



Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan

Meeting Minutes – 30 November 2020

Ref	Item	Action Owner
1.	<p>Attendees: Marian Hamer (MH), Chair, Parish Councillor; Shelley Blackaby (SB) CBC Planning Policy Officer; Ian Robertson (IR); Simon Mann (SM); Alan Warnes (AW); Mary Williamson (MW) Parish Councillor; Robert Frost (RF) Parish Councillor; Matt Halls (MHa); James Elmer (JE); Noel Mead (NM);</p> <p>MH welcomed SB to the group, and provided a potted history of progress to date on the Neighbourhood Plan (NP)</p>	
2.	<p>Apologies: John Crookenden</p>	
3.	<p>Agree minutes of last meeting: Agreed</p>	
4.	<p>Matters arising: SM advised that he does not agree with the statement in the minutes 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”</p> <p>SB then provided an update of the status of the Emerging Local Plan (ELP); she advised that section 2 of the ELP, which contains the 2 preferred sites in Great Tey, could not be examined by the planning inspector until such time as section 1 had been processed. CBC now have two planning inspectors who have been appointed to examine section 2, but they do not have a date for examination hearings. It is expected that these will take place in Spring 2021, following which it is hoped that section 2 of the CBC local plan can be adopted.</p> <p>SB confirmed that, whilst we can agree development principles for the site at New Barn Road, the neighbourhood plan group does not have the authority to have the site removed from the ELP.</p> <p>It was agreed that all sites in the ELP, i.e. Brook Road and New Barn Road, should be within the scope of the NP. MH advised that this was always the intention, and accepted that the terminology in the previous minutes was misleading.</p> <p>SB suggested looking at West Mersea NP which, whilst it is still at pre-submission stage, is a good example of a plan with 2 preferred sites; JE agreed to look at this in conjunction with other adopted plans he has been studying.</p> <p>SB advised that in the absence of a Local Plan, an adopted NP would have direct influence on planning policy for an area, but a developing NP would have little impact on planning decisions; the plan would need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, and the 6 week consultation period in progress, for it to have any impact.</p> <p>MHa endorsed the view that development will go ahead on the New Barn Road site, and the best we can do is to influence the design principles for the site.</p>	JE
5.	<p>To review the results of the consultation and agree on next actions: A summary of the responses and comments is attached to these minutes. MHa queried whether households that responded as ‘Mr and Mrs’</p>	

	<p>should be counted as one vote or two. SB advised that CBC would count them as just one vote. AW amended the figures to show two votes per household and it made little difference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q1 – Yes 63%; No 37% • Q2 – Yes 31%; No 69% • Q3 – Yes 47%; No 53% • Q4 no change • Q5 – Option 1 14%; Option 2 41%; Option 3 45% <p>In view of the narrow margins, it was agreed that we should adopt the same approach as CBC; SM stated that he does not agree with this approach, and feels that it would make more difference when analysing the comments section of the responses. SB suggested that our NP should include a consultation statement which confirms our methodology. We should also state that any published figures represent a percentage of ‘those who responded to the consultation’, and that we should establish what percentage of the population of the parish responded to the survey.</p> <p>With regard to Q5b JE proposed the view that, of the people who responded ‘neither’ in relation to development on New Barn Road, 87% were not in favour of any development, and he feels that this should be reflected in our NP. MH expressed the view that this is just one interpretation of the figures, and that other interpretations could be applied. MW noted that the majority of parishioners had not responded, despite having the opportunity to do so. MHa stated that it is our responsibility to record the responses as percentages and report factual findings, and not extrapolate figures for our own conclusions. SM advised that he has started to analyse the comments section of the survey responses, so that he can summarise the comments in terms of percentages. MHa offered to help SM with this exercise.</p> <p>In relation to the responses received and recorded, NM requested confirmation that personal information will not be shared with any other parties.</p> <p>After some discussion the following actions were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM and MHa to liaise to produce an analysis of the comments section of the responses in terms of percentages. • SB to send a copy of the CBC privacy policy • SB to provide the number of households and the number of people of voting age in the parish. • JE to circulate his review of the figures for all to comment. • MH to send a courtesy communication to Peter Fairs, as well as the owners of the glebe land and the A120 land, informing them that the results of the survey are being processed and we will inform them of the outcome when available. 	<p>SM, MHa</p> <p>SB SB</p> <p>JE and ALL MH</p>
6.	<p>To consider a recent approach from a local landowner to include an additional parcel of land in the Neighbourhood Plan: In view of the lateness of the hour it was agreed to acknowledge the approach and discuss this at the next meeting.</p>	MH
7.	<p>To receive an update on project plan/background information: JE advised that he has been working with SM an MHa to build a draft document, based on examination of a number of adopted NPs in the borough. He has created a Draft Neighbourhood Plan document and</p>	

	<p>inserted material from existing documents, as well as adding headings for extra chapters. They have also begun to formulate Visions and Objectives based on responses to public consultations.</p> <p>MH thanked them for the work they have put in.</p>	
8.	<p>Any other business for discussion:</p> <p>MW asked if there have been any developments with regard to funding; MH advised that we have not heard any more, and that it is in the hands of the Parish Clerk</p> <p>IR asked if we have any idea how much we are likely to get from S106 monies. MH advised that we do not know at this stage.</p> <p>MH advised that the Neighbourhood Plan Group has been advised by agents for Mersea Homes that they are awaiting the outcome of the consultation following the Call for Sites, to inform their negotiations with Colchester Borough Council on the proposed development on New Barn Road, including the layout. Mersea Homes have advised that, subject to these negotiations, they hope to submit a planning application for the site in 2021.</p>	
9.	<p>Date and time of next meeting: The next meeting will be on Tuesday 5th January 2021 at 8.00 via Zoom.</p>	