

Mylor Neighbourhood Development Plan

Minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2020 at 7pm by Zoom.

Present: David Lansdowne - Chairman, Pat Willmore, Jonathan Griffin, James Robinson, John Killick, Tim Brighton, Jane Moss, John Adams, Beccy Brougham

In attendance: Michael Brougham, Pat Farrell, Councillors Hall, Shelton and Polglase, Fiona Ferguson, Jan Robson and Jill Quilliam

13 other attendees

1	<p>Chairman's introduction – David Lansdowne</p> <p>DL welcomed everyone to this zoom SG meeting which would be recorded for accuracy, the recording to be destroyed after the minutes are approved. Attendees would have the opportunity to ask questions on every agenda item. Openness, transparency and inclusion have been the foundation of everything the SG has done. We had hoped to hear from the consultant but 2 months down the line there is still nothing to report. SG would hope to catch up the lost time. The initial pre-app for Tregew Meadow 2 has been concluded. Mylor Parish Council has arranged a public meeting on 7/12 at which it is hoped all interested parties will take the opportunity to have their say.</p>														
2	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>None</p>														
3	<p>Declarations of Interest.</p> <p>John Adams (NDP SG Communications Group Joint Lead) Saltbox Close resident Tim Brighton (NDP SG Transport Group Lead) Saltbox Close resident Nicholas Trefusis (Trustee of the Trust owning Saltbox Close site – not beneficiary) NT requested anyone involved with the original SB application also declare an interest. Both JA and TB declared that they had been involved opposing the original application. Jan Robson – Chairman of the PC at the time of the original SB application.</p>														
4	<p>Record of Previous meeting and admin points – Pat Willmore</p> <p>It was Proposed by Jonathan Griffin and agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2020 be approved as a true record of the meeting and signed by Pat Willmore on behalf of the Chairman.</p> <p>PW set out the current membership of the SG:</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="272 1429 1054 1675"> <tr> <td>Chairman</td> <td>Councillor David Lansdowne</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Administrator</td> <td>Pat Willmore</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint Housing group leads</td> <td>Jonathan Griffin/James Robinson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transport</td> <td>Tim Brighton</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education and Amenities</td> <td>Beccy Brougham</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Economy & Business</td> <td>John Killick</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint Comms Group leads</td> <td>Jane Moss/John Adams</td> </tr> </table> <p>Fiona Ferguson complained that the list of SG members and TORs were not readily apparent on the NDP website. Jane Moss agreed to check and remedy this.</p>	Chairman	Councillor David Lansdowne	Administrator	Pat Willmore	Joint Housing group leads	Jonathan Griffin/James Robinson	Transport	Tim Brighton	Education and Amenities	Beccy Brougham	Economy & Business	John Killick	Joint Comms Group leads	Jane Moss/John Adams
Chairman	Councillor David Lansdowne														
Administrator	Pat Willmore														
Joint Housing group leads	Jonathan Griffin/James Robinson														
Transport	Tim Brighton														
Education and Amenities	Beccy Brougham														
Economy & Business	John Killick														
Joint Comms Group leads	Jane Moss/John Adams														
5	<p>Terms of Reference (TORs) and Accountability – Pat Willmore</p> <p>PW briefly explained that the SG was formed by the PC to fulfil its obligation to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan following a household questionnaire and public meetings held in 2016/2017. The Chairman (Steve Solomon), Project Manager (Michael Brougham) and Administrator (Pat Willmore) were appointed at a public meeting called by MPC in July 2017. The</p>														

