



**MARKS TEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**  
**Notes from the Steering Group Meeting**  
**Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2020**  
**7pm on **

**Present on Zoom:**

John Wood (MTPC)  
Ian Scott-Thompson (Sec)  
Frank Clark  
Richard Gore  
Allan Walker (MTPC)  
Gail Gibbs  
Sue Stacey  
Rachel Hogger

**Apologies:** Patsy Beech, Karen Seward

Welcome (from John). John had previously issued a rough email Agenda.

With the next stage of the process beginning in mid-July, & our goal being to be ready for the referendum next May, we have much to discuss. While some of us are central to some of the items, I expect everyone will want to weigh in. Our agenda for tomorrow is largely based on Rachel's recent email, & her proposal last October that set out her probable work plan & costs:

1. Introduction - moving from Reg 14 to Reg 16 – Rachel. There are 5 strands of work.  
(following the meeting, Rachel clarified in writing via comments to the meeting minutes that these are:  
1. – consideration of the Reg 14 comments and preparing a schedule of recommended changes to the Reg 14 plan. 2. – prepare the Consultation Statement. 3. – prepare the Basic Conditions Statement. 4. – Commission a health check of the NP and 5. – prepare the submission Neighbourhood Plan.)

Once consultation is finished, you collect the comments made. We can start logging them now, organised by the page number of the Plan, similar to the Witchford example.

2. Analysing the responses - Rachel & Richard. It will take quite a lot of meetings, to work through all the comments, drafting a schedule of changes. Acknowledge comments, but don't respond defensively early on. Rachel is very happy to be involved in this stage. Online comments can be converted directly (eg from survey monkey into excel), but paper ones will need to be input manually. In terms of inputting, Local householders' comments are easier, but landowners and developers are trickier since they tend to write long letters. **John, Rachel, and Richard** will start on this logging process, forwarding the SurveyMonkey output (in Excel), on to Rachel. Everyone send any letters or paper forms received to date, to John. **We will share out the task of inputting residents' comments on an Excel format, which Allan will design.** Gemma has a database of all the consultees. Comments from statutory bodies can be listed separately. We will create a log of residents' responses, and a log for statutory bodies and others. **Rachel and John** will test out a sample extract from survey monkey, this week. John will send all letters from statutory consultees to Rachel and Rachel will discuss with Gemma potential for using her time to do some input.

3. Consultation statement – John. This includes information about who we consulted, when, and what we did about it. **Richard** will forward an email to John and Allan, containing this information. Meanwhile John has been sifting Steering Group minutes and noting public meetings, consultations etc. **Sue** will hunt for Rachel's 2018 template sent to Juliet English, and forward it on.

4. Likely impact of developments related to the Local Plan and the two roads on the Neighbourhood Plan – Allan. We have tried to write the Neighbourhood Plan to be independent of the Local Plan. The Garden Communities will drop out of the Local Plan (but may come back in another form, in years to come). We expect the A12 to be improved, but on the present underpass route through Marks Tey. However, it's now possible that CBC will give a housing allocation to Marks Tey. If so, we will need to demonstrate that we have made some provision in the NP, such as behind the shops (with less impact

on the A120). Catherine's email to Gemma helpfully mentions her concerns. In May 2020, CBC had 5.4 years' supply of deliverable sites.

5. Do we need to consider allocating sites? This would mean going back through the consultation process again. It would give us stronger protection; but if CBC have 5 years' supply, then there's no added value in this. We need to hold to the A120 improvements first. **Allan** will ask CBC (Ian Vipond) to talk to us, and tell us their development proposals. There are also national planning pressures: we cannot simply stop all development. **Rachel** will also talk to Catherine.

The group agreed that we need to revisit the question as to whether we should allocate sites or not, if and when Colchester come back to the group stating that there is now a new housing requirement for the NP to deliver on.

6. Basic conditions statement – Rachel. We have to demonstrate that our Plan meets the NPPF, SEA, HRA, European regulations etc. **Rachel** will write this for us (pew!) Brexit does not remove legislation, sadly.

7. Other business. Health Check, a professional examiner pre-testing the NP: will CBC subsidise this? Catherine has not come back to us yet – **Rachel** will chase.

**John will report to MTPC briefly on where we are at, on our finances, if we look as if we will need extra funding from the PC, and on the need to keep pressing CBC to talk to us about its housing expectation / plans for MT.**

Allan: if a referendum is deferred until May 2021, can it coincide with CBC and MTPC elections? And can we get it ready by then? Yes, if no site allocations, and provided there's no further Covid-19 spike. Steering Group will need to meet weekly on Zoom through July. Rachel is hoping to go on holiday 8-31 August, leaving us with a schedule of amendments to make to the NP. This is quite an ambitious timetable and if we don't meet it (by the 7 August) then it is still possible to meet May 2021 referendum. But either way, we need to commit to regular meetings in July.

8. