

Minutes

Local Development Framework Panel

5th February 2009



Councillors	Present	Councillors	Present
Miss L Barlow	Apologies	H J Messenger	Yes
G Butland	Yes	Lady Newton	Yes
N R H O Harley	Yes	Mrs W D Scattergood	Apologies
M C M Lager	Yes	Miss M Thorogood	Yes
N G McCrea (Chairman)	Yes	R G Walters	Apologies

Others in attendance:

Eleanor Dash, Planning Policy Manager, Braintree District Council
Paul Munson, Deputy Director of District Development, Braintree District Council
Melanie Ward, Locality Support Officer (Minute Clerk), Braintree District Council
Councillor David Mann, Ward Member for Bocking North
Councillor Liz Edey, Ward Member for Bocking Blackwater
Mr Lee Harding, Chairman, Braintree Town Football Club
8 Members of Public

48. Apologies

Councillors Miss Barlow, Mrs Scattergood, Walters

49. Declarations Of Interest

Councillor Butland declared a personal interest in Public Question Time as he has attended Braintree Town Football Club as an FA Assessor and knew the Chairman.

50. Minutes

The minutes of the Local Development Framework Panel meeting held on 23rd October 2008 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

51. Question Time

Lee Harding, Chairman of Braintree Town Football Club (BTFC) wished to thank Braintree District Council (BDC) for their assistance in including a potential football club relocation site as part of the proposed growth area west of Panfield Lane. He updated the Panel on the Football Club's proposals at land west of Pods Brook Road/A120 Braintree by-pass and stated that the proposed growth area west of Pods Brook Lane was deliverable and had the support of landowners. A green buffer would be included between the proposed development site and Rayne. Written representations had been submitted via the consultation process and details of the proposal west of Pods Brook Road had been submitted to Planners.

52. Overview of Representations on the Draft Core Strategy.

Representations received during public consultation were still being logged. Officers would start analysis by the end of next week and publish findings on the web site

once completed. A total of around 4,500 comments had been received, 440 relating to growth areas. Panfield Lane received the highest response, which were mainly objections to open space use and traffic issues. A full report of representations would be issued at a subsequent meeting. The costing, delivery and timing of the infrastructure required further work along with phasing of sites in the plan.

Members wanted to know how the Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) was going to be progressed.

An ARUP Consultants Study had shown a potential way of accommodating very large-scale development in the East of England. This would involve Chelmsford as one of the key centres for major growth development in the 2021-2031 period; a lower level of growth would include Colchester; and new settlements in 6 locations could include Braintree as an option.

Paul Munson stated that the new LDF system was intended to be more flexible and quicker to change. The Strategy for the period to 2025 should be capable of adaptation to respond to changing circumstances.

Members were concerned that the Review of the Regional Plan might involve major growth areas adjoining the District boundary over which the Council would have little influence. At the moment EERA were looking to County Councils and Unitary Authorities to advise them on future growth strategies and it was for ECC to involve the District Councils in this process. If at the end of this process there would be major growth in and around the Braintree District, then the LDF would need to look at a joint Core Strategy with Chelmsford and Colchester to have more say in the surrounding infrastructure.

Current proposed schemes such as BTFC were welcomed as it would link in with existing infrastructure and create local jobs. There was not enough funding to support rail links, A12 and Health services in the volume of development proposed. Eleanor Dash stated that discussions with key providers were underway to identify which services needed to be improved, including the sewage disposal requirements for new developments to the West of Braintree and to consider costs and requirements to apply to development proposals.

A report on the Review of the Regional Plan and the ARUP Consultants Study would be brought to the next meeting.

Decision: Members agreed

1. To note the overview received.
2. For an update of representations to be brought to the next meeting.
3. That a report on the Review of the Regional Plan be brought to the next meeting of the Panel to be held after the public meeting.

53. Decision Making Process for Changes to the Core Strategy by Members of the Panel and Local Committees.

A process was required to consider representations. The Panel were requested to consider what types of reports were to be given to the Local Committees and be discussed by the LDF Panel, and whether a seminar would need to be arranged to discuss issues raised in representations.

Members agreed that reports on area specific representations would be taken to Local Committees. Decisions on whether to amend the Core Strategy in response to representations be considered at the LDF Panel meeting on 15th April.

It was decided that a public meeting be held in place of the next LDF Panel meeting to commence at 6:00pm. This would be open to all Council Members and the Public and be web-cast.

Decision: Members agreed

1. That representations on area specific issues be taken to the Local Committees who would make representations to the LDF Panel.
2. That general strategy issues be taken to LDF Panel.
3. That the next LDF Panel meeting be a public meeting to discuss representations, which would be web-cast.
4. That decisions on whether to amend the Core Strategy in response to representations be taken at the LDF Panel meeting on 15th April.

54. East of England Regional Spatial Strategy Review of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation.

The report of the Panel on the single-issue Review of the East of England Plan on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation was now available. This included requirements for each District for the period post 2011. It will be for each District to make site-specific allocations. 41 pitches in total are required for the District, 17 of which would be required post 2011. Consultants would need to be employed to assess potential site locations for sites required after 2011.

Members were against employing consultants solely for Braintree District but agreed that a joint study with other Essex Authorities could be beneficial.

Decision: Members agreed

1. To note proposed changes to the Gypsy and Traveller policy requirements.
2. That consultant's be appointed to carry out a joint study of post 2011 site provision for the district with other Essex Authorities.

55. Urgent Business.

No items for inclusion.

56. Any Other Business

No items for inclusion.

57. Private Session

No items for inclusion.

58. Date Of Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next Local Development Framework Panel meeting be publicised as a Public District Meeting.

Action:

- a. Event to be publicised for public attendance.
- b. Progress report to be brought to the next LDFP meeting.

The meeting commenced at 6:00pm and closed at 7:04 pm

N G McCrea (Chairman)