

Mylor Neighbourhood Development Plan

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2021 at 7pm by Zoom.

Present: Pat Willmore, Jonathan Griffin, James Robinson, John Killick, Tim Brighton, Jane Moss, John Adams,

In attendance: Michael Brougham, Pat Farrell, Councillors Myers, Munro-Lott, Perry and Polglase, Jan Robson

15 other attendees

1	Introduction – Pat Willmore PW welcomed everybody to the meeting, which was being recorded for accuracy, the recording to be destroyed after the minutes are approved. The purpose of this meeting is principally to deal with the election of a new Chair following the resignation of David Lansdowne and the co-option back onto the steering group of Michael Brougham – Project Manager and Pat Farrell – Environment lead. The next meeting of the SG will take place on 28/1/2021 following the PC meeting (26/1)
2	Election of Chair PW nominated Jane Moss. JA seconded this proposal. No other nominations. Jane Moss was unanimously elected as Chair in accordance with SG TORs. JM pleased to take on role and work with team. Welcomed members of the PC. Responding to recent queries on make up of group she reminded people of how the SG was formed as a parish wide exercise. Most of the original group still in place. Have been working for 3 years and are nearly at the end of the road. Acknowledged difficulties with PC but is pleased to report that constructive work is now largely back on track. Cllr. Perry has been most helpful in liaising.
3	Apologies for absence Beccy Brougham
4	Declarations of Interest. John Adams (NDP SG Communications Group Joint Lead (Advisory)) Saltbox Close resident. Tim Brighton (NDP SG Transport Group Lead) Saltbox Close resident. Pat Farrell (co-optee NDP SG Environment Group Lead) lives near Saltbox Close. Nicholas Trefusis noted that he had originally been on SG but had stepped down when it was clear he had a conflict of interest. JM stated that any member declaring an interest would not take part in or vote on relevant discussions.
5	Record of Previous meeting and admin points – Pat Willmore It was Proposed by John Adams, Seconded by James Robinson and agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2020 be approved as a true record of the meeting and signed by Pat Willmore on behalf of the Chairman. Nothing to report on finance.
6	Co-options to the Steering Group Pat Farrell (Environment Lead) proposed PW seconded JG – agreed unanimously. Michael Brougham (Project Manager) proposed JR seconded JG – agreed unanimously.

	<p>Back to full complement according to TORs. Work now is detailed in reviewing REG 14 comments with PC. Invitation still open for enthusiastic parishioners to join group. Looking forward to working with PC.</p>
7	<p>Progress of Mylor Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>JM knows there is work to be done to deal with comments. There was a brief introductory meeting with the consultant last week which has led to renewed optimism that the SG/PC can move forward to complete the plan.</p> <p>Our next meeting 28/1 will be much more detailed.</p> <p>MB (screen shared latest 10 week project plan). Explained his work over past 3 years as co-ordinating project manager and lead author. Reg14 consultation ended 11/9 and our task now is to deal with the 150 comments received. There is a lot of work involved using the consultant's advisory report. This will be considered and implemented based on local demand. There are 2 further stages (6 week planning consultation and independent examiner) before referendum. The PC will need to approve any changes arising from Reg14 comments. The consultation statement is also required which will include a matrix of these comments. A basic conditions statement also needs to be done. The reg14 comments will be dealt with principally by the authors of the relevant sections. Parish Councillors are welcome to get involved at this stage. This is a legal process – SG does the work, PC makes the ultimate decision. Fully collaborative exercise.</p> <p>JM – the Parish Councillors are currently also scrutinising the comments.</p> <p>RM – congratulated JM on taking Chair. Now much better working relationship. Cllr. Perry is liaising and with the help of consultant we will move forward to a conclusion.</p> <p>Cllr. Perry – congratulations to JM. Keen to work on this project. Important to liaise.</p> <p>Fiona Ferguson</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Feels that the names and addresses of SG should be available and more visible. JM – the Steering Group will consider this and report back. 2) What did PW mean by no longer being in charge of finance. PW – despite its TORs the SG has never had control of the finance. Approximately £9500 in grant funding was used plus approximately £1200 from PC funds as a top up due to additional costs being incurred to cover the Regulation 14 consultation being carried out under Coronavirus restraints. Finance for the consultant is a matter for the PC. 3) It is a shame that nobody from Flushing is on steering group. NT would be good to reach out. JM – we have had lots of interaction parish wide. JA-agrees with NT. However, we have been overtaken by Covid and it has changed the way we operate. JG – we all agree. Important to consider the stage we are at. Bureaucratic exercise now where we are unable to put new issues in the plan. We are dealing with the REG14 comments. MB – Lot of detailed work. Tremendous input from NT. He has made extensive comments under Reg14. Would he like to work with MB to incorporate those comments into the plan? JM - would Flushing Parish Councillors be willing to be more proactive in representing Flushing residents' views. Cllr. Perry – suggested Cllr. Pashley may be willing to assist with this. Beccy Bromley – concerns about differences between Flushing and Mylor. Invited to contact group if she would like to be further involved. 4) Project plan is 10 week plan. What happened to the 2 weeks mentioned previously by David Lansdowne? 5) What has happened to £6000 budget for consultant? What work has he done to date? MB – Support via CC for 'amateurs' to produce plan. However, having a consultant

	<p>provides professional input and tightens up the plan technically which will assist with the independent inspection stage. Will try to get more assistance from the consultant via additional funding from the PC.</p> <p>JM – understands that there is sufficient resource left for the consultant to oversee and provide a technical audit of the plan prior to final submission.</p> <p>6) Is the housing policy in the plan sustainable or is there conflict with other policies in the plan?</p> <p>JG – Homechoice register is constantly replenished. All decisions on development will be taken by LPA – NPPF assumption being to develop.</p> <p>JR – NDP has specific rules whereby it must work on housing number evidence. Figures seem correct. Housing register is an inexact science and the numbers can be interpreted in different ways.</p> <p>FF believes we should work with a provider such as a community land trust so that we set our own affordable housing criteria. The homechoice register will prioritise workers over people with a personal local connection. She believes we are not addressing this conflict.</p> <p>Beccy Bromley – disagrees. She is a resident of TM1 where most residents have a local Flushing connection and she is looking forward to TM2.</p> <p>JM – as we move forward there are clearly still assumptions to be tested.</p> <p>NT – TM1 residents are not in a ‘ghetto’ and the development is of a high standard.</p> <p>JG – SG has always considered TM1 an exemplary development.</p>
7	<p>Closing Remarks – Jane Moss</p> <p>Next meeting of PC is 26/1. Next SG meeting 28/1.</p> <p>Thank you to everybody who attended.</p>
	<p>The meeting closed at 8pm</p>