

Minutes



Local Development Framework Sub-Committee

23rd May 2012

Present:

Councillors	Present	Councillors	Present
D L Bebb	Apologies	Lady Newton	Yes
G Butland	Apologies	W D Scattergood	Yes
A V E Everard	Yes	C Siddall	Yes
M C M Lager	Yes	M Thorogood	Yes
J M Money	Yes	R G Walters	Yes

Councillors P Horner, D Mann and A F Shelton were also in attendance.

1 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

INFORMATION: The following interests were declared:-

Councillor W D Scattergood declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 5 - Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Draft Inset Plans and, in particular, GRM1 – Land at Long Fen, Great Maplestead as objectors to and supporters of the site were known to her in her capacity as Ward Councillor.

Councillor C Siddall declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 5 - Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Draft Inset Plans and, in particular, Earls Colne Airfield structural landscaping, as the owners of the Airfield were known to him.

Councillor R G Walters declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 5 - Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Draft Inset Plans and, in particular, Earls Colne Airfield structural landscaping, as the owners of the Airfield were known to him.

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

2 **MINUTES**

DECISION: The Minutes of the meeting of the Local Development Framework Panel held on 11th April 2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3 **QUESTION TIME**

INFORMATION: There were nine statements made. Details of the people who spoke at the meeting are contained in the Appendix to these Minutes.

Councillor P Haylock (Great Maplestead Parish Council) and Councillor J Burlo (Pebmarsh Parish Council) attended the meeting and spoke during the consideration of Item 5 - Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Draft Inset Plans.

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

4 **SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN AND DRAFT INSET PLANS FOR EARLS COLNE AIRFIELD structural landscaping, FOXEARTH and LISTON, GOSFIELD AIRFIELD, GOSFIELD site GOS5, GREAT MAPLESTEAD, LAMARSH and ALPHAMSTONE, CRESSING, PEBMARSH and SHALFORD**

Councillor P Haylock, Chairman of Great Maplestead Parish Council, joined the meeting and spoke on the Great Maplestead Inset Plans.

Councillor J Burlo, Chairman of Pebmarsh Parish Council, joined the meeting and spoke on the Pebmarsh Inset Plans.

INFORMATION: Mrs E Dash, Planning Policy Manager, presented a report on the preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. The report included proposed Village Inset Plans for villages in the District together with Parish Councils' views on proposed sites. Together with the Core Strategy, these documents identified sites for development over the forthcoming fifteen year period. It was anticipated that further development sites would be put forward by landowners/agents following public consultation on the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.

The report related to sites within the rural parts of the District and it was noted that the Core Strategy required a minimum of 300 dwellings to be provided in non 'key service' villages. However, as more than 300 dwellings had either been built, or granted permission in these villages, there was no requirement for the Council to allocate more dwelling sites.

In considering Liston Village Inset site LIS1 – former International Flavours and Fragrance (IFF) Site, near Long Melford, it was noted that both the District boundary between Braintree and Babergh and the County boundary between Essex and Suffolk ran through the site and Members queried whether the boundary could be moved. It was reported that altering an administrative boundary was a lengthy process. However, it was agreed that details of the procedure should be provided to Members of the Sub-Committee.

In discussing Gosfield Village Inset, it was agreed that Officers should obtain the view of Gosfield Parish Council regarding the provision of allotments and to report back on this to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

With respect to Great Maplestead Village Inset, Members were reminded that on 22nd February 2012 they had agreed to allocate site GRM1 – land at Long Fen, Great Maplestead as a residential development site and to include it within the development boundary, subject to this being supported by the residents of the village following consultation by the Parish Council. The Chairman of the Parish Council reported that as part of the preparation of the Village Design Statement a questionnaire had been sent to all residents who had been asked if the village envelope should be extended to include site GRM1. There had been a good response to the questionnaire and a substantial number of residents had indicated that they did not support the inclusion of the site. Officers reported on the number of planning applications which had been approved over recent years for sites in Great Maplestead and Little Maplestead and reminded Members that site GRM5 – land adjacent to Treeways, Church Street, Great Maplestead had been approved for inclusion within the development boundary. Furthermore, if required the Parish Council could request the designation of land adjoining the village envelope as an exception site for the provision of affordable housing. Based on this information and the outcome of the questionnaire, Members of the Sub-Committee proposed that the site should not be allocated as a residential development site.

