



## WMTC Neighbourhood Planning Group

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 24<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2017

Councillors Present:-

Cllr Powling (Absent)	Cllr Jenkins (Chair)	Cllr Banks
Cllr Clements	Cllr Weaver	Cllr Bragg (Absent)
Cllr Moore	Cllr Wargent (Absent)	

Attendees: Veronique Eckstein, Alan Brook, John Dyson, David Cooper, Paul Knappett, Jay Stapley, Debbie Gooch (NHP Co-ordinator)

The meeting was Chaired by Cllr Jenkins.

RMJ opened the meeting with the news that we had two new members to the group – Prof Marcus Pembrey & Colin Foulkes

### 1. Apologies for Absence

Sandra Howard, Mel Burley, Professor Marcus Pembrey, Colin Foulkes, Carl Powling was attending a First Aid Course.

### 2. Ratification of the Minutes of the Meeting from 20<sup>th</sup> December 2016

RMJ stated that the Draft Minutes of meeting in December were now on the shared NP GoogleDrive and that if anyone had any comments could they please be emailed to DG.

DG commented that the draft Minutes were distributed later than hoped due to being unwell

DC felt that some figures from December Minutes, under Item 6, were not correct.

He stated as follows:-

“When the plan went to the Borough in 2004, there were 65 houses on there at 22.5 to the hectare. There was 2.9 hectares of housing land and 6.3 hectares of public open space. In the end, the Inspector threw it out as it was not dense enough. He made them put in about 101 – although it ended up as 103 and then there were 2 slipped in at the back of Suffolk Avenue and 3 in the back of Brierly Gardens. The total was 108 – at approximately 36 to the hectare on that site.

The Borough had said that they wanted it to be a low density on that site, but the Inspector would not accept the low density. Though we have said that it should be as the surrounding area density – Dawes Lane is Wellhouse Green – so be warned that we have to be careful with the density. If you look at the Dawes Lane site and you put 35 to the hectare you get about 150 houses on the bit that is ear-marked for development.

Section 106 is quite a muddle in the Borough. I cannot get any sense out of them, they have not agreed it and it seems to be that on each site they do a deal at the moment. S106 is not agreed in the Borough and will not be until 2018 at the earliest. The Examiner/Inspectorate might have something to say about that, and he looks at it in June next year, but at the moment that is what they are planning.”

DG asked DC is our NP timeline was realistic or even perhaps lucky to be coming into it at this time. DC answered

“We hear that if you do have a NP you get more out of S106 – 25% instead of 12.5% according to Cllr Jowers but it appears that each Borough does its own thing anyway – each site. Be very wary of any monies”

DG questioned the percentage based on the RCCE and the CBC Planners indications.

DC further added that

“The island population figure based on the housing at August 2016 was 3,580 houses/properties on the island. It averages on West Mersea at 2.03 persons per property so you are running at about 7,267. Approximately 200+ or so are second homes so if you look at variations when you look at households against dwellings on the census from 2011. No other Parish in or around Colchester has that difference between households and dwellings. There are normally 1 or 2 but not as many as Mersea. The 2011 Census stated 3,300 Households & 3,551 Dwellings and in practice at the time we had 3,527 according to Rating Office at CBC. In respect of second homes, you would not see it on the census figure until you look at the number of dwellings. There is a separate figure for dwellings on the census figure.

Population figure using  $3,580 \times 2.03$  (per household) = 7,267”

PK commented that the census quotes a figure of 2.2 per household, with a figure of 7,800 for the population most of the time.

*[The document giving the definition of Dwelling and Household has been emailed to the NP Group and can also be found on the shared drive].*

DG stated that the December Minutes would not be changed to reflect his comments but that his statement would be part of the Minutes of this meeting.

It was suggested that the Local Plan documents were 300+ pages and that the pages relevant to Mersea could be put on the shared website. It was further suggested that a link to direct people to the right document and the right pages could be provided.

RMJ asked if there were any other observations on the Minutes, and asked that they were emailed to DG for amendments to be made.

### **3. Funding & Budgeting**

RJM confirmed that WMNP will be applying for a grant for the costs of the Neighbourhood Plan from CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy). He added that the closing date for applications for funding for the year 2016/17 (to end of March) closes on 27<sup>th</sup> January, and we would need funding for 2017/18 year. He confirmed that he would complete the Expression of Interest Form in February and then complete the application. He confirmed that claims cannot be made retrospectively; that no substantial expenditure should be made until funding is received.

Tollesbury had applied for and received their grant; as they had not used all of that grant in the year it was applied for they had had to repay it and re-apply in the next financial year. RMJ confirmed that there had not been much in the way of claimable expenses made so far.

### **4. Summary of Last Meeting**

DG commented that as the majority of the discussion at the last meeting was about the CBC Local Plan meeting that had taken place on 15<sup>th</sup> December.

DG stated that matters arising during the meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> December would be addressed in the next item and in Any Other Business

## 5. Provisional Timescales/Milestones

### Questionnaires/Surveys

RMJ stated that he felt there should be a NP template for every Borough Council to use and that it should be adjusted to suit the individual area. As there was no template we had to create our own. The Housing Team had met to review a selection of Qs: how the questions were asked, the information achieved, the presentation of the analysis, and the completed documents, and particularly at those that had been assessed and adopted as NPs.

Having considered all of this, a draft Q for Housing/Housing Needs had been created using the Boxted NP as a template. It had been developed by the RCCE and has easy to follow questions and style which worked with paper and could also be “mirrored” by the online Q which would in turn simplify data entry. The analysis could be easily produced from the online database to provide and evidence necessary to contribute to the final NP document.

DG commented that draft Housing Needs doc did not ask for names and addresses but did ask for postcode and house number.

