

Danbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of the Meeting held on 19th June 2017
At the Old Pavilion, Main Road, Danbury, CM3 4NQ

Present: Steve Arthurs (SA)
Norman Bartlett (NB)
Dan Carlin (DC), Danbury Parish Councillor
Sue Dobson (SD)
Stephen Holland (SH)
Gilly Lutton (GL)
Lesley Mitchelmore (LM), Neighbourhood Plan Coordinator
Mark Scofield (MS), Hands Off Danbury Action Group
Roger Sheriff (RS)
John Steele (JS), Danbury Parish Council

Observing: One member of the public – Joel Fayers (JF) from Snapdragon Consulting

Agenda Number	Agenda Item	Action
1.	Apologies for Absence	
	Apologies were received from Judith Clacy (JC), Elly Bunn (EB), Irene Giudotti (IG), Martin Lister and Anthony Rogers (AR).	
2.	Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items	
	No interests were declared.	
3.	Public Participation Session	
	There was no participation from the public.	
4.	Minutes	
	The minutes from the meeting of May 12 th 2017 were circulated. The minutes were signed as a true record of that meeting.	
5.	Action Points Arising from the Minutes – not otherwise listed on the agenda.	
	<p>MS had requested a list of historic planning applications from Jenny Robinson at Chelmsford City Council (CCC) but this had not been forthcoming. MS also stated that the Richborough Application is expected to be decided by 14th July 2017. The Old Chase Farm Appeal will be heard on 5th July and Gladman have now appealed. RS raised a concern that residents need to understand that the Neighbourhood Plan would not be able to provide a by-pass for the village.</p> <p>SH replied that this would be possible when providing feedback to the visions and objectives questionnaires. DC suggested that if it became an issue then the group could issue a statement.</p> <p>The coordinator reported that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Page 2: The response from Jenny Robinson with regards to when the 100 houses in the preferred options were effective had been emailed to the group. Please see</p>	

	<p>attached.</p> <p>Page 2: Emails were sent to prospective new group members on 18th May inviting them to this meeting but no reply was received.</p> <p>Page 5: No members identified links with local community groups other than St John's Church. The group will at least need to consult with the church groups/any other religious group and disability groups.</p> <p>Page 5: The finalised survey has been submitted for the Danbury Times. There is a minor amendment to what was sent in the agenda pack and this will be discussed later in the agenda.</p> <p>Page 5: Articles were printed in the Maldon and Burnham Gazette, The Journal, Contact Magazine, The EALC e-bulletin and Parish Life (which is distributed to Parish and Town Councils).</p>	
6.	Feedback from the Coordinator	
I.	<p>Chelmsford City Council (CCC) Preferred Options Consultation – Update</p> <p>The feedback report from the consultation will be presented to the committee at CCC on 13th July. It is unlikely to include results the call for sites at this stage.</p>	
II.	<p>Feedback from School's Engagement Danbury Park School</p> <p>The coordinator summarised the report written after the visit to Danbury Park School and explained the activities that the children were engaged in.</p>	Coordinator to circulate the report to members
7.	Feedback from Working Groups	
I.	<p>Communications Working Group</p> <p>An article for July's edition of The Journal was circulated. It is very similar to page 2 of the July Danbury Times, advertising the questionnaire. HOD, the Danbury Society and Parish Council will also advertise the questionnaire.</p>	Coordinator, SH, MS, NB
II.	<p>Visions and Objectives Working Group</p> <p>An amended version of the questionnaire was circulated and minor amendments to questions 10, 13 and 23 were noted. This has now been submitted for the Danbury Times July issue which will be distributed at the end June/beginning July. A copy of the online version was also circulated.</p> <p>The young persons and business questionnaires have been started and it was agreed that the group that approved the questionnaire would also approve these in time for the beginning of the consultation period.</p> <p>Members discussed the option of including local organisations in the business questionnaire. It was decided that this would not be appropriate and that separate letters will be sent to organisations. ML has written some draft questions and the coordinator will collate these into letters.</p>	<p>SH, questionnaire approval group</p> <p>Coordinator</p>

