

# Felsted Neighbourhood Plan Review Group

Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> June 2024, 5:45 pm. URC Hall

## Minutes (Meeting 7)

### Present:

Roy RAMM (RR CHAIRMAN), Richard FREEMAN(RF), Nick ARMON-JONES(NAJ), Brian POPE(BP), David COHEN(DC), Mike MASTER(MM), Hywel JONES (HJ), Mary-Ann DUNN(MD), Kevin FARROW(KF), David ANDREWS (DA), John MOORE(JKM), Roy MITCHELL(RM).

### 1. Apologies for Absence:

None: all present

### 2. Declaration of Interest:

None

### 3. Minutes of Last Meeting:

Dated 16<sup>th</sup> May 2024 (Meeting 6), approved after minor amendments for clarity.

### 4. Matters Arising (not on Agenda):

None

### 5. Site Selection:

RR and RF reported that they had met with representatives of three sites submitted on the UDC Call for Sites list displayed at the Drop-in Meeting.

Of the three sites, one will not be available for development until 2034 which is consistent with the Review Groups objective of seeking a phased development plan. One site supports the development, if needed for a new village shop and post office in an acceptable location. The third site has the capacity to meet the additional development imposed on the parish by UDC. It was agreed to progress to the next step and write formally to the landowners' representatives.

Following a general discussion of the details and possible house numbers, including the inclusion of a reasonable assessment of 'windfall sites' estimated at circa 10%, it was agreed that the identified sites could meet the requirement to deliver 84 homes by 2041.

### 6. Policy Reviews:

(The group noted the numbering error in the agenda items at 6, shown as 8.1 and 8.2 should have been recorded as 6.1 and 6.2. RR apologised for the error.)

The Group had considered all the policies in the extant NP and considered that, in general, the plan remained relevant and little amendment was necessary.

**The objectives of the following policies are considered to have been met and will be removed.**

- 6.1 (FEL/VA4). Burial Ground:** RR reported that FPC have agreed to accept the offer from the United Reform Church to accept the ownership and running of their Burial Ground in Chelmsford Lane. FPC has written to the Church Diocese advising of this development which will provide space for Felsted Residents for decades to come. Management control will be passed onto The Felsted Community Trust. Consequently, it was agreed to remove this Policy from the Plan.
- 6.2.1 (FEL/VA1). Doctors Surgery:** A new Health Centre / Doctors Surgery is to be built in the Bury Farm Development. Construction to commence shortly. The policy should be deleted.
- 6.2.2 (FEL/VA2) Memorial Hall:** Recent meeting with the Memorial Hall Committee concluded they had no future plans to develop. The policy should be reconsidered with a view to delete.
- 6.2.3 (FEL/HVC3) Royal British Legion:** Recent meeting their spokesperson concluded they have no future plans to develop. The policy should be reconsidered with a view to delete.
- 6.2.4 (FEL/SC1-4) Felsted School:** Recent meeting with the headmaster concluded they had no plans for development which would affect the FNP. A Pedestrian Crossing has been installed across Stebbing Road fulfilling one of the Policy concerns. The policy should be reconsidered with a view to delete.
- 6.2.5 (FEL/SC6-7) Felsted Primary School, Watch House Green:** Recent meeting with the headmistress concluded they had no plans for development. The new car park to be included in the Sunnybrook Development will fulfil the car parking problem along adjacent roads. The policy should be reconsidered with a view to delete.
- 6.2.6 (FEL/CW2) Nature Area and Felsted Fen:** HJ (Also a member of PC Nature Area Working Group) suggested a future vision review of the area, including the extension at the west end of the Bury Farm development. The extension to the nature area that will come via the Bury Farm Development is designated as "Public Open Space" so there can be no limitations on public access (if that is what might be considered for our existing nature area) so the two sites are, in that respect, very different. HJ said that it would be helpful if the review considered a policy about the nature area, ensuring a sensible balance between preservation of the environment, ecological sustainability and engaging public access. It was agreed that a draft policy would be considered.
- 6.2.7 Additional Policies**  
DC reported that as primary legislation requires all new build housing to have domestic electric vehicle charging points, inclusion of a policy in respect of new dwellings was therefore unnecessary.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the provision of public car charging points should be added to the review.

A wide ranging discussion took place about the introductory paragraphs of the NP and it was agreed there was a the need to introduce 'reviewed text' to reflect changes to the parish since 2020 when the plan was formally made.

7. **Traffic Survey:**

RF confirmed that Essex CC had completed the Traffic Survey along the length of Station Road, and we are awaiting their report. He was concerned that the contractors had ignored his proposed measuring points, so whilst volume data might be immediately accurate and helpful, speed analysis, based on data collected immediately before and immediately after tight bends, which slow traffic, maybe less helpful in understanding overall speed.

8. **Treasurer's Report:**

BP confirmed the current grant was spent so it was agreed we should apply for a second grant of £4,000 in preparation for future expenditure to cover further consultation charges, a Town Meeting and final publication of the Revised FNP Report.

9. **Any Other Business:**

**9.1 Solar Farm Development:** NAJ reported that it was rumoured the recent installation of underground cabling along Fritch Way was in preparation of a new solar farm. RF reported that there had been 2 consultations documents but no planning application for a solar farm installation other than the approved solar farm in Willows Green. The completed cabling was a long approved and overdue upgrade of the general infrastructure unconnected with any solar energy development.

**9.2 Social Housing:** RF reported that meetings with building developers suggested that Social Housing Associations preferred to manage large estates which was beyond the FNP scope where a small number of Social Houses would be incorporated within new developments. Following a general discussion, it was agreed to contact RCCE for their guidance and contact 2 Social Housing Associations who have been known in the past to support small developments.

Action: RR and RF agreed to further this issue with the RCCE

**9.3 Windfall sites:** A discussion took place about the acceptability of including windfall sites in our review. RR reported that advice is that it is generally accepted in long term development plans to allow a reduction allowance of 10% of house numbers can allowed against the target for Windfall developments (IE: small developments built within large properties, which are outside the FNP scope). Therefore, our target of 84 houses in the FNP may be reduced by 8. The group asked that this advice be verified.

10. **Date of Next Meeting:**

Given the need to begin rewriting the NP, the need for contact with landowners and the holiday season, a deffered date of next meeting was agreed. **Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2024 at UDC 1745**