In discussing Cressing Village Inset, reference was made to site CRE11 - 1 Oak Corner, Shelleys Lane, Cressing. Concern had been expressed during Question Time by the Agent for the site that the Parish Council may have mistaken its location and it was suggested that the Parish Council's views should be clarified.

During the debate on Pebmarsh Village Inset, it was moved and seconded that the recommendations set out within the report be approved. An amendment was subsequently moved and seconded that site PEB8 – land to the rear of Charwin, Cross End, Pebmarsh be included within the development boundary. On being put to the vote the amendment was declared LOST. The vote on the substantive motion to approve the recommendation contained in the report was declared CARRIED.

Regarding site SHA7 - land to the South of White Court, Braintree Road, Shalford, a revised map indicating an alternative development boundary was circulated at the meeting.

DECISION: That the draft Village Inset Plans for Earls Colne Airfield structural landscaping, Foxearth and Liston, Gosfield Airfield, Gosfield site GOS5, Great Maplestead, Lamarsh and Alphamstone, Cressing, Pebmarsh and Shalford and the specific recommendations set out in the report relating to these settlements be approved for the purpose of consultation, subject to the following amendments:-

Gosfield Airfield - That Gosfield Airfield Map 1a, incorporating an industrial development boundary around part of site GOS1, be approved as the draft site allocations Inset Plan. It was agreed that sites GOS4, GOS6 and GOS7 should not be included within an industrial development boundary and should remain as countryside.

Gosfield – That, in addition to the decision made by the Local Development Framework Panel on 24th January 2012, site GOS5 - land North of Meadway, Gosfield be not allocated as a development site, and the existing village envelope be retained as shown on Map 2, subject to the 'community woodland' designation for The Grove, Hall Drive, Gosfield being removed.

Great Maplestead – That site GRM1 – land at Long Fen, Great Maplestead be not allocated as a development site and excluded from the development boundary.

Cressing – That site CRE11 - 1 Oak Corner, Shelleys Lane, Cressing be not allocated as a development site, subject to Cressing Parish Council confirming that it does not support this site.

Shalford – (1) That SHA6 – land to the rear of Grubbs Cottage, Church End, Shalford (re-drawn to exclude the area identified as 'under woodland management) as shown on Map 2, and SHA7 - land to the South of White Court, Braintree Road, Shalford as shown on Map 4, be not allocated as development sites.

(2) That the designation of the area of land at the junction of Braintree Road and Church End (up to the current fence line adjacent to White Court) as informal recreation, as shown on Map 4, be approved.

5 **NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a report on the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the key implications for planning in the Braintree District. The NPPF had replaced previous Government planning policy guidance with a much smaller document and contained some new guidance, including a presumption in favour of sustainable development and a requirement to grant permission where a plan was absent, silent, or where relevant policies were out of date.

The Government had published the final version of the NPPF on 27th March 2012. This had replaced, with immediate effect, various Government Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Planning Policy Statements on specific subjects, with the overriding aim of streamlining guidance and encouraging growth.

The Council had one year to determine which, if any, parts of the Core Strategy should be updated to reflect the NPPF, and would be required to take account of the new guidance in the preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. The Council would also have to consider whether guidance contained in the former Regional Plan and National Planning Policy Guidance should be incorporated within the Plan.

The NPPF proposed that Councils should consider applications for housing in the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and relevant policies for the supply of housing would not be considered up to date if a Council could not demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites. It was therefore important that Braintree District Council continued to demonstrate that a five year supply existed. The NPPF required the Council to identify an additional 5% of housing land as a buffer to ensure delivery against target. However, the buffer could be identified from readily available sites, which were forecast to be built after the five year period. The Council would be required to incorporate the new policy on the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.