	The coordinator circulated draft copies of letters for statutory and non- statutory consultees.	
III.	<p>Members held a discussion about a document that had been circulated to the research group. http://www.savills.co.uk/research_articles/141280/217790-0.</p> <p>IG has been looking at environmental aspects and the Living Landscapes Documents.</p> <p>GL has been trying to engage with the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), looking into the possible causes of above average asthma rates in the village and how pollution may be reduced by the planting of hedges.</p>	
8.	Next Steps	
	<p>The Town and Country Planning Act regulations for Neighbourhood Planning and the documents required to meet them. There are basic conditions that need to be met by the neighbourhood plan. Members resolved to form a working group to oversee this and ensure that conditions are met. From the skills audit, SA, RS and SD were asked if they would join the group. SA and SD agreed. The coordinator has begun work identifying the documents required. A meeting has been arranged for 23rd June with Jenny Robinson and Clare Stuckey from CCC to discuss how best to approach some of the requirements. The meeting will also discuss developer engagement and site allocation. This will be attended by SH, SD, DC and the coordinator. This will be an ongoing process.</p> <p>Members to form a working group to develop the strategy for considering sites and engaging with developers/landowners/agents. From the skills audit, DC and AR were recommended to join the group, also NB if he had available time. As AR was not present at the meeting, the coordinator will invite him to join the working group. SA also volunteered to join the group. The strategy needs to be place for the next steering group meeting on 17th July. The coordinator will collate existing information about sites that have come forward.</p> <p>Members held a discussion about future questionnaires and resolved to review the success of the Visions and Objectives questionnaire when planning the next consultation. The next questionnaire will not be able to be delivered in the Danbury Times and would need to be delivered by hand. MS stated that HOD volunteers would help to deliver them. There is funding for the printers to put the questionnaires into envelopes.</p> <p>The coordinator will organise training for members in writing policies.</p>	<p>Coordinator, SA, RS, SD</p> <p>Coordinator, DC, SA, SH</p> <p>Coordinator, Visions and Objectives Group, Communications Group</p> <p>Coordinator</p>

	<p>Members were concerned that residents may not be aware that the Neighbourhood Plan will be subject to a referendum. It was resolved to inform residents of this fact during the next public engagement activities or include it in a press release where appropriate.</p> <p>The member of the public was asked to leave the room at 8.11pm (as they work for a consultancy representing a development company) whilst members held a discussion about planning applications and appeals.</p> <p>The member of the public returned to the room.</p> <p>Members to receive guidelines for the creation of Suitable Accessible (Alternative) Green Space (SANG) The link for this document was previously circulated to members. The document relates to the use of alternative green spaces to reduce pressure of increased recreational use on environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>SANGS may be relevant to sustainability when considering sites as will green open spaces and the distance from houses to green spaces. The research group is collating a list of existing green spaces within the village.</p>	ML
9.	Proposed Photographic Competition	
	<p>It was proposed that the competition be delegated to the Communications working group.</p> <p>It may be possible to have aerial photographs taken of the potential sites.</p>	Communications Group
10.	Questions From the Public	
	There were no questions from the public. Joel Fayers from Snapdragon Consulting had come to the meeting to hear about developer engagement.	
11.	Items for Public/Press Release	
	The previously circulated article will be submitted to the Journal.	SH
12	Items to be Included in the Next Agenda	
	<p>The following items were requested for the next agenda: A strategy for sites and developers. Summary of existing potential sites. Timetable of dates for meetings.</p>	
13.	Date of Next Meeting	
	Monday 17 th July at 2pm at the Old Pavilion	
14.	Timetable of Meetings	
	<p>Monday 21st August at 7pm. Members resolved to continue holding meetings on the 3rd Monday each month alternating between 2pm and 7pm.</p>	

The meeting was closed at 8.37pm.

Confirmed as accurate record of the meeting:

Chair _____

Date _____