

## Danbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of the Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2017  
at The Dawson Suite, Danbury Sports and Social Centre Main Road, Danbury, CM3 4NQ

**Present:** Steve Arthurs (SA)  
Dan Carlin (DC), Danbury Parish Councillor  
Judith Clacy (JC)  
Sue Dobson (SD)  
Martin Lister (ML)  
Gilly Lutton (GL)  
Lesley Mitchelmore (LM), Neighbourhood Plan Coordinator  
Mark Scofield (MS), Hands Off Danbury Action Group  
Roger Sheriff (RS)  
John Steele (JS), Danbury Parish Council

**Observing:** One member of the public - Josh Woolliscroft (JW) from Snapdragon Consulting

Agenda Number	Agenda Item	Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	
	Apologies were received from Norman Bartlett (NB), Elly Bunn (EB), Irene Giudotti (IG), Stephen Holland (SH) and Anthony Rogers (AR).	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items</b>	
	No interests were declared.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Public Participation Session</b>	
	There was no participation from the public.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Minutes</b>	
	The minutes from the meeting of March 20th 2017 were circulated and coordinator drew members' attention to some amendments that had been made and highlighted in red. The minutes were signed as a true record of that meeting.	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Action Points Arising from the Minutes – not otherwise listed on the agenda.</b>	
	<p>The coordinator reported that:</p> <p><b>Page 4:</b> The initial Communication had been printed and circulated at the Annual Parish Meeting, some local groups and at the drop-in workshops.</p> <p><b>Page 5:</b> The drop-in session has been completed. The questionnaire is in the process of being collated and finalised.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. Will there be a paper questionnaire for children as well?</a></p> <p>A. The Children's questionnaire will be online. The will be a paper questionnaire for the School's engagement which will be discussed under agenda item 6.IV.</p> <p><b>Page 6:</b> The training meeting for volunteers for the</p>	

	<p>drop-in sessions had taken place on 3<sup>rd</sup> May. Declaration of interest forms had been completed by all members.</p> <p><b>Page 7:</b> The press release would be discussed under item 11 of the agenda.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. Page 3 of the minutes refers to the preferred options consultation. At Chelmsford City Council's Preferred Options Consultation Roadshow, there appeared to be some confusion amongst planners as to when the 100 houses would be effective. Please can we write to Jenny Robinson for clarification?</a></p> <p>A. The parish Clerk has written to Jenny Robinson for written clarification of this point. MS has asked Jenny Robinson for a breakdown of historic planning applications the parish.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. Please can we have clarification of the dates for the determination of the Richborough Application?</a></p> <p>A. This was extended until the 12<sup>th</sup> May and is still pending consideration.</p>	<p><b>Coordinator – to chase response from Jenny Robinson.</b></p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Feedback from the Coordinator</b>	
	<p><b>Group Membership:</b> Jenny Bucknell has resigned from the group and I have had two offers of help as a result of the workshops. I will invite them to the next steering group meeting.</p>	<p><b>Coordinator – invite new volunteers to next Steering Group meeting.</b></p>
I.	<p><b>Funding Update</b></p> <p>Funding of £3499.49 has now been received. This is currently underspent as SH secured discounts on the website and a less expensive online survey tool - Survey Monkey - was chosen. It was decided to print and laminate posters in house and the initial communication and survey were combined into one leaflet. Any underspent monies will have to be paid back at the end of the grant period, although it may, with written permission from the funders, be used for another activity within the project if required.</p>	
II.	<p><b>Chelmsford City Preferred Options Consultation – Update</b></p> <p>This consultation closed yesterday – May 11<sup>th</sup>.</p>	
III.	<p><b>Communications with Developers and Agents</b></p> <p>Once the results of the Visions and Objectives activities have been analysed, the group will need to begin to consider the available sites for development and the types and designs of houses. Jenny Robinson had informed the coordinator that Chelmsford City Council was conducting a call for sites alongside the preferred options consultation. They would ask anyone submitting a site in Danbury, for permission to share their details with the Neighbourhood Plan Group.</p> <p>It is important to remember that whilst the group will need to engage with the developers/agents/landowners, it is the site that is being considering first and foremost and not developer. Any communications regarding sites to date have received a standard response that the group is not likely to be in a position to consider sites until the autumn of this</p>	

