

Notes of the Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) Meeting Thursday 23rd March - 7.30 pm at White Hart Hotel, Coggeshall

1. Welcome and apologies:

Present:

Peter Kohn (PK)	Chairman/Facilities & Infrastructure
Jan Stobart (JS)	
Michael Bowes (MB)	Economy
Alex Stevenson (AS)	Heritage and Environment
Paul Javin (PJ)	Heritage and Environment
Tom Walsh (TB)	Housing
Steve Lavender (SL)	Housing
Jo Brindley (JB)	Publicity

Apologies: Jill Ward (JW), Tracey Thomson (TT), Anna Appleton-Claydon (AA-C), Meg Jones (MJ), Michael Horne (MH)

2. Minutes of the last meeting: Agreed by all

3. Matters arising not covered in the minutes

- i. Parish Council (PC meetings)
 - Open spaces – Alex reported on the agreement of the Parish Council to funding the Landscape character assessments
 - March 27th (Planning meeting). TW and AA-C will be attending as councillors. PJ to attend but Bovis had withdrawn pending discussions with Essex CC about education and Trine will present their Dutch Nursery proposals instead.
- ii. Feering and Kelvedon neighbouring plan groups meeting March 27th: MB, PK, AS and JB to attend
- iii. A120 submission. PK noted that the submission on behalf of Feering, Coggeshall, Stisted and Bradwell had been submitted on time.

New planning submissions – Bovis consultation. A discussion about whether to engage with new planning applications and developers had several divergent opinions. There was no desire to unintentionally enhance a developers application by appearing as a consultee. On the other hand if applications were to go ahead the NP would want to influence them in the same way as the Dutch Nursery development where the engagement had improved the scheme using the NP emerging principles. Because developers had options on many plots of land both inside and outside the ring road this was likely to be an ongoing issue. the group *discussed the difference between objecting to a development and engaging / influencing. It was agreed that for sites allocated in the BDC draft plan it was sensible and possibly incumbent on the group to engage to influence the proposals in accordance with our emerging policies based on research and community consultation. In regard to unallocated sites within the parish we can object as a group, without engaging and so avoid the possibility of positively influencing development plans and therefore helping the developer to gain planning permission.*

 - Pidgeon Appeal for West St on 9th May. It was agreed that TW would represent the Neighbourhood Planning steering group at the appeal hearing. He asked for support from the group in preparing the arguments. JS reported the recent appeal for a development at Silver End which had concentrated on the impact on the primary school provision and that this had gone against Braintree DC Planning Committee refusal. It would not be wise to place too much reliance on this particular line of argument and therefore knowledge the capacity situation was in neighbouring schools would be needed to be known.

4. Community Engagement Plan – Parish Survey 26/11/16

- Survey in April - draft questionnaire/quotes for support
 - i. JB circulated draft 9 of the survey which has been designed on the basis of getting evidence for the issues that have already been discussed and the policies that MB

has drafted. JB had tested the draft out on her parents which had highlighted some of the issues with answering

- ii. The group were very positive about the draft and went on to examine the questions section by section
- iii. Particular attention was given to the housing section to examine whether there were too many questions. It was agreed that the questions did examine questions raised by the draft policies. **Action: TW agreed to take the discussion offline with JB to look at these in more detail.**
- iv. The final question about the potential use of planning gain from developers and whether this should be the spur for more development was keenly debated. There was no wish to set off the impression that the NP was keen on this happening but it does represent one of the choices that could be made in the village. It was agreed to return to an earlier wording about this subject to try and make the choices as clear as possible.
- v. The on-line version was been explored by AA-C.
- vi. An inducement to complete and return the survey, e.g. a bottle of champagne, meal voucher or donation to a charity, will also be included.
- vii. AS suggested that the website and FB page should include explanations of some of their terms / ideas in the survey for the community to reference. **Action: AS to pursue and circulate.**
- viii. PK suggested that there should be a short timescale for getting the survey out: **Action: PK and JB to take final decisions re content and process for getting the survey out, as long as this stayed within the budget**

- Website – AS has updated with news, progress and minutes and will be meeting with AA-C to find out more about WordPress.
- Drone photos. A local enthusiast has offered the opportunity to take photos from a drone for inclusion in the NP. this was agreed
- AS +PJ due to meet the Chamber of Commerce 5th April
- PJ noted that community consultations with Stakeholder Groups should now be progressed. Details of the groups has been placed on Dropbox and members will need to confirm their involvement with these groups. ACTION ALL

5. Budget Plan

This had been approved by the Parish Council

6. Draft Plan

- i. Gantt chart:
 - The whole plan would need to be moved back; MB asked that we try and stick with our existing timetable
- ii. Preparing policies for consultation – testing against Braintree policies and the matrix. meeting with Alan Massow (AM) 8/3/17:
 - MB had prepared a 4 page document for the meeting with AM. the group worked through the sections. this was apt of a much longer document which AM agreed to take an early look at
 - AM gave advice on what policies to include and exclude and where repetition might add value. The CNP doesn't need to include all areas especially where the local plan already covers
 - The 5 year land supply was discussed and whether this left developers with opportunity to go outside the BDC draft plan. AM advised that without the NP there was a presumption in favour of developers
 - The draft local plan on the website is a consultation version
 - we discussed community aspirations, especially the cycle routes and riverside walk
- iii. **Action: All policy areas need to upgrade their policies in the light of comments made by Alan**

7. Landscape Character Assessments. Parish Council had approved a budget for the areas identified. AS to organise consultant to carry out work

8. BDC business rates – Fork ‘andles

Mb had investigated the issues and the comments were appended to the agenda. essentially there was no action to be taken at this time

9. AOB. Waste Management Plan

There had been a request for additional truck movements to the A120. There was a new planning application to increase the height of the proposed stack to 50m. It was agreed that members who would wish to protest must do this individually

Date and time of next meeting: 7.30 pm on March 27th at the White Hart