	<p>SG leads were appointed at a public meeting in September 2017. The SG's TORs were ratified by MPC at its September 2017 meeting. No Parish Councillor expressed an interest in joining the SG. In early 2018 Councillor Lansdowne joined the SG as Chair following the resignation of SS. Jan Robson, the then PC Chair, also assumed an active role working with the SG.</p> <p>The SG TORs define its purpose as overseeing the preparation of the NDP until the final submission draft is ready to progress to the independent examiner and a successful referendum has been held. We are still a few stages away from that.</p> <p>They also define its purpose as being to engage fully with the local community throughout the process - which has been done. The TORs give the SG full delegated authority to achieve this purpose. The SG is accountable to the PC throughout the making of the plan and to comply with this duty of accountability the SG has sought and received approval from MPC at every appropriate stage.</p> <p>The SG will be automatically dissolved once it has achieved its purpose and MPC considers its services are no longer required.</p> <p>At this late stage of proceedings it seem logical and sensible for the SG, AHWP and the consultant to work together to ensure housing delivery reflects the needs and wishes of the community in line with the plan and to work collaboratively to ensure the plan will progress to a YES vote at referendum.</p> <p>It is common practice for a consultant, at whatever stage of the proceedings he is appointed, to work closely with a SG. 2 months down the line no member of the SG apart from its Chair has had any contact with the consultant.</p> <p>MPC seems to have taken upon itself the role of fulfilling the purpose of the SG. This has been done without any resolution being tabled.</p> <p>This all poses the following question: does MPC accept that the SG has delegated powers to continue with its work in close consultation with the consultant as has been stated in his contract?</p> <p>FF confirmed that the SG was formed under s.102 ss. 4 of the Local Government Act 1972 and that MPC had delegated full powers to it in order to complete the task through to referendum. There is no mechanism for MPC to take back these delegated powers. She asked whether the SG was prepared to roll over and play dead or whether it was prepared to fulfil its obligation to the people of Mylor.</p> <p>DL responded that it was certainly the intention of the SG to complete the task it had been set by MPC on behalf of the community but that the situation with the PC is currently quite difficult.</p> <p>Beccy Brougham responded (supported by other SG members present) that despite the setbacks and having many other commitments she is still determined to see the plan through to the end on behalf of her community.</p> <p>MB confirmed that the SG was set up and its TORs written in line with extensive guidance and toolkits provided by Locality. He praised Cornwall Council's provision for assisting communities in the production of NDPs.</p>
6	<p>Website ownership and use – joint working with PC – Communications Group</p> <p>JM gave a brief résumé of her and JA's professional backgrounds which underlined the wealth of experience they bring to the role of leading the comms group.</p> <p>JM reported that MPC has the NDP on its agenda for 30/11. It proposes to appoint one of its new co-optees as liaison with the NDP. This is welcome news and the SG looks forward to working with her.</p> <p>At an informal meeting between MPC and NDP SG on 19/11 most Councillors who spoke seemed comfortable with the idea of open communication and participation with the NDP via the Comms Group apart from Councillor Polglase who indicated that MPC should control the messages appearing on the NDP website. His proposal on the MPC agenda 30/11 is for MPC to take back control of the NDP website and associated media channels run by NDP. This should be resisted. If</p>

	<p>passed this would have technical and financial consequences for MPC. The appointment of a Councillor to liaise would be pointless as all communication tools would be removed from the NDP preventing the Comms Group carrying out its function. The Comms Group ‘owns’ the website and always has done – ownership is not simply a matter of who paid for the initial set up costs.</p> <p>JA continued by saying that the website was set up in 2017 to provide a channel of communication between parishioners and the NDP in order to fulfil one of the purposes as set out in the TORs. Community engagement is the guiding principle of NDPs and is enshrined in the Localism Act 2011 from which all NDPs flow. The website has interactive elements and facilitates a ‘conversation’ between the NDP and any interested party. The site is constantly monitored for questions and responses are rapidly given. All feedback, positive and negative, is welcomed. It is the repository for all things to do with the plan. The SG has the resources and expertise to manage this website. The website is one of a range of media conduits but the Comms Group does not overlook those in the community without IT ensuring they are kept up to date and that their views can be accommodated eg via Mylor Magazine.</p> <p>The NDP website is set up as a communications tool – quick, responsive and 2 way. MPC’s website is a basic noticeboard with all communications having to go through the Clerk.</p> <p>JM believes that this move to take over the website has arisen largely due to 1 controversial post ‘Has the NDP been compromised by CC’ following numerous unanswered requests by the SG and others to get clarification from the PC on its position regarding an affordable housing site which was potentially in conflict with the draft plan following the display of an email in Mylor PO. Although this post was criticised by MPC it still failed to provide the clarification requested. As soon as clarification was given by Sam Irving at the last SG meeting the posts on the website were updated. MPC has updated its own website this very week providing a link to the NDP website – something the comms group has been asking for for 3 years. We await the outcome of Monday’s MPC meeting with interest.</p> <p>Councillor Heather Hall thanked JM and JA for their explanations and hoped for a successful outcome on Monday. She urged Councillor Polglase to respond.</p> <p>Councillor Polglase responded that he agreed that it is very important which is why he has tabled the resolution. He cannot speak for MPC but is happy in principle with the spirit of openness and that the SG is willing to co-operate with the liaison appointee.</p> <p>MB pointed out that it is vital that the community has a capable, well-crafted messaging campaign to go hand in hand with the next public consultation phase carried out via a full planning application. This will be the community’s only chance to review changes made to the draft plan they have already been consulted on before the plan goes for independent inspection and referendum. The community needs to know what it is voting for. MPC has not shown any expertise in PR.</p> <p>Jan Robson raised the question of payment for the website. JA responded that MPC may have paid for the original web address but that it has not paid for and does not own the web content.</p> <p>FF felt that the main concern should be that the website is open and transparent. This is the case with the NDP website but not the MPC website. She asked DL if he was going to allow this takeover of the website to happen. He informed her that he would listen to the debate but that he is pre-disposed to vote against the motion.</p>
7	<p>Affordable Homes Developments in Flushing and Mylor – Jonathan Griffin/James Robinson</p> <p>JR told the meeting that there is a lot said in the plan about strengthening the role of MPC in the planning process so that it can better represent the wishes of the people it represents. There is unanimity in recognising the need to provide affordable housing for people with a connection to the Parish over the life of the plan.</p> <p>There is progress on the provision of affordable housing at Tregew Meadow 2 in Flushing. The project has resulted from the needs and wishes of the community expressed through the plan. Whilst agreement is broad, early involvement in the planning process is vital to ensure that the scheme delivers the community’s precise preferences. The consultation, in accordance with Planning & Sustainable Development Service Pre-application Community Engagement Guidance,</p>