	<p>year.</p> <p>The group needs to consider how it wishes to proceed in relation to sites – perhaps some workshops for steering group members would be the most appropriate in the first instance.</p>	<p><b>Coordinator – Strategy for considering sites</b></p>
IV.	<p><b>Schools Engagement in partnership with Danbury Parish Council</b></p> <p>Each year, Danbury Parish Council arranges visits with schools to tell them about the Parish Council. This year, they decided to use the Neighbourhood Plan as a focus. The aim is to give the children an understanding of how public consultations work whilst learning about the Neighbourhood Plan and completing some questionnaires. The schools' questionnaire was circulated with the agenda.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Feedback from the Launch at Danbury Parish Council's Annual Parish Meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2017</b></p>	
	<p>141 people attended the launch. The maps created a lot of interest.</p> <p>SD explained the basis of her speech which was received well.</p> <p>It was disappointing that despite Sue's speech explaining why it was so important for the community to share their views, only 34 questionnaires were completed. It is possible that people needed more time to consider their responses. DC felt that attendance at this Annual Parish Meeting was higher than in previous years and that people were engaging.</p> <p>There was a concern that a resident had confused the initial communication from the Neighbourhood Plan with a communication from HOD (Hands off Danbury). HOD has been encouraging everyone to get involved and they have a put a link to the Neighbourhood Plan Website on their website.</p> <p>The coordinator referred members to the report that had been circulated with the agenda and emphasised the fact that the summary of responses related ONLY to the 34 questionnaires received as a result of the Launch – and so a small sample.</p> <p><b>The most popular aspects of the village were:</b> Green open spaces; footpaths, bridleways and public rights of ways; and the community.</p> <p><b>The Least Popular Aspects of the Village were:</b> Traffic (including Highway Safety and Pollution); The Medical Centre being 'oversubscribed'; and litter.</p> <p><b>The most popular things that people would like to have and use were:</b> A by-pass; smaller dwellings that people could afford or downsize to; and highway safety improvements (ie: Cycle paths, reduced speeds on the roads and safer footpaths in</p>	

	some areas.)									
<b>8.</b>	<b>Feedback from the Public Engagement Workshops on May 4<sup>th</sup> and May 6<sup>th</sup>.</b>									
	<p>Members were thanked for their help at these workshops, in particular, SH, EB and MS.</p> <p>DC was impressed with the knowledge of members and believed that the training session had been worthwhile.</p> <p>The coordinator referred members to the report that had been circulated with the agenda: The workshops were advertised in the Journal, Contact, Essex Chronicle, Danbury Times, at the Parish Council Annual Parish Meeting, on the Parish Council Facebook Page (reach of approx. 1000 people), the Parish Council Website, The Neighbourhood Plan Website, The Farmers Market, Posters in the 3 Village Noticeboards and posters in a number of locations around the village.</p> <p>The sessions proved to be very successful, with 207 people leaving comments. A few children attended with their parents and also made comments.</p> <p>On Thursday, the closing time was extended to 19:45 so that people going to vote had the opportunity to drop-in to share their views. This was worthwhile as a further 19 attended.</p> <p>3,101 comments were provided by the village, split as follows:</p> <table data-bbox="427 1780 593 1915"> <tr> <td>Q1</td> <td>1,158</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2</td> <td>1,017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3</td> <td>872</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vision</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </table> <p>MS reported that posters had also been placed in The Mission, the Catholic Church, the Anchor and the Bakers. DC</p>	Q1	1,158	Q2	1,017	Q3	872	Vision	54	<p><b>Coordinator – add</b></p>
Q1	1,158									
Q2	1,017									
Q3	872									
Vision	54									

