

## MUCH HADHAM PARISH COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

### Minutes of the Meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held in the Bowls Club on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2016, at 7.30 pm

**PRESENT:** Cllr Ian Devonshire, Martin Adams, Michael Byrne, Neil Clarke, Ken Howlett, Bill O'Neill, Hugh Labram, Lynne Mills.

1. APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIR AND ACTING SECRETARY  
Cllr Ian Devonshire was proposed as acting chairman by MB and seconded by MA.  
Lynne Mills was proposed as acting secretary by HL and seconded by KH.
2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE  
Apologies were received from Mari Fleming, Ian Hunt, Mark Ashwell and Penny Taylor.
3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST  
There were no declarations of interest.
4. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME  
Ian Hunt had supplied notes for the meeting in which he stated, following the NP course attended by several of the group, the public consultation event should be put back as the project was not advanced enough at the present time. It was important to get things right particularly when creating statutory planning subject to inspection and referendum, and the duration of the project would be closer to 2 to 2+ years in delivery. We would also need an appraisal protocol put in place so we can show the criteria applied in assessing suitability of potential sites. We need to remind ourselves of why we are here by agreeing the project imperative, update our collective knowledge of what goes into the evidence base, consider whether we are aiming to deliver the plan before or after the local plan and provide an update of the tasks we've taken on board. There are still two vacancies, one for dealing with infrastructure matters and for a communications leader.
5. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING  
The draft minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> February were accepted as an accurate record.
6. MATTERS ARISING  
It was proposed that the public consultation event would need to be postponed as other considerations had to be addressed.  
  
MB reported that he had met with Foxleys and he and IH had met with Gordon Morrison who offered a donation and some services of the consultants at Strutt and Parker. It was generally felt that the steering group should not take up the donation for reasons of potential bias. Whilst it was important to talk to the landowners, the group should not be beholden to them, and we should bear in mind that the steering group had a bigger mandate than any other group. Evidence would need to be obtained from professionals – ie from planners, estate agents etc.
7. PROJECT IMPERATIVE  
HL made the point that we need to adhere to the same language as NP documentation e.g. the use of "imperative" in the documentation is "vision". After some discussion it was agreed that HL and MA would produce the project imperative.
8. COURSE FEEDBACK  
MB stated that the enormity of the task was becoming clear and the amount of work needed was a

shock. Questions asked would be in planning terms, sites must be suitable, available and achievable. Specific sites would need to meet all the requirements and whether they could be bought or sold. Would the land be available within the lifespan of the plan? KH stated that we need to be careful over perceived want vs actual want bearing in mind what was good for the village, impact on the environment, health, sustainability etc. The Neighbourhood Plan would be specific re sustainability – eg Uttlesford states their safe walking distance to shops is 0.8 miles. ID reminded the group that any decisions had to comply with present or emerging policies. HL stated that the vision objectives needed to be brief and clear, probably using a matrix log of quality evidence and conclusions. It was pointed out that if the Neighbourhood Plan was rejected it would need to be started again from the very beginning and that the Examiner could reject it more than once. For this reason we need to get it right from the start. KH stated that policies needed to be site specific with clear objectives being of paramount importance. We need a housing needs survey, including interviewing residents and approaching several local estate agents to assess demand. The Braintree Neighbourhood Development Plan was reassuring – MA to upload to Dropbox.

HL and KH presented a report obtaining evidence for housing demand – cf attached. Briefly two types of survey were suggested. One to local estate agents as they know the needs and demands. And another as village samples – survey with questionnaire being undertaken both in Ash Meadow (private homes) and Windmill Way (64 homes) being mixed both with social (26 homes) and private (38 homes).

9. DELIVERY DATE

It was suggested we should carry on at the same pace as the original timetable for now, although the timetable itself may need revisiting, then reconsider position before submitting to the Examiner. BO’N pointed out the longer we leave it the easier it would be for developers to move in.

10. RESIDENTS’ SURVEY

It was noted that the residents’ survey provided many views and related to land use, although useful in other ways. The NP will not reflect all those other views and opinions as they are outside its scope, and that will need to be explained. Future surveys will need to include questions specific to land usage. It was suggested that a working session with Isabel Haddow would be very useful – ID to approach her re. dates, sooner rather than later. A public consultation event would still be needed, possibly in June. Need to start with the vision statement, followed by objectives and evidence gathering and then feedback from residents.

11.

NP TASKS – EMAIL 17<sup>TH</sup> FEB.

Group generally sound with their tasks except LM who didn’t have any idea what consultants would be needed. MB stated he had some ideas and LM, ID and MB to meet to discuss.

12.

PROJECT PROGRESS/IT

MF not present. It was suggested that Dropbox was a little cluttered and perhaps some sort of file naming convention would be helpful.

13. LOCAL PLAN PROGRESS

ID stated that 9 sites were reported to be achievable but not deliverable.

14. RESIDENTS COMMENTS

There were no comments.

15. ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

The public consultation event.

16. CLOSING COMMENTS

It was noted that Strutt and Parker wanted to make a presentation at the next Parish Council

Meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April.

17. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of next meeting will be 12<sup>th</sup> April at the Bowls Club

Future meetings dates, venues TBA.

12<sup>th</sup> April

10<sup>th</sup> May - Green Tye Mission Hall

14<sup>th</sup> June

12<sup>th</sup> July

9<sup>th</sup> August

13<sup>th</sup> September

11<sup>th</sup> October

8<sup>th</sup> November

13<sup>th</sup> December

The meeting closed at approximately 9.45 pm.

LM – 12/3/16

DRAFT