

Danbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Minutes of the Meeting held on 20th March 2017
at The Old Pavilion, Main Road, Danbury, CM3 4NQ

Present: Steve Arthurs (SA)
Norman Bartlett (NB)
Elly Bunn (EB)
Dan Carlin (DC), Danbury Parish Councillor
Judith Clacy (JC)
Sue Dobson (SD)
Irene Guidotti (IG)
Stephen Holland (SH)
Martin Lister (LS)
Gilly Lutton (GL)
Lesley Mitchelmore (LM), Neighbourhood Plan Coordinator
Anthony Rogers
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
1.	Apologies for Absence	
	Apologies were received from Gill Fletcher, and Jenny Bucknell.	
2.	Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items	
	No interests were declared.	
3.	Public Participation Session	
	<p>There was no participation from the public.</p> <p>Q. NB queried what the purpose of this item was as all members of the steering group were effectively members of the public.</p> <p>A. This is to give members of the public who are not members of the steering group an opportunity to address the Steering Group.</p> <p>Q. Why would they ask a question here for an agenda item that may be not be addressed until much later in the meeting?</p> <p>A. At the Chair's discretion, an item may be moved up the agenda in response any participation from the public.</p>	
4.	Minutes	
	The minutes from the meeting of February 20th 2017 were circulated. The minutes were signed as a true record of that	

	meeting.	
5.	Action Points Arising from the Minutes – not otherwise listed on the agenda.	
	<p>The coordinator reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles of the Chelmsford City Council and the Parish Council have been added to the Constitution. • The role of the Spokesperson/Press Officer has been added to the Constitution • The Chair’s emergency action has been added to the constitution. • NB has checked Appendix 1 of the Communication Strategy (the stakeholders list) • The training workshop went ahead on 7th March as planned. • The initial communication has been completed. • Suggestions for speakers were received for SD and NB. It has already been agreed that SD would speak at the meeting. 	
6.	Feedback from the Coordinator	
I.	<p>The coordinator reported that a conditional offer for funding for the period 1/04/2017 to 3/10/2017 has been received. The Parish Clerk has completed the Due Diligence forms and we await confirmation of the award.</p>	
II.	<p>A link to Chelmsford City Council’s Preferred Options documents had been previously circulated to the group and members confirmed that they had had an opportunity to look at them.</p> <p><u>Q. Now we have a hybrid’ are we as a Steering Group supposed to respond to the consultation?</u></p> <p>A. As the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group we have to abide by the option chosen by Chelmsford City Council so we shouldn’t have an opinion and should remain neutral. However, if individual members of the Steering Group wish to respond in a personal capacity, they are entitled to do so.</p> <p><u>Q. As a part of the Neighbourhood Planning Group, should we do a poll of what the community thinks?</u></p> <p>A. That is for the Parish Council to say and not the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p> <p><u>Q. It isn’t much of a consultation if there is only one choice.</u></p> <p>A. The Workshops will give people an opportunity for people to discuss this with us and the consultation will still be running when we hold them.</p> <p><u>Q. The production of this hybrid document seems to go against the opinions of key statutory consultees. If the City Council can throw over consultees and people what will they</u></p>	

	<p>do to our Neighbourhood Plan? Chelmsford City Council has knocked their credibility over this.</p> <p>A. We need to stay neutral and can't presume that the community won't say that they do want housing. The Neighbourhood Plan can dictate what type and where.</p> <p>Q. Is the Parish Council going to respond to this?</p> <p>A. That is up to the Parish Council to determine whether and what response they make as per their remit.</p> <p>Q. If the preferred option is for 100 houses, when would that be effective?</p> <p>A. When the plan is in place.</p>	
	<p>The coordinator reported that enquiries had been received from a couple of developers/agents and as the group is aware, Josh Woolliscroft from Snapdragon Consulting has been observing steering group meetings from the public gallery. The coordinator has enquired which sites they have an interest in and what their intentions are towards the neighbourhood plan and that is all. The coordinator considers that it is too early in the process to be able to have meaningful discussions with developers/agents at this stage as the group has yet to consult with the public and doesn't want to distract/potentially bias the Visions and Objectives questionnaire.</p> <p>Q. MS asked whether the group could know who the developers/agents were.</p> <p>A. The coordinator felt that it is too early in the process for the group to be discussing individual developers/agents. The coordinator has brought this to the meeting so that members are aware and to confirm with the group that it is too early in the process to enter into discussions. If the group wishes to enter into discussions at this stage then they can make this known now and it can be arranged.</p> <p>The group discussed this and DC felt that it would be more meaningful to wait until the Visions and Objectives Consultation has been completed. SA stated that developers can engage through the consultation if they so wish and then present to the group when the group is ready.</p> <p>The coordinator informed the group that no meetings with developers had taken place and would not outside of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meetings.</p> <p>SD said that all developers would be treated the same and engaged through the call for sites process when the Steering Group is at that stage of the Neighbourhood Plan Process.</p>	
7.	Feedback from Training Workshop	
	Members agreed that the workshop was useful.	
8.	Feedback from Working Groups	