RMJ asked DG to ensure that both the *Peter C Survey Jan 16 2017.pdf* and *Draft Housing Need Q 230117.docx* were on the shared drive for all to review. He asked everyone who wished to comment on the Qs or wished to add items to email those to DG within 7 days. These comments would also be put on the shared drive.

RMJ stated that the Qs would need to be discussed with our Borough Councillors, the CBC Planners Sandra Scott & Karen Syrrett, and RCCE. He added that we will need to canvass opinion outside of our group to see if it is understood.

### Logo

Several Councils had adopted logo or branding to identify their NP on their website and documents. The logos for the Myland & Braiswick NP, Marks Tey NP and West Bergholt NP were discussed. It was noted that Boxted did not have a logo for their NP.

A draft housing needs Q front page using a photo of the new village sign was reviewed. The photo had been taken by Councillor Moore and she granted permission for it to be used.

JS commented that the logo should become the branding for the NP, adding that although it was the Town Sign it was not obvious it was about the NP. PM said that she would look at the photo of the sign and see how it could be made more recognisable as the image for the NP.

### Sponsorship

RMJ stated some NPs, most particularly West Bergholt & Marks Tey, had used an incentive such as a Raffle or a cash prize with entry through the random selection of completed and submitted Qs. It appeared to be within the rules to have more than one supporter or sponsor for your NP. The group agreed with the principle but felt that it should not detract from the document or it should remain clean and clear. RMJ mentioned approaching Bev Perkins who is a director of the Co-op in this regard.

### Introduction to the NP

It was agreed that an introduction/information page for the NP should be produced.

RMJ mentioned that Tiptree NP had a single page information document. He asked JS, the Editor of the Courier what his experience could tell us in respect of how much text people are prepared to take on board. JS suggested that a summary of approximately 1 paragraph would be ideal.

## Information about the NP/Questionnaire/ Marketing & Media

JS commented that information about the NP and the Q should be fed to the community so people would be made aware. He further commented that you tread a fine line between boring your audience and patronising them. His advice was to provide education before the issue of the Q, with information being “drip fed”.

It was agreed that information for the WMTC website, updates, social media and The Courier should be developed and linked, and produced as soon as possible

SW suggested a “Your NP needs You!” campaign via the Courier. The Group reviewed the Marks Tey “Your Village Your Say” cover document and agreed that a strap line of this sort should be adopted.

SW stated that she had briefed the Womens’ Section of the British Legion as she gave a talk there as a Councillor and they are all briefed about NP and the forthcoming Q.

RMJ asked DG to be in contact with JS with notes on the NP by Friday latest. DG confirmed that she and Sophie were working on the “media” message. JS confirmed that he really wanted a status update for each issue and DG said she would endeavour to do that

Courier dates: 31<sup>st</sup> Jan, 14<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup> Feb, 14<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup> March & 3<sup>rd</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup> April AND 1<sup>st</sup> May

## Great Dunmow NP Delivery Pack

The Group reviewed the Great Dunmow NP which was delivered in a sealed clear plastic envelope, with a business reply envelope. The front page was in colour with a 3 pages of introduction, in rather large writing.

The Great Dunmow NP Q itself was a whole separate book-style document with 2 pages - 4 back to back pages, with page 4 (back page) with return instructions and an area to complete their names and addresses for more information or to express an interest to get involved.

JS suggested keeping information to the front page if possible to encourage completion of the document, with more info on the back page and the meeting agreed with that comment.

DG commented that ideally the front page/overleaf would not be connected to Q which would be in a book style separate document.

## Production of WM NP

The group moved on to discuss the logistics and costs of the production of an NP for WM with costings based on 3,500 Q packs – based on the Great Dunmow NP pack.

DC asked if the cover would be colour and the inside black and white, this was agreed.

A lengthy discussion ensued with main points being:

## Business Reply Service with Royal Mail:

The cost for a 12 month licence is £114

Royal Mail only charge for the post that is returned through their postal service:-

Returned mail via RM	1 <sup>st</sup> Class = 52pence	2 <sup>nd</sup> Class = 39 pence
100 returns via RM	1 <sup>st</sup> Class @ 52p = £52.00	2 <sup>nd</sup> class @ 39p = £39.00
1000 returns via RM	1 <sup>st</sup> Class @ 52p = £520.00	2 <sup>nd</sup> class @ 39p = £390.00

It was agreed that a business reply envelope should be white and that A5 might be more suitable size for our Q.

AB commented that it would be a way of increasing the percentage of responses, that it might cost more but it looks official, discreet and would encourage replies. It was agreed that it might even encourage people to complete and return to drop off points.

#### Confidentiality & Privacy

This issue has been discussed at previous meetings and it was agreed that a reply envelope would help to provide added confidence of the privacy of the completed Qs when being returned or dropped off.

#### Drop off Points/Boxes

It was agreed that drop off points should be used including the Doctors Surgery, MICA, Garage. VE suggested using the school as drop off point and to get kids and parents involved.

#### Distribution & Delivery of Questionnaires

DG commented that a Q must be delivered to every single property in order to meet the criteria and evidence for the NP

A provisional date of distribution of Qs was 1<sup>st</sup> April with replies by 30<sup>th</sup> April.

RMJ asked if 4 weeks was normal, and DG replied that it appeared to be the general time from other NPs

It was suggested that the Q be inserted as part of the Courier. JS replied that if you that he would need accurate weight information for a quote per insert.

It was further suggested that if the Q was to be delivered with the Courier the front page could read "This edition includes your Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire".

JS said that he would check on the banner headline and printer information as discussed.

JS left the meeting.

DG added that Mersea Life delivery rate was £15 per 1,000

#### The Business Questionnaire

DC mentioned that we had to audit our facilities