Local Plan Sub-Committee held on 12th July 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

25 **QUESTION TIME**

INFORMATION: There were two statements made. Details of the people 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.

26 **HATFIELD PEVEREL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION**

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a report on the Hatfield Peverel Neighbourhood Plan. This had been submitted to Braintree District Council as part of the consultation process in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The consultation process concluded on 30th September 2016, but an extension of time had been agreed for the District Council's response to be submitted. The Council's proposed response, which would be submitted by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing, was attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

Hatfield Peverel Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Group had been working on the Neighbourhood Plan, which contained policies on the economy, the environment, infrastructure and housing. The Plan did not allocate any sites for housing development. If approved, the Plan would become part of the Braintree District Local Plan and it would have the same status as the non-strategic elements of the Local Plan. The policies contained within the Plan would be used in the determination of planning applications.

Once the initial consultation process had concluded, the Plan would be submitted to Braintree District Council, which would be required to carry out further consultation in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Regulations. Once this had been completed, a formal examination of the Plan would be arranged. If the examiner was satisfied that the Plan was able to meet the 'basic conditions' it would proceed to a Referendum. If more than 50% of the Referendum vote was in favour, the Neighbourhood Plan would be made and it would become part of the Local Plan.

DECISION: That the proposed response by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing to the Hatfield Peverel Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 consultation be noted.

27 **BRAINTREE DISTRICT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2016-2019**

INFORMATION: Members of the Local Plan Sub-Committee considered a report on an updated version of the Local Development Scheme.

The Council was required to publish a Local Development Scheme, which set out the timetable for the production of the Local Plan, other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents over the forthcoming three years. The revised, draft Local Development Scheme for 2016-2019 dated September 2016 was attached as an Appendix to the report. The document would replace the previous Local Development Scheme for the period January 2015 – December 2017, which had been approved in January 2015. A revised Local Development Scheme was required to take account of the updated Local Plan timetable and to incorporate information about additional Development Plan Documents which would be produced in respect of proposed garden communities.

DECISION: That the Braintree District Local Development Scheme 2016 – 2019 dated September 2016 be approved.

28 **BRAINTREE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN – OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION STRATEGY**

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a report on the outcome of recent consultation on the Braintree Draft Local Plan.

The draft Local Plan, Sustainability Appraisal and accompanying evidence base had been subject to consultation between 27th June 2016 and 19th August 2016. This had enabled the public, local businesses and key stakeholders to comment on the Plan and the policies and allocations contained within it, including the Strategic Plan (garden communities) shared with Colchester Borough Council and Tendring District Council.

The report provided an update on the consultation methods which had taken place and the number of people who had been informed. A total of 3,095 comments had been submitted by 1,295 people during the consultation period, many of which had been submitted directly onto the 'objective consultation portal'. The consultation responses were available to view on the Council's website and were currently being processed to identify any changes that might be required to the Local Plan and the evidence base. The representations submitted and any proposed amendments to the Local Plan would be reported to future meetings of the Local Plan Sub-Committee.

Responses submitted to Braintree District Council, Colchester Borough Council and Tendring District Council regarding the Strategic Plan would be combined and

considered by the three Authorities working together. Further information would be presented to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

DECISION: That the report on the outcome of the consultation strategy on the draft Local Plan be noted.

29 **BRAINTREE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN – CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a report summarising the comments submitted to the Council following public consultation on the draft Local Plan which had taken place between 27th June 2016 and 19th August 2016. The report included information about proposed new sites which had been put forward and, where applicable, recommended amendments.

The report related to the villages of Alphamstone, Birdbrook, Borley, Liston, Toppesfield, Belchamp Otten, Belchamp Walter, Belchamp St Paul, Colne Engaine, Foxearth, Gestingthorpe, Audley End, Helions Bumpstead, Lamarsh, Little Maplestead, Middleton, Ovington, Pentlow, Sturmer, Fairstead, Twinstead, Great Henny and Little Henny. Maps of the sites which had been put forward for consideration and the proposed Inset Maps for each village and settlement to be contained within the Pre-Submission Local Plan were included in an Appendix to the report.

With regard to Colne Engaine, it was reported that two new sites had been submitted. These were COLE612 – land adjacent to Bramble Rise, South of Brook Street, Colne Engaine and COLE638 – land at Colne Heights, Brook Street, Colne Engaine. A number of comments had been submitted in support of site COLE612 and Colne Engaine Parish Council had indicated its support for a change to the development boundary on the western side of Brook Street. Whilst these sites were too small to be allocated for residential development, it was proposed that a minor amendment should be made to the development boundary adjacent to Brook Street to include site COLE638 and the Northern part of site COLE612.

Specific reference was also made to sites COLE186 – land South of Brook Street, Colne Engaine and COLE187 - land at Brook Farm, Station Road, Colne Engaine, which had been put forward as possible sites for development. Members agreed that site COLE187 was not suitable for residential development as it would represent an unwarranted encroachment into open countryside and was partly within flood zone 2. However, it was considered that the development boundary could be amended to incorporate the Northern most part of site COLE186.

In discussing the Inset Map for Foxearth, it was reported that there was a typographical error in the report and that the area of site FOXE236 was '1.1' hectares, not '0.11' hectares as stated.

DECISION:

- (1) That Alphamstone remains as a settlement within the countryside with no development boundary.

- (2) That Birdbrook remains as a settlement within the countryside with no development boundary.
- (3) That Borley remains as a settlement within the countryside with no development boundary.
- (4) That Liston remains as a settlement within the countryside with no development boundary.
- (5) That the Inset Map for Toppesfield remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (6) That the Inset Map for Belchamp Otten remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (7) That the Inset Map for Belchamp Walter remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (8) That the Inset Map for Belchamp St Paul remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in Appendix.
- (9) That the Inset Map for Colne Engaine is altered to include an amendment to the development boundary at Brook Street to incorporate site COLE638 and the Northern parts of sites COLE612 and COLE186.
- (10) That the Inset Map for Foxearth remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (11) That the Inset Map for Gestingthorpe remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (12) That the Inset Map for Audley End remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (13) That the Inset Map for Helions Bumpstead remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (14) That the Inset Map for Lamarsh remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (15) That the Inset Map for Little Maplestead remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.
- (16) That Middleton remains as a settlement within the countryside with no development boundary.
- (17) That Ovington remains as a settlement within the countryside with no development boundary.
- (18) That Pentlow remains as a settlement within the countryside with no development boundary.
- (19) That the Inset Map for Sturmer remains unchanged from that in the draft Local Plan, as shown in the Appendix.

- (20) That Fairstead remains as a settlement within the countryside with no development boundary.
- (21) That Twinstead, Great Henny and Little Henny remain as settlements within the countryside with no development boundary.

The meeting commenced at 6.00pm and closed at 7.15pm.

Councillor Mrs L Bowers-Flint
(Chairman)

APPENDIX

LOCAL PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE

5TH OCTOBER 2016

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Details of Questions Asked / Statements Made During Public Question Time

- 1 Statement Relating to Agenda Item 5 – Hatfield Peverel Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Statement by Councillor Les Priestley, for Hatfield Peverel Parish Council, Wadworth, Nounsley Road, Hatfield Peverel (Supporter)
- 2 Statement Relating to Agenda Item 7 – Braintree Draft Local Plan – Outcome of Consultation Strategy

Statement by Ms Rosie Pearson, for Pattiswick residents' group and 'Campaign Against Urban Sprawl in Essex' (CAUSE) (address not supplied)