

Danbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 16th December 2019 at 2pm
At Danbury Parish Council Office, Main Road, Danbury, CM3 4NQ

Present: Steve Arthurs (SA)
Judith Clacy (JC)
Sue Dobson (SD) Chairman
Irene Guidotti (IG)
Stephen Holland (SH)
Mark Scofield (MS)

In Attendance: Lesley Mitchelmore (LM), Neighbourhood Plan Coordinator

Agenda Number	Agenda Item	Action
19/20 46	Apologies for Absence	
	Elly Bunn (EB), Cllr A Chapman (AC), Martin Lister (ML), Gilly Lutton (GL)	
19/20 47	Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items	
	Mark Scofield declared a non-pecuniary interest that he was the Chairman of HOD, a member of the Danbury Society and lived overlooking a Site. Stephen Holland declared that he was a director at the Danbury Community Association (Sports and Social Centre.). Judith Clacy declared a non-pecuniary interest that she lived overlooking a site. Steve Arthurs declared that he was a trustee of the Landisdale Trust and Fabric Officer at St John's Church. Sue Dobson declared that she was a City Councillor (representing a different Ward) and a member of Chelmsford City Council Planning Committee.	
19/20 48	Public Participation Session	
	None	
19/20 49	Minutes	
	RESOLVED: that the minutes from the meeting of 29th July 2019 were approved and signed as a correct record.	
19/20 50	Actions Arising from the minutes	
	Actions arising from the minutes not otherwise listed on the agenda.	
	<i>Irene Guidotti arrived at the meeting.</i>	

	<p>19/20 39 2.1 2: The response from Essex Highways had been received and additional queries raised. A further response was awaited.</p> <p>19/20 39.2.1.3: Proposals had not been received for sites D7 and D15.</p> <p>19/20 39.2.1: Aecom (through the grant funders Locality) were providing a Sites Assessment Update for the updated site proposals.</p> <p>19/20 39.2.3 The Housing Needs Assessment had been successfully applied for and was underway. The final report was anticipated by the end of February 2020.</p> <p>19/20 39.3 The 'Update Me' form had been added to the Danbury Neighbourhood Plan Website and a number of requests to join the mailing list had been received. The Coordinator would confirm the number of residents on the mailing list after the meeting.</p> <p>19/20 39.4. 1 and 2 The Basic Conditions pro-formas were yet to be produced.</p> <p>19/20 40 The Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) was underway.</p> <p>19/20 41 Comments to the Chelmsford City Council Main Modifications consultation had been received from two members and had been included in the Parish Council Response.</p> <p>19/20 42</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The next steps for the plan had been published. ii. The link for the mailing list had been added to the Neighbourhood Plan Website and had been advertised on local social media. <p>19/20 43 The Consultation process for proposals received from Landowners/Agents were not included in the agenda.</p>	
19/20 51	Feedback from Working Groups	
	<p>19/20 51.1 Plan Writing Group</p> <p>Members received a verbal update on progress from Irene Guidotti. The plan writing group were looking at the Design Code and were reviewing the Building for Life 12 document¹. The group had reviewed the Danbury Framework policies and were considering the historical and more modern context of the Village. Stephen Holland had taken photographs around the six Character Areas of Danbury that had been updated earlier in the process to assist. It was suggested that the Group should consider areas adjoining Danbury.</p> <p>¹ (https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/resources/guide/building-life-12-third-edition)</p>	

	<p>19/20.51.2 Sites Working Group</p> <p>The group received a verbal update from Stephen Holland and the Appraisal Criteria to assess sites against the Objectives for the Plan had been circulated prior to the meeting. Amendments were made to the proposed Appraisal Criteria for Environment and Business and Economy. The wording of the Design and Heritage Objective would be reviewed to ensure that it was firm enough in its intention without being too prescriptive. The Criteria were proposed as amended by Stephen Holland and seconded by Sue Dobson and all agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: that the Appraisal Criteria as amended during the meeting be approved and adopted.</p> <p>Proposed: Stephen Holland, Seconded: Sue Dobson, all agreed.</p>	SH
19/20 52	<p>Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA), Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) and Site Assessment Update</p>	
	<p>Members received a verbal update on the SEA, HNA and Site Assessment updates. Gratitude was expressed towards the consultants at Aecom who were working to meet timescales for the Neighbourhood Plan. It was anticipated that drafts would be received by the end of the year.</p>	
19/20 53	<p>Plan Writing</p>	
	<p>Members considered what further outside assistance may be required to speed up the preparation of the draft plan written to a professional standard.</p> <p>i. Plan writing Assistance: It was explained that this was not available as a technical support package through Locality, that funding would need to be applied for and may require Parish Council approval depending on costs. The Coordinator had contacted some companies but they had yet to respond. After some discussion, it was agreed that assistance would be required to bring the draft plan and policies together and format and check it to ensure that it was robust. It may also include the cost of artwork and printing</p> <p>RESOLVED: to seek professional assistance to complete the draft plan.</p> <p>Proposed: Sue Dobson, Seconded: Judith Clacy, all agreed.</p> <p>ii. Design Guide: this was available as a technical support package through Locality. Members considered whether to ask for a review of the Design Code once it had been produced by the Group or apply for the Design Code to be produced in its entirety.</p>	<p>Coordinator, SD, SH and Plan Writing Group</p>

