

## Mylor Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2021 at 7pm by Zoom.

**Present:** Jane Moss (Chair), Pat Willmore, Jonathan Griffin, James Robinson, John Killick, John Adams (advisory), Michael Brougham, Pat Farrell, Beccy Brougham

**In attendance:** Councillors Myers, Perry, Polglase and Shelton, Cornwall Councillor Symons  
Jan Robson  
24 other attendees

<b>1</b>	<p><b>Introduction – Jane Moss Chair</b></p> <p>Welcome to all members of public and representatives of MPC. Meeting will be recorded. Video recordings will be erased after the minutes are approved. Audio recordings will be retained for a longer period. Relevant questions will be invited throughout the meeting.</p> <p>2 months have passed since our last meeting due to the fact that we have been completing our draft. The plan and all associated documentation has now been delivered to MPC. Although this is a major milestone we are still cautious about what will happen now.</p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Apologies for absence</b></p> <p>None</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Declarations of Interest.</b></p> <p>Pat Farrell (NDP SG Environment Group Lead) lives near Saltbox Road) Nicholas Trefusis (interest in anything to do with the Trefusis Estate)</p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Record of Previous meeting and admin points – Pat Willmore</b></p> <p>It was <b>Proposed</b> by Pat Farrell, <b>Seconded</b> by James Robinson and <b>agreed</b> that the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021 be approved as a true record of the meeting and signed by Pat Willmore on behalf of the Chair.</p> <p>PW reported that following a discussion with the Parish Clerk it appears that there may be a further £1000 in grant funding available from Locality. This is for additional printing costs incurred due to consulting under Coronavirus restrictions. The Parish Clerk will try to claim this retrospectively.</p> <p><b>Matters arising from the minutes:</b></p> <p>SG had expressed its concerns about the issues arising from negative messaging and misinformation on social media. A statement of support was provided by MPC following the 28 January meeting but it must be reported that the problem has not entirely ceased. Rebutting this misinformation is distracting and time consuming. JM cited the example at the latest PC meeting of Councillor Symons erroneously blaming the SG for delaying the SB2 development. JM asked that should people be given such information they should question its validity and request evidence.</p> <p>JK has more information concerning the PRP which he believes would be useful for the SG/MPC to consider.</p> <p>JM recorded thanks to Tim Brighton, who has stood down from the SG, for his work on the Transport section of the plan and wished him and his family well.</p>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Progress of Mylor Neighbourhood Development Plan – Michael Brougham</b></p> <p><b>JM</b> reported that SG had been working since early January to an agreed 10 week collaborative project plan with MPC. SG has stuck to the program and delivered the completed draft to MPC. <b>MB</b> had set a 10 week plan for delivering the plan. SG overran by a week but the work has now been done. A vast body of work. This incorporates the actions in response to the Reg 14 comments, all documented in the Consultation Statement.</p> <p>As the authorised body for commissioning the plan MPC now has the responsibility for the endorsement and submission of the plan. There is scope for specified editorial changes prior to</p>

	<p>submission. Once submitted to Cornwall Council there will be a legal compliance check. This is followed by a 6 week public consultation with all comments going directly to an independent examiner who will ensure that this plan is fully evidence based. This may lead to some changes. Once through this stage the plan goes to a parish referendum. A simple majority will see the plan made and form the first tier of planning legislation.</p> <p>MB praised his colleagues for the huge amount of work undertaken in getting the plan to this stage.</p> <p><b>JM</b> thanked MB for his extraordinarily professional leadership of this project.</p> <p>We are still anxious however due to the tight timescale. Has the PC got the time to complete its work prior to the end of its term?</p> <p><b>RM</b> wishes to reassure the SG. MPC has a timetable leading to an EM on 20/4. MPC is reviewing the documents. Comments are being compiled in a spreadsheet for discussion with the consultant. Desired amendments will be notified to SG via PW.</p> <p><b>PP</b> has arranged a meeting with the consultant on 12/4. Questions and comments will have been compiled beforehand.</p> <p><b>JG</b> would it not be useful to discuss any questions with the authors of the plan?</p> <p><b>PP</b> agreed that it might be helpful, especially given the shortage of time, that the SG should be consulted first.</p> <p><b>JG</b> advised that the SG has received strong advice that the PRP will probably not get past the examiner. However, it has been left in the plan as the community wanted it.</p> <p>Secondly, the community, during consultation, indicated a preference of growth in both villages. The proposed TM2 is proceeding in accordance with this stated preference. MPC was doubtful about retaining the direction of growth in Mylor Bridge. The SG believes, as with the PRP, that this should be retained in the plan, albeit in an amended form, as this was what the community wanted. Unfortunately SB2 discussions muddied the waters despite having no bearing on the plan. SG recognises that this might be contentious.</p> <p><b>James Robinson</b> it is important to stress that the plan is strategic and that any implementation of housing/site selection will fall to MPC as a completely separate issue. Although the plan shows a preferred direction of growth, applications for policy 9 developments are not totally bound by this.</p> <p><b>JM</b> MB will draft a letter to ST setting out SG's reasons for its decisions on the final drafting of the plan so that he can see the advice we have given to MPC.</p> <p>Stressed the value to MPC of involving SG with any issues/questions arising from their scrutiny of the plan. The 2 issues just flagged up by JG are the critical items but there should really be nothing else of concern. The SG now has limited time to offer so needs to know quickly what editorial changes are required. Please use the SG while there is still time. Please give us sight of the spreadsheet.</p> <p><b>PP</b> will feed that back to MPC and pass on the spreadsheet. Conscious that time is extremely short.</p> <p><b>KP</b> thanked SG for its work on behalf of the Parish. 'Seconded' by <b>ES</b>. RM also recorded thanks.</p>
6	<p><b>Supporting Documentation for Incoming Parish Council – Jonathan Griffin/James Robinson</b></p> <p><b>JG</b> – pointed out the action chapter at the end of the plan. This is not policy but has arisen out of consultation eg a transport and accessibility plan and facilities for teenagers/younger people. SG will write this information up and pass it to PC.</p> <p>In addition there is an excellent advice paper being drafted for the PC on how to respond to a development site proposal.</p> <p>This information has been crystallised from the vast body of information gleaned over the past 3+years.</p> <p><b>James Robinson</b> the made NDP will assist MPC in responding to planning applications.</p> <p><b>ES</b> this will be of great use to MPC planning committee.</p>