	<p>distributed leaflets at the Danbury Business Man’s Club. In future, it was noted that posters could be placed in the National Trust Notice and Danbury Lakes Notice Boards.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. Was 207 people a good turnout?</a></p> <p>A. The coordinator would have liked more but that may not have been manageable given the size of the room and number of volunteers. What was important was that people stayed and took time to make so many comments. At this stage, it is a good foundation to build upon and our most powerful marketing tool is word of mouth.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. How many attendees were residents of Danbury?</a></p> <p>201 were residents. 4 were from surrounding areas who used the village and 2 were from development companies. Some families brought their children who also made comments.</p> <p>SA felt that it was good that 872 comments were made in relation to question 3.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. Are there any lessons to learn for next time?</a></p> <p>A. Perhaps a bigger venue, although the location was good and the events coincided with polling day and the farmers market which increased foot fall. JC and ML were very effective at directing people in from the car park. People saw the banner which was very clear. Perhaps the layout of the room could be improved to promote circulation. The post it notes worked well.</p> <p>In hindsight, not as many initial communication leaflets were required and we need to be more proactive in attending local groups.</p>	<p><b>additional posters location to the feedback report. Add National Trust and Danbury Lakes to list for posters.</b></p>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Feedback from Working Groups</b>	
I.	<p>The progress report from the Communications Working Group was circulated. The coordinator described how the group was progressing against the plan where the initial communication had been circulated. The group needs to be more proactive on engaging local groups and the coordinator asked members to inform her if they had any links/contacts.</p>	<p><b>Members –inform coordinator of any links into local groups.</b></p>
II.	<p>The progress report from the Visions and Objectives Working Group was circulated. Survey monkey has been chosen for the online survey and the paper version will be distributed with the Danbury Times. It needs to fit onto 4 sides of A4. Freepost envelopes will be inserted into the magazine. The application for a freepost licence was sent 2 weeks ago and so the Coordinator has chased Royal Mail for a response.</p> <p>As the survey will have to be finalised for insertion into the Danbury Times before the next steering group meeting, members agreed to delegate the authority to approve it to DC, SH, NB and SD.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. Will we do a sustainability appraisal?</a></p>	<p><b>DC, SH, NB, SD – to approve the questionnaire.</b></p>

	<p>We may need to when we are considering sites. Jenny Robinson has said the City Council will help us with the scoping for it and then we will need to see what already exists and where new work needs to be done. Sites that have come forward in previous calls for sites have already been appraised.</p>	
III.	<p>Members had a discussion about how best to consider the use of and issues facing leisure facilities and parks that are used by groups who aren't necessarily resident in the Parish. It was agreed to contact organisations rather than individual members. Some of those organisations, for example the National Trust are statutory consultees. IG has drafted a letter for such organisations.</p> <p>NB has been considering traffic and pollution and GL, housing demand and some health issues.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. Have you considered equestrians and also the local ramblers group?</a></p> <p>A. A lot of equestrians are from Little Baddow. SD will work on this.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the group contact the Living Landscapes Group – a Parish Councillor is involved with them.</p> <p><a href="#">Q. Have some new air pollution monitoring tubes gone up?</a></p> <p>A. HOD put some up but not all of them. Alan Lindsay at Essex County Council is a possible contact for this. It is believed that levels were above European standards at the Griffin but MS stated that levels can be exceeded up to 18 times in one year.</p>	<p><b>SD – contact Essex Bridleways Association</b></p>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Questions From the Public</b>	
	There were no questions from the public.	
<b>11.</b>	<b>Items for Public/Press Release</b>	
	<p>The coordinator circulated a press release for the Essex Chronicle and Maldon and Burnham Gazette. Members were asked to pose for a photograph for the articles but they felt that it would be unfair as not all members were present and would prefer not to submit a photograph this time around. Articles will also be placed in the Journal and Contact Magazines.</p>	<p><b>Coordinator – issue press release</b></p>
<b>12</b>	<b>Items to be Included in the Next Agenda</b>	
	<p>The following items were requested for the next agenda:  A strategy for sites and developers  <i>SD felt that the group had done really well so far</i>  <i>SA left the meeting at 3.12pm</i>  A photographic competition  The preferred options consultation  SANG – a planning mechanism designed to allow the applicant to provide alternative green space.  Timetable of dates for meetings.</p>	<p><b>Coordinator – produce timetable of meeting dates</b></p>

<b>13.</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
	Monday 19 <sup>th</sup> June at 7pm at the Old Pavilion	
<b>14.</b>	<b>Timetable of Meetings</b>	
	Monday 17 <sup>th</sup> July at 2pm and Monday 21 <sup>st</sup> August at 7pm. Apologies were received for the 19 <sup>th</sup> June from JC and for the 21 <sup>st</sup> August from SD and RS. Members were asked to inform the coordinator as soon as possible if they knew in advance that they would be unable to attend due to summer holidays.	<b>Members – inform coordinator in good time if unable to attend summer meetings</b>

The meeting was closed at 3.20pm.

Confirmed as accurate record of the meeting:

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_