	<p>RESOLVED: to investigate professional assistance for the Design Guide and apply either for the Design Guide Technical Support Package through Locality or apply for funding for an outside body via Locality/Parish Council depending on timescales. The final decision was delegated to the Plan Writing Group, the Chairman and Vice Chairman and Neighbourhood Plan Coordinator.</p> <p>Proposed: Sue Dobson, Seconded: Mark Scofield, and all agreed.</p>	
19/20 54	Items for Public/Press Release	
	None	
19/20 55	Items to be Included in the Next Agenda	
	None	
19/20 56	Date of Next Meeting	
	The next meeting was scheduled for 20 th January 2020 at the revised time of 2pm, at the Parish Council Office.	Coordinator
19/20 57	Timetable of Meetings	
	<p>20th January 2020 2pm 17th February 2020 2pm 16th March 2020 7pm</p> <p>All to be held at the Parish Council Office.</p>	

There being no more business the Chairman closed the meeting at 3.35pm.

Confirmed as accurate record of the meeting:

Chair _____

Date _____

Danbury Neighbourhood Plan – Site Allocation

Introduction

At the Steering Group meeting on 29th July 2019 it was decided Landowners would be asked to put forward their development proposals providing:

- Location Plan
- Proposed Access
- Area for development (which must be adjoining the DSB) to accommodate up to 30 homes. This is in accordance with Residents' replies to Question 12 of the NP Questionnaire No. 2
- Housing mix should be in line with CCC LP policies
- Mitigation of any constraints.

Re-Assessment of Sites

A re-assessment of the sites is now required taking account of the landowner proposals. Locality have been approached for funding to allow AECOM to undertake this assessment on our behalf. The SG believes an independent assessment and report will provide robust evidence to facilitate the site selection. In addition, the SG does not have the technical skill to undertake a Landscape assessment of the sites.

Draft Selection Criteria have been developed – see Appendix 1.

Neighbourhood Plan Objectives

The selected Sites must be assessed against the Objectives of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Draft Appraisal Criteria have been developed – see Appendix 2. Draft Thresholds to be used in the assessment have also been developed – see Appendix 3.

SNH

14/10/2019

Summary Site Selection Criteria

Objective	Appraisal Criteria
<p>Housing & Development ‘To ensure there is a high-quality housing provision for all ages, which responds to Danbury’s needs. Any development will be sustainable (meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs). It will also be appropriate to the scale and nature of the Parish, with the separation between existing settlements being maintained. Green energy in new developments will be encouraged’.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be Sustainable [Use AECOM Overall Assessment of Partial Site] 2. Available for development and without known impediment 3. Has satisfactory highway access and minimal impact on highway network 4. Keep separation between settlements 5. Be within or adjacent the Defined Settlement Boundary 6. Not cause harm to the setting of SSSIs, listed buildings, Conservation Area 7. Not cause harm to important views, designated open green spaces, valued landscapes, residential amenities or habitats 8. Is well-connected to existing village amenities, for example the Medical Centre, Co-op or Tesco, Schools, Open Spaces, Pubs and a Bus Stop 9. Not at high risk of flooding 10. Use previously developed and infill sites 11. Over 500m of AQMA 12. Excluded from Minerals consultation as under 5ha of unconstrained land within the Minerals Safeguarding Area

DNP Objectives - Appraisal Criteria

The following minimum thresholds of significance have been identified to appraise the Landowners' development proposals against the DNP Objectives.

Objective	Minimum Threshold
<p>Design & Heritage 'Conserve and enhance Danbury's heritage assets and positive features which contribute to the village – <i>development affecting these assets and features will not be supported.</i>' (Wording in italics to be reviewed)</p>	<p>Unlikely to affect heritage assets or their settings</p>
<p>Environment 'To seek protection, conservation and enhancement of this significant element of Danbury's character, including its open spaces and rural lanes.' (<i>Assessment of rural lanes included in Transport & Movement</i>)</p>	<p>No designated areas (e.g. SSSIs) affecting site No protected species No effect to green infrastructure Agricultural Land should not be used No material effect on Landscape No effect on contaminated land Over 50m from a waterbody No requirement to upgrade water infrastructure Within Flood Zone 1 Over 500m from Danbury AQMA Excluded from Minerals consultation as under 5ha of unconstrained land within the Minerals Safeguarding Area</p>
<p>Transport & Movement 'To promote clean, safe streets and spaces, seeking creative solutions to the traffic issues that currently affect Danbury; encouraging sustainable transport, addressing parking issues and improvements to pavements where possible.'</p>	<p>Has satisfactory highway access or suitable access can be provided Minimal impact on the highway network Within 400m of public transport</p>
<p>Recreation & Leisure 'To improve Danbury's recreation & leisure facilities and increase provision where a shortfall exists.'</p>	<p>Within 800m walking distance of Eves Corner/Dawson Field Provision/loss of recreational facilities and open space</p>
<p>Amenities 'To ensure that important amenities are retained and sufficient for the future needs of residents.'</p>	<p>Within 800m walking distance of all services</p>
<p>Business & Economy 'To encourage further small-scale enterprises particularly working from home; commercial sites for green energy will also be supported where locally appropriate and where they will cause no demonstrable harm to the character of the area.'</p>	<p>Neutral effect on employment No effect on schools etc.</p>

