

Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan



Meeting Minutes – 9 November 2020

Ref	Item	Action Owner
1.	Attendees: Marian Hamer (MH) Chair, Parish Councillor; Mary Williamson (MW) Parish Councillor; Robert Frost (RF) Parish Councillor; Alan Warnes (AW); Ian Robertson (IR); Simon Mann (SM); Matt Halls (MHa); John Crookendon (JC); Noel Mead (NM); James Elmer (JE)	
2.	Apologies: None	
3.	Agree minutes of last meeting: Agreed	
4.	Matters arising not dealt with elsewhere: None	
5.	<p>Feedback from Parish Council meeting 13 October: MH advised that a parishioner had attended the last Parish Council meeting to raise a complaint about the lack of information from the Parish Council about the progress of the proposed development on New Barn Road, following archaeological surveys which had been carried out without prior warning. She was also concerned at the lack of public consultation on the proposals. MH had been able to inform the parishioner that the Parish Council had received no official notice of the archaeological surveys, and that this appears to be common practice ahead of formal planning proposals, as it was a similar situation on the Brook Road site. MH also informed the parishioner that a consultation was in progress and documents would be distributed during the next few days.</p> <p>Whilst Parish Councillors are public servants and should be accountable to the parishioners they serve, MH expressed her disappointment as the parishioner who brought these complaints is married to a member of this group; MH felt that a lot of work had been put into producing the consultation document, and the parishioner concerned should have been aware that it was in hand. MH also stated that she did not feel that fellow members of this group were supportive of our efforts, since they were in agreement with the complaints raised. MH stated that she had considered resigning her role as chair of this group following events at the Parish Council meeting. However she advised that she had decided to continue, unless members considered that she was not up to the job.</p> <p>On the question of communication, MH stated that she has been happy to take responsibility for providing updates to the parish magazine, which is the best method available to us to keep all parishioners up to date with developments. However, there are members of this group who feel that our communication with the community is inadequate. She suggested therefore that, as there is a lot of reliance on social media to put information in the public domain (even though there is an significant proportion of society that does not use this medium) perhaps one of those people complaining at the inadequacy of communication should set up a Facebook page for this group and post regular updates. There was no response to this proposal.</p>	

	<p>There was some agreement within the group that we could do more to keep the community up to date with progress of the Neighbourhood Plan, and it was agreed that minutes from future meetings will be published on the Parish website. Members are happy to approve minutes via email so that they can be passed to the Parish Clerk with minimal delay. It was agreed that we need a quorate number of approvals before minutes can be published, which in this case is 5 approvals.</p> <p>JC pointed out that as a group we should be operating in collaborative manner and working together to bring this project to a conclusion. He also expressed the view that, as the New Barn Road site is already in the Colchester Borough Council (CBC) emerging Local Plan, the site should not be part of our negotiations in formulating the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), and we should concentrate our efforts going forward on what we <i>can</i> achieve for our community in producing a plan for future development. This view was endorsed by MHa and no objections were raised at the meeting.</p>	
6.	<p>To receive an update on consultation responses: JE gave a summary of responses received to date. The response rate is disappointingly low, but current figures demonstrate that opinions on the New Barn Road site are much more polarised than was originally perceived. MH advised that, whilst these responses are helpful in negotiations with ADP (the agents for the developers) and CBC, we should do as JC suggested and concentrate on what we can achieve to progress the NP. MH confirmed that she is still happy to be the point of contact between the Parish and ADP regarding the New Barn Road site.</p> <p>There followed a discussion around measures to boost responses to the consultation. A proposal to 'knock on doors' was dismissed in view of the Coronavirus crisis. MH will post a reminder on the village Facebook pages, and JC will ask Sarah Barron if she would be happy to display something on her mobile shop.</p>	MH JC
7.	<p>To receive an update on funding. SM advised that Groundworks are still insisting on us returning funding that was unused at the end of the last financial year. The Parish Clerk will return to the Rural Community Council of Essex (RCCE) and point out that their terms and conditions are ambiguous, and that they should be more flexible particularly in light of the 6 months hiatus brought about by the Coronavirus crisis.</p>	
8.	<p>To receive an update on project plan/background information: JE advised that he had met with SM and MHa and they have begun to put together background information for the NP. They have created a folder for updates and are studying some adopted plans from communities similar to ours, to get ideas on format.</p> <p>JE will use minutes from previous meetings and Parish Council records to provide a record of progress to date.</p> <p>We discussed obtaining photos to illustrate the final plan. JC to speak to Jane Pearson, the local historian, to see whether she has any archive photos she can contribute. MH will also put a request in the next issue of Round and About magazine.</p>	JE JC MH
9.	<p>Any other business for discussion:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have received an email from Shelley Blackaby at CBC planning department offering support with our plan, following the resignation of our previous planning advisor. MH agreed to write to her with an update of our progress and invite her to attend our next meeting. • We have received an email from a local landowner offering another parcel of land to be considered in the plan. RF pointed out that we are in danger of having too many sites and leaving ourselves open to more development than is desirable. MH agreed to return to the landowner and decline the offer on the grounds that he missed the deadline for the Call for Sites, which had passed several months ago. • JC suggested we should start to give consideration to how to spend any S106 monies generated by the new developments. JE suggested that we should consult with parishioners about desirable projects. MHa pointed out that there were a number of suggestions from our original public consultation process, and we could use these as a wish list to include in our next questionnaire. 	<p>MH</p> <p>MH</p>
10.	<p>Date and time of next meeting: The next meeting will be on Monday 30th November at 8.00 via Zoom</p>	