

Stutton Neighbourhood Plan: Working Group
Minutes of meeting held on Tuesday 13th August 2019

Present: Mark Nowers, Caroline Waller, Nick Pavitt, Jenny Morris, Carol Tilbury, Susan Hemmings, Penny Greenland.

1. **Apologies:** Fran Flower, Ian Flower, Emma Woollard, Keith Hoskings.
2. **Minutes of last meeting:** Agreed
3. **Matters arising**

Village Character Assessments

Action 3.1 Nick will ensure outstanding village character assessments are completed.

Greenway

Action 3.2 Mark will send the Greenway map to Henry Strutt.

Sewerage

Paul Bryant's response to Mark's query about overloading of the sewerage system, and where this issue lies within the Neighbourhood Planning process, was as follows:

"A Neighbourhood Plan cannot force the relevant waste water company to upgrade / improve their local network. Also to note that, with any new development proposal, the onus will be on the applicant to demonstrate that the existing network is capable of dealing with the increase in demand. Remember also that Anglian Water (who I assume are the network provider in this area) are a statutory consultee on planning applications, and will be on your N'hood Plan!

A qstn for you: *Have the Parish Council already raised this issue with Anglian Water, and what has been their advice?* If not, the best contact there is Stewart Patience (Spatial Planning Manager, AW) E:
patience@anglianwater.co.uk

You might want to have a look at the [Reg 14 Pre-submission draft Fressingfield NP](#) as I think they may have similar local issues. Improvements to sewers/sewage system as a potential Community Action are mentioned on page 21 and the matter is discussed further on, for example, pages 26 - 27 and pages 64-65.

Perhaps also have a look at policy STRAD4: Utilities Provision in the adopted [Stradbroke NP](#) as possible way forward in terms of policy guidance."

Community Land Trust

Action 3.3 Jenny will talk to Bill about perhaps having a display board at the September 7th Drop In event.

Neighbourhood Plan and Joint Local Plan Alignment

Paul Bryant's answer to Mark's query concerning this was as follows:

“one of the basic conditions is that the ‘the [Neighbourhood] Plan be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the area.’

For groups such as Stutton, who are at the crossroads as far district level planning is concerned, you will need to be mindful of both existing (adopted) policy and of emerging (Joint Local Plan) policy. That said, I'd suggest that the group look more towards the emerging JLP as this sets out the general tone and direction of growth until 2036. Also to note that, while the JLP is still of limited weight in planning decision terms at present, it will eventually replace pretty much all of what currently exists in terms of current policy guidance in Babergh (the 2006 Local Plan and the 2014 Core Strategy).

You may also want to see what NP Examiners have to say on this matter. From one recently published [Exam Report](#) I will quote from Ann Skippers (on page 11 of her report) where she says:

There is no legal requirement to examine the Plan against emerging policy. However, [Neighbourhood] Planning Practice Guidance [para 009] advises that the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which the Plan is tested.

Furthermore Parish Councils and local planning authorities should aim to agree the relationship between policies in the emerging neighbourhood plan, the emerging Local Plan and the adopted development plan with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance.

The [Haughley] Plan has rightly been produced in parallel with the production of the emerging Local Plan. While there is no requirement for the Plan to conform to emerging policies, I see no harm in it referencing the JLP Draft. Conformity with emerging plans can extend the life of neighbourhood plans, providing this does not result in conflict with adopted policies. However, the JLP Draft could change significantly and so this should be carefully considered. “

4. September 7th Consultation Event

We discussed the document that Penny had prepared and made a number of suggested amendments and additions. We will finalise this, and other arrangements for the drop-in, at a meeting to be held on Tuesday 20th August, 3.15pm at Edge Hill, Alton Hall Lane.

5. Any Other Business

Action 5.1 Jenny agreed to write a response, on behalf of the Working Group, to the Joint Local Plan consultation, recommending that Babergh and Mid-Suffolk should adopt M4(2) of the Building Regulations (Accessible and adaptable dwellings) as the compulsory requirement for all new dwellings, with 10% of developments over 20 dwellings to be to M4(3) standard (wheelchair user dwellings). Mark will suggest that the Parish Council should also submit this response.

6. Date of next meeting

Monday 16th September, 7pm at Stutton Community Shop.

“There is no legal requirement to examine the Plan against emerging policy. However, [Neighbourhood] Planning Practice Guidance [para 009] advises that the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which the Plan is tested.

Furthermore Parish Councils and local planning authorities should aim to agree the relationship between policies in the emerging neighbourhood plan, the emerging Local Plan and the adopted development plan with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance.

The [Haughley] Plan has rightly been produced in parallel with the production of the emerging Local Plan. While there is no requirement for the Plan to conform to emerging policies, I see no harm in it referencing the JLP Draft. Conformity with emerging plans can extend the life of neighbourhood plans, providing this does not result in conflict with adopted policies. However, the JLP Draft could change significantly and so this should be carefully considered.”