	<p><b>MB</b> believes that the environmental policies in Mylor NDP will lead to improved designs of developments.</p> <p><b>RM</b> thanked SG on behalf of the incoming PC.</p> <p><b>JM</b> Community engagement is vital to prevent a disconnect between public and public bodies and services, including local councils. NDPs greatly help with this. Community engagement with our plan has been consistently high and should not end with Plan. MPC should be committed in future to keeping open dialogue going supported by a communications policy.</p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>NDP Steering Group – our role</b></p> <p><b>JM</b> asked all SG members to comment on their ongoing availability.</p> <p>All members agreed that whilst they will assist with clarification/editorial amendments they will not be available for any significant changes or further meetings to discuss detail. All committed to assist in getting the plan submitted.</p> <p><b>JK</b> would like to look at the PRP a little further.</p> <p><b>JG</b> as a plan author will work on some further editing and the information for the incoming PC. He indicated a willingness to work with JK on PRP which is a Cornwall wide problem but subsidiary to the plan.</p> <p><b>MB</b> will undertake to deal with editorial changes. The Action Plan chapter should lead to a revision by MPC of the Parish Plan (as opposed to NDP). Believes more work is required on the messaging to the public until the Referendum. This is a substantial PR task.</p> <p><b>JM</b> this conversation needs to be had with the PC. It is necessary to keep engagement open with the public via all media.</p> <p><b>JA</b> the website can be used as an archive and cease to be an interactive site. Happy to offer technical support on this.</p> <p><b>JM</b> lots of good examples of communications policies out there eg Loggerheads PC.</p> <p><b>JA</b> NDP’s mailing list could be transferred across to MPC according to set protocols. The website cannot be migrated.</p> <p><b>PW</b> happy to continue as a point of contact. Conduit should be Parish Clerk/NDP SG administrator.</p> <p><b>MB</b> pointed out that there are 40 made plans in Cornwall and 100+ in the pipeline so lots of examples to look at. Recommends looking at Fowey Town Council.</p> <p><b>JM</b> senses a commitment from MPC to get the plan to the next stage. We wish to be helpful where we can but it is essential to keep us informed as a matter of urgency.</p> <p><b>PW</b> estimated that the plan will have cost approximately £16000 of public money. There will be a cost to keeping the website accessible but JA has negotiated a favourable price with the website manager.</p> <p><b>RM</b> thinks that passing across the spreadsheet prior to the consultant’s meeting will be helpful. Reiterated MPC’s commitment to get the plan through.</p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>Closing Remarks – Jane Moss</b></p> <p>The Parish has stepped up eagerly to engage with the making of plan. The Parish needs MPC to now champion this plan. The evidence for the plan is cast iron. The made plan will be a huge help to the Parish. It needs to be embraced and not sidelined. NDP SG has continued despite some extremely difficult times over the past months due to its belief in the project and the plan’s value to the community.</p> <p>JM offered grateful thanks to everybody who has contributed or assisted in any way whatsoever to date and in particular to her two predecessors as Chair; Steve Solomon and David Lansdowne. She thanked Jan Robson for her support and help whilst a Parish Councillor and since. We have appreciated the support of members of the PC where given.</p> <p>Thanks to MB for his huge help. He and PW have been with the project from the very start until now.</p>

	<p><b>PW</b> It has been an honour to be involved with the project. Somewhat reassured by the commitment shown this evening to get the plan approved. Should the plan not get approved/made then all the things the public said they valued most highly would be put at risk including provision of affordable housing. No plan equals no settlement boundary which opens up the prospect of speculative, profit-driven commercial developments maximising open market housing and minimising affordable housing.</p> <p>PW commends the plan and encourages MPC to move it onto the next stage and the community to support it at referendum. The made plan will benefit everybody.</p> <p><b>JRobson</b> thanked everybody. She was PC Chairman at the inception of the NDP project and is immensely grateful for the work carried out on behalf of MPC for its community.</p>
	The meeting closed at 8.40pm

DRAFT