

DRAFT Minutes of NP/PC Meeting held on Wednesday 31 January 2018 re Neighbourhood Plan

Present: Cllr C Browning (Chair), Mr D Burr, Mr R Carpenter, Mr D Chivers, Mr W Luttmann-Johnson, Miss J Pask, Mr N Price and Mr I Poole (Planning Adviser)

Apologies: Messrs N Chappell and M Brearley

Declarations of Interest: None

1	<p><u>Introduction and Update on Progress:</u> Cllr Browning extended a welcome to everyone and thanked them, and the full Neighbourhood Plan Working Party (NPWP), for all their work so far.</p> <p>Mr Price advised that the purpose of this meeting was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) agree revisions to the Neighbourhood Plan in readiness for its final submission to Babergh District Council (BDC) and</li><li>(ii) agree the process and timetable.</li></ul>	
2	<p><u>Draft NP Proposals Maps: Cluster Designation Options and Area of Special Landscape Quality:</u> Mr Price stated that the NPWP has a remit from the village to produce an environmentally led NP, which maintains the character of the village with the residents' declared wishes for limited development within small groups of dwellings. With this desire in mind, 4 'clusters' within the village evolved. Now, with the iteration of the Local Plan, it seems that the preferred option within Babergh is to have a hamlets policy. A hamlet is proposed as 10+ dwellings (or more). Mr Price feels it is important for Hartest to have a detailed cluster policy that would 'sit beneath' the Local Plan hamlet policy. Mr Burr felt that the Hartest NP does not have regard to existing clusters as, e.g., Brick Farm or Hartest Place. He felt that there is also no information as to how these clusters were determined. Mr Chivers commented that, as far as logic is concerned, he felt it was fairly clear. Mr Price added that a cluster also has to front a highway. There followed a discussion on these aspects. Mr Burr added that such areas must be sustainable; an obvious choice being Pear Tree Farm, another area cited was the 'Springfield' site (but here there is no mains sewerage, footpaths etc). Mr Price added that, in such cases, there would be a very small number of pedestrians. Mr Poole advised that the village does not have to do anything about development; Lawshall is now receiving planning applications. One such application was contrary to their NP and was consequently withdrawn. Five new houses are proposed near to their village hall, which is likely to conform to their NP policy; any development now would be considered "infill". Mr Poole added that Local Authorities are required to have a 5 year land supply. Central Government stated in December 2016 that, if there is a NP in place, and it allocates sites, the NP will carry weight in the determination of planning applications received, but the District does not have a 5 year plan. The NPWP is not required to run a further pre-submission consultation; it was felt that this could take at least another year – by which time BDC would be well advanced in the</p>	

	<p>development of its Local Plan. When BDC made a call for sites for the Draft Local Plan, no sites came forward in Hartest. Other parishes are getting inundated with applications; Debenham has received an application for 300 homes. Mr Burr added that this was probably due to the fact that most landowners do not have retained agents. Mr Price asked, whether, in view of Mr Burr's disagreement in principle, the PC has a majority to be able to take forward this matter. The PC had previously considered the draft NP and Cllr Browning stated that it was happy to proceed with the majority vote (excluding Mr Burr).</p>	
3	<p>On behalf of those present at the initial meeting, the NPWP was given the mandate to maintain the character of the village and, thus, to organise the agreed amendments, namely;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Expand the definition of Visually Important Gaps and the classification of same on the Proposals Map.</li> <li>➤ Consider changing Visually Important Gap definition to, e.g., Important Hedgerow, as appropriate.</li> <li>➤ Update the Proposals Map to reflect the agreed amendments. Mr Burr expressed concern about the possible creation of a ribbon development of 5 dwellings, which he felt all concerned would wish to avoid. Mr Poole stated that the opportunity might exist for one or two.</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed, as requested by Mr Burr, to amend the appropriate documentation to reflect only a single dwelling, or pair of semis within a single curtilage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Special Landscape Quality: SLA designation is likely to be removed under local planning in the future. Mr Poole advised that an NP designation had been supported at Lawshall. It was noted that Mr Carpenter had produced a supporting report, which had been circulated, which is an important document for SCC and BDC.</li> <li>➤ Paul Munson at BDC has requested clear justification of the SLQ. Mr Carpenter cited the issues of the head waters of the Glem; one from Lords' Farm, one from near Swan Farm Bungalow. He said that, if there is any vegetation within the landscape, it would be taken to Blue Hog Lane. The Proposals Map and Justification will be amended.</li> <li>➤ <u>Policy Amendments:</u></li> <li>➤ <u>HAR 1:</u> Settlement Pattern Policy: A minor amendment to wording re small infill sites in clusters. Agreed</li> <li>➤ <u>HAR 2:</u> Housing Development within the Built-up Area Boundary: No comments Agreed</li> <li>➤ <u>HAR 3:</u> Housing Development outside the Built-up Area Boundary: Proposal to increase single or small scale groups; stated maximum of 3 dwellings adjacent to BUAB to be increased to 4. Mr Poole agreed to review wording to reflect single curtilage as above.</li> <li>➤ <u>HAR 4:</u> Housing Mix: No change</li> <li>➤ <u>HAR 5:</u> Replacement Dwellings: Amended due to BDC concerns. Mr Burr requested that the word 'grandiose' was removed if it was still in the plan wording.</li> </ul>	<p>NP</p> <p>NP</p> <p>NP/IP?</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p> <p>IP</p>

4

- HAR 6: Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites: No change
- HAR 7: Biodiversity Assets: No change
- HAR 8: Protecting and Maintaining Features of Biodiversity Value: No change
- HAR 9: Hardest Area of Special Landscape Quality. Amendments agreed
- HAR 10: Protection of Important Views: No Change. Now included within HAR 9.
- HAR 11: Settlement Gaps: No change
- HAR 12: Local Green Space: No change
- HAR 13: Protection of Heritage Assets: No change
- HAR 14: Design Principles: Amendment requested by Anglian Water – Already done
- HAR 15: Economic Development – Applications for new/redundant farm buildings. Any viable? Check. Other Assets: Garage: Almost no development whatsoever. Check as to what BDC may have published re marketing. Whether can just reverse that. Mr Poole agreed to review policy wording
- HAR 16: Provision and Retention of Services and Facilities: Change mentioned, but no explicit details.
- HAR 17: Crown Public House: No comments received; no amendments.