	<p>organised by MPC on 7/12 where all are welcome to put forward their views is very welcome and should serve as a 'test case' for any future applications that may come forward.</p> <p>Community development – ie consultation between the community, MPC and a selected developer – should not be overlooked as a possible option.</p> <p>JG stated that the situation in Mylor Bridge is less clear. At its extraordinary meeting on 18/8 MPC voted to focus its attention on the provision of affordable housing at Saltbox Close. No public consultation had taken place on this. NDP did not recommend the site as the survey returns did not justify it. The controversial email from CC in September, suggesting SB may be suitable for 70 dwellings, referred to ongoing discussions, an earlier email and asked for MPC's response. JG has no more information to give. MPC's own website now states that proposals for affordable housing in Mylor Bridge will be coming forward in the not too distant future but that no decisions have been made by MPC with CC or any other developer regarding affordable housing provision in Mylor Bridge.</p> <p>Councillor Shelton questioned when the decision regarding SB close was taken by MPC. JG confirmed that it was at the ECM on 18/8. The situation did not come into the public domain until the controversial CC email in September.</p> <p>HH confirmed that the relevant resolution on 18/8 was a split decision carried by 1 vote.</p> <p>MB expressed concern that CC intends to deliver the TM2 development against the Housing Register which is dominated by the need for single occupancy dwellings. There is a mismatch between what the NDP says and what CC has been pursuing. It may now be that Sam Irving and Cornwall Councillor Andrew Mitchell (Housing Portfolio Holder) recognise, particularly since the NDP meeting of 22/10, that what they may have been told may not actually be in line with what the community wants. The email from CC on 15/9 requests input from MPC. It is important that this input reflects the views of the community it represents and not the personal view of a small number of parish councillors.</p>
8	<p>Ratification of proposal for working with the MPC appointed consultant – David Lansdowne</p> <p>This item is for the SG to formally ratify the following proposal on the 30/11 MPC agenda:</p> <p>Future working arrangements for the NDP Consultant to be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Directly between the SG and the Consultant whilst always maintaining close alignment with the NDP SG TORs 2) The Parish Clerk to be copied into all communications at all times. <p>Agreed unanimously by SG members.</p> <p>JG asked Councillors present to consider why there had been no engagement with NDP SG as a group. The Clerk informed the SG that the consultant could not engage individually with SG members due to cost. The SG would have carried out the necessary work on the Reg 14 comments, produced the consultation statement and handed all this to the consultant. The SG had been ready and willing to do this work.</p> <p>FF commented that £3000 paid to the consultant seems a lot of money to have spent on carrying out work without any reference to the SG to whom the task had been delegated. A waste of public money being paid by Mylor.</p> <p>MB expressed concern that the Consultant was brought in to replace him and cannot understand why the process isn't working properly. After 4-5 weeks of no communication there had been a useful meeting. The consultant was due to respond with his response and comments week commencing 23/11 which has not happened. The current use of the consultant seems to be a waste of taxpayers' money. The consultant should have started working with the SG on day one. The SG would have worked on the reg14 comments and then the consultant would have used his expertise to close out the non-contentious issues and then deal with the trickier issue of affordable housing delivery. The actions of the PC equate to a set of pseudo-executive decisions made by</p>

	<p>people without authority. Questions need to be asked of Councillors who think they are the Parish Council but are not as to what they think they are doing. Half of the budget has been spent but the SG, which has delegated powers, has not been consulted at all.</p> <p>Councillor Shelton reported that the 'earlier email' referred to in the 15/9 email from CC had not been forthcoming despite his having requested it. The SG had no knowledge of it and could not assist.</p>
9	<p>Chairman's Closing Remarks – David Lansdowne</p> <p>DL repeated his statement from 22/10 meeting that the NDP steering group is still alive and kicking and keen to offer its assistance to the Parish Council and consultant. The group is looking to complete the plan in accordance with its TORs. Its overriding hope is to get the plan to referendum next May but this may be delayed due to the disappointing lack of progress during October and November.</p>
	The meeting closed at 8.39pm