NP Objectives Appraisal Criteria

		Neutral/Green	Amber	Red
Design & Heritage				
To conserve and enhance the historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting (13.1)	Unlikely to affect heritage assets or their settings	May have an adverse effect on designated heritage assets and/or their settings which can be mitigated	May have a significant adverse effect on a designated heritage assets or their settings which cannot be mitigated	
Environment				
Proximity to: - statutory international/national nature conservation designations (SAC, SPA, Ramsar, National Nature Reserve, Ancient Woodland); - local nature conservation designations (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site) (1.1)	No designations affecting site	Within 100m of a locally designated/Within 500m from an international/national site	Within 100m of a statutory designated site	
Presence of protected species. Presence of BAP habitats and species (1.2)	Does not contain protected species/BAP priority habitats and species	Within 100m of protected species/BAP priority habitats and species which can be mitigated	Contains protected species/BAP priority habitats and species which cannot be mitigated	
Green infrastructure provision. Enhancement of habitats and species (1.3)	Development would not affect green infrastructure provision	Development would not adversely affect green infrastructure provision	Development would have a significant adverse effect the green infrastructure network	
Development of brownfield / greenfield/ mixed land Development of agricultural land including best and most versatile agricultural land (Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grades 1, 2, 3 or 3A and 4)) (7.1)	Mixed greenfield/brownfield land or Agricultural Land Grade 4	Agricultural Land Grade 3 or 3A	Agricultural Land Grade 1 or 2	
Soil contamination (7.2)	Not affect the contamination of land/soils	Could be affected by existing contaminated land	Would result in the contamination of land/soils	
Proximity to waterbodies (8.1)	In excess of 50m of a waterbody	Within 10-50m of a waterbody	Within 10m of a waterbody	
Requirement for new or upgraded water management infrastructure (8.2)	No requirement to upgrade water management infrastructure	N/A	Requirement to upgrade water management infrastructure	
Presence of Environment Agency Flood Zones (9.1)	Within Flood Zone 1	Within Flood Zone 2	Within Flood Zone 3	
Proximity to Danbury Quality Management Areas (AQMA) (10.1)	In excess of 500m from the AQMA	Within 500m of the AQMA	Within the AQMA	
Development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas (12.1)	Excluded from Minerals consultation as under 5ha of unconstrained land within the Minerals Safeguarding Area	Over 5ha of unconstrained land within the Minerals Safeguarding Area and consultation required	Essex CC decion is likely to strongly resist development	

NP Objectives Appraisal Criteria

		Neutral/Green	Amber	Red
Transport & Movement				
Site Access		Has satisfactory highway access	Suitable access could be provided	Suitable access could not be provided
Impact on the highway network (6.2)		Minimal impact on highway network having dual access with footway	Access on to a road with either dual lanes without a footway or only a single lane with a footway	Access on to a road with only a single lane without a footway
Access to bus stops, railway stations or park and ride facility (6.1)		Within 400m walking distance of all services	Within 400m or more of one or more services	In excess of 400m from all services
Recreation & Leisure				
Access to recreational facilities and open spaces		Within 800m walking distance of Eves Corner/Dawson Field	More than 800m walking distance of Eves Corner/Dawson Field but within 600m of an open space	More than 800m of any facilities or more than 600m of an open space
Provision/loss of recreational facilities and open spaces (4.2)		Development would provide additional recreational facilities or open space	Development would not contribute to the provision of additional services and facilities and would increase pressure on existing services and facilities	Development would result in the loss of key services and facilities without their replacement
Amenities				
Walking distance to key services including: - GP surgeries - Primary schools - Post Office - Supermarkets (4.1)		Within 800m walking distance of all services	Within 800m of one or more key services and/or within 400m of public transport	More than 800m of any key service
Business & Economy				
Provision of employment		No loss of employment	Development of site without employment potential up to 1ha	Development of site without employment potential over 1ha
Impact on schools etc. 3.3		Development would not affect educational establishments or would contribute to the provision of additional services	Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities but would increase pressure on existing educational facilities	Development would result in the loss of an existing educational establishment/building without replacement provision elsewhere