Text Amendments:

NP: Update all mentions of the school within the Plan (IP to action)

Comments Log & Responses: Forms part of consultation statement with BDC submission. Circulated to everyone. Mr Burr had sent in comments. Mr Burr to recirculate document.

29 Local Responses: Mr Burr feels there were approx 15 comments against clusters, which is not reflected in the document. Messrs Price and Chivers believe that there were fewer objectors in relation to the clusters. All comments received will go to BDC examiner to ensure it meets basic conditions. Examiner may request changes to comments made. Mr Burr stated that if this is going through to BDC as is, it doesn't accurately reflect comments made. Mr Price disagreed advising that every single comment received was documented and, wherever possible, the contributor's own words were used.

Mr Poole outlined the process for this round of consultations: You could include within the main body of the document (as bullet points). Mr Burr advised that the proposed re-definition has probably allayed most of those fears; he is happy.

Garage Site/Community Shop Proposal: Mr Price had met with Mr Carpenter, Mr Collins and subsequently Mr Burr. If we felt such a proposal were worth supporting within the community, we could decide whether to include it within the NP. How to make the proposal sufficiently attractive to the community to fund itself. As a community shop, the site is excellent. However, if the shop only lasted, say, two years, there would be very little residual value. Possible to have some

	<p>sort of housing/community scheme and allow us to use BDC funds; some affordable housing and a commercial unit as a shop. Long shot, but if we felt it could be supported, the NP could support a scheme. If we allocate the site, this would bring NP into statutory use even if BDC does not have a 5 year plan. The site would require a great deal of work. Good position for a shop. Lots of things in the Plan already to support it. Dr Browning suggested that, unless it's essential, such amendment would complicate Plan and perhaps delay matters. (Approx 6-9 months until referendum)</p>	
5	<p><u>Public Meeting and Consultation</u>: Allow people to submit comments following a public meeting. How far should consultations extend; residents, businesses, landowners in the village? Ian Poole remarked that it would not be necessary to include statutory authorities in this exercise. It was agreed that all previous consultees would be notified (with the exception of the aforementioned statutory consultees). Response methods last time included: online survey, email and correspondence. It was agreed to use the same methods and that the consultation period should be for four weeks.</p> <p>It was agreed to meet again shortly and then again at the beginning of the exercise and the consultation launch.</p> <p>It was further agreed to:-</p> <p>To hold a public meeting in March – arranged for Wednesday 21 March (1800-2200 hours) – chaired by Dr Browning (PC Chairman) and to provide a presentation of each of the 17 policies (by Ian Poole) (There would be no need to go through all the community action points; they could be explained to the meeting and then have a Q&amp;A session.)</p> <p>Produce a leaflet for inclusion in the March next edition of 'Contact' – required by 22 February (text by 13 February).</p> <p>By 22 February, the following would be required; posters, billboards and leaflet.</p> <p>David Burr offered to arrange the display of notices publicising the consultation launch. Notices for the web site, notice board, the Crown, Institute, etc – required 2 weeks prior to the public meeting. Those documents on which the consultation will focus (the NP and Proposals Map) will all be available on line.</p> <p>Also required:</p> <p>Format for consultation</p> <p>Format for reporting comments and responses (including Church)</p> <p>Hard copies to be available in Church, the Crown and the Institute.</p> <p>Ian Poole to action updates (agreed by email).</p>	
6	<p><u>Submission to BDC</u>: PC will need to make the decision to submit (as 'responsible body' – to be minuted. Written plan and any supporting maps, consultation statement, basic conditions statement.</p> <p>Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Ian Poole ran through documents for BDC; they will check that they are in order and will undertake a 6 weeks' consultation themselves. We will have to publicise that it's out for further consultation. All comments to BDC and appropriate date(s) in 'Contact'. Already had discussions</p>	

	<p>with BDC on the preferred Examiner. (NPWP favoured person dealing with Lawshall's NP (based in Chelmsford). BDC pays examiner's costs. Some queries for the NPWP may arise from the examination exercise. Upon receipt of answers, the examination is complete. (Mr Poole advised that, on very rare occasions, there may be a public hearing.) Some changes may be requested by the examiner. It is rare that the examiner advises the NP cannot proceed. From examination, the NP proceeds to BDC and then to referendum (lead in time 6 weeks).</p> <p>Towards the end of the period, there will be discussions as to when the referendum can take place (preferably not during school holidays). Mr Poole advised that Babergh will not want the formal consultation during school holidays, therefore, timings will be tight to complete before summer holidays.</p>	
7	<p><u>Agreed Dates &amp; Actions:</u></p> <p>13 February: Notice of public meeting ready for circulation in 'Contact'</p> <p>22 February: A5 Leaflets ready for 'Contact' and publication on website.</p> <p>7 March: Laminated posters – ready two weeks ahead of consultation Photographs to be taken for inclusion in consultation Statement</p> <p>21 March: Consultation launched: Comments to be requested from everyone on each individual policy.</p> <p>18 April: Consultation closes.</p> <p>16 May: 7 p.m. Meeting PC/NPWP – Institute</p>	<p>NP</p> <p>NP</p> <p>NP/DB</p> <p>DB</p>