<p>I.</p>	<p>SH circulated a thermometer graphic to the group (see attached) to demonstrate progress against milestones in the plan to date. This plan may be subject to change over time however. This is a tight schedule as the plan is to stay in line with Chelmsford City Council's local plan process as much as is possible and bearing in mind that the coordinator's contract ends in April 2018.</p> <p>Articles advertising the public drop in sessions in the Journal, Danbury Times and Contact Magazine (inclusion T.B.C) were circulated and agreed. The Danbury Times will also include an article written by DC on behalf of Danbury Parish Council. NB had checked Appendix 1 of the Engagement Strategy and added in some additional contact points. Contact addresses need to be added for businesses and it is expected that this will be obtained from the Parish Council.</p> <p>In addition, appendix 3 will document engagement exercises, the first being the launch event.</p>	
	<p>The Initial Communication was circulated to the group and SH asked members to consider the three questions. The questions will be as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What do you like and value about the village? 2. What don't you like about the village and could be improved 3. What doesn't the village have that you would like and would use? <p>Members were concerned that such general questions may illicit numerous responses. SH responded that people would be asked for their top 3 items.</p> <p>The plan is to print 2000 leaflets and attend local groups to ask them to complete them. If any members are associated with any local groups and could do this, please would they let the group know.</p> <p><u>Q. We can't control traffic and transport through the local plan, so should we be asking about it. It is misleading the public.</u></p> <p>A. Members discussed this: It is relevant as it is a planning consideration. The Parish Council can make representations to the City Council. 100 houses wouldn't be enough to provide the infrastructure and that needs to be addressed through the Local Plan. This is relevant to the vision for Danbury. Through Neighbourhood Plans local people can be imaginative and look for creative solutions.</p>	<p>SH</p> <p>Coordinator</p>

	<p>the summer holidays and there is not funding to print them separately.</p> <p>The Visions Strategy Document was proposed by DC, seconded by JS and agreed by the group subject to amendments to the questions.</p> <p>Q. Are we pushing the timetable out too far? A. We will push it out earlier if we can.</p> <p>We propose a meeting for volunteers for the drop-in sessions on 20th April 2017 at 2pm.</p>	Coordinator, Communications and Visions and Objectives Working Groups
III.	IG fed back from the research working group.	
9.	Launch at the Parish Annual Meeting	
	<p>An outline for the Launch had been circulated to members. The Parish Council is preparing posters. SH asked for volunteers for the Launch to man the Neighbourhood Plan table and hand out the initial communication document. The City Council will provide maps.</p> <p>MS published the dates on HOD Social Media. Members agreed with the outline for the launch. Most members of the group are intending to attend the APM.</p>	
10.	Governance	
I.	The amended constitution was circulated. It was proposed by JS, seconded by IG and adopted by the group.	
II.	Members who have not yet completed their Declaration of Interests forms were reminded that they need to be completed. The coordinator will email reminders to those members.	Coordinator
11.	Questions From the Public	
	<p>Q. NB asked why this section was on the agenda A. To give members of the public the opportunity to ask questions/clarify any points from the meeting.</p> <p>There were no questions from the public.</p>	
12.	Items for Public/Press Release	
	<p>Members were reminded about the publicity for the launch and drop-in sessions in the Danbury Times, The Journal and Contact magazine.</p> <p>The coordinator informed members that as a condition of the Grant Funding, the group will be required to publicise Neighbourhood Plans to other areas. This can be done by an article in the Chronicle about the Launch and Drop in sessions once they have been completed.</p> <p>Q. Are you going to have twitter?</p>	Coordinator

	<p>A. We haven't decided yet and if we did, it would need someone to monitor it.</p> <p>Q. Would it be in order to put links onto other twitter feeds?</p> <p>Members had a discussion as to whether members could use other twitter feeds to advertise and circulate news about the Neighbourhood Plan. RS felt that it wouldn't be appropriate as the Group would not be able to agree what was put out on those feeds.</p> <p>NB offered the social media and other channels of the Danbury Society – blog, twitter, Facebook, email and newsletters etc.</p> <p>The group decided to advertise the events in the community section of the Chronicle and to put something in the journal on a monthly basis.</p>	
13.	Items to be Included in the Next Agenda	
	<p>There were no requests for items to be included in the next agenda.</p> <p>Q. When do requests for items for the next agenda need to be received by the Coordinator?</p> <p>A. The agenda is sent out the week before the meeting so ideally items need to be received two weeks before.</p>	
14.	Dates of Next Meetings	
	Friday 12 th May at 2pm at the Old Pavilion	

The meeting was closed at 8.35pm

Confirmed as accurate record of the meeting:

Chair _____

Date _____