DECISION: That it be Recommended to Cabinet and Council that:-

- the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework be noted.
- an assessment of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and the Local Plan Review be carried out to establish which policies, if any, are in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and to consider proposals for the amendment of such policies, as appropriate, within the transitional period.
- the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework be taken into account in future work, including in development management and in drawing up development management policies for the Local Development Framework.

6 PANFIELD LANE, BRAINTREE - MASTER PLAN PUBLIC CONSULTATION

INFORMATION: Consideration was given to a report on the responses received following initial consultation on the preliminary development Master Plan for land at Panfield Lane, Braintree.

The Panfield Lane site had been allocated as a strategic growth location in the adopted Core Strategy. The site comprised land for the erection of 600 dwellings, community facilities, open space and 15 hectares of land for employment use including a possible new site for Braintree Town Football Club. A spine road linking Springwood Drive with Panfield Lane would also be provided for use by local traffic. It was anticipated that the houses would be developed between 2018 and 2026, but the employment use would not be phased. The Core Strategy required that development of the growth location should be in accordance with a Master Plan to be approved by the Council as a Supplementary Planning Document.

Mersea Homes and Hills Residential, the developers of the Panfield Lane site, were currently preparing a Master Plan and had held an informal public consultation event on 2nd and 3rd March 2012 to obtain the views of the public and interested parties on their preliminary proposals. A summary of the responses submitted was attached as an Appendix to the report.

Officers had submitted a provisional response to the consultation and this was set out in section 3 of the report. This indicated that the draft Master Plan was broadly consistent with the Council's Core Strategy, but contained insufficient detail and should identify specific land uses, highway layouts and more information on the local centre. Members of the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee were requested to endorse the response, subject to the paragraph under 'Landscape Issues' relating to an area of vegetation adjacent to the Enterprise Centre being deleted. In discussing the draft Plan, Members suggested also that the proposed HGV width restriction should be removed and a vehicle weight restriction imposed instead; and that the Council's requirement for a mix of housing tenures and types, particularly in respect of affordable housing, should be reinforced.

The Master Plan would be re-drafted and a revised Plan published later in the year for further public consultation, before being adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

DECISION: That the responses submitted following consultation on the preliminary Master Plan for Panfield Lane, Braintree be noted and the Council's response set out in section 3 of the report, as amended above, be agreed.

The meeting commenced at 6.00pm and closed at 8.30pm.

Councillor R G Walters

(Chairman)

APPENDIX

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SUB-COMMITTEE

23RD MAY 2012

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Details of Questions Asked / Statements Made During Public Question Time

Statements Relating to Item 5 - Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and Draft Inset Plans

- (i) Statement by Mr Tony Clayton, Liston Mill, Liston (Liston Village Inset - Site LIS1) (Objector)
- (ii) Statement by Mrs Cheryl O'Connell, Liston Lodge, Liston (Liston Village Inset - Site LIS1) (Objector)
- (iii) Statement by Mr Edward Gittins, Edward Gittins Assocs, Unit 5, Patches Yard, Glemsford, Suffolk (Gosfield Airfield Inset) (Agent for Supporter of site)
- (iv) Statement by Mr Peter Schwier, Long Fen, Great Maplestead (Great Maplestead Village Inset and Site GRM1) (Supporter)
- (v) Statement by Mrs Michelle Bessell, Laundry Cottage, Monks Lodge Road, Great Maplestead (Great Maplestead Village Inset and Site GRM1) (Supporter)
- (vi) Statement by Mrs Pauline Hennessey, Library Cottage, Monks Lodge Road, Great Maplestead (Great Maplestead Village Inset and Site GRM 1) (Supporter)
- (vii) Statement by Mr Edward Gittins, Edward Gittins Assocs, Unit 5, Patches Yard, Glemsford, Suffolk (Cressing Village Inset - Site CRE11) (Agent for Supporter of site)
- (viii) Statement by Mr Andy Stimpson (address not available) (Pebmarsh Village Inset - Site PEB8) (Supporter)
- (ix) Statement by Mr Chris Loon, Springfields Planning and Development Ltd, 15 Springfields, Great Dunmow, Essex (Shalford Village Inset – Site SHA7) (Agent for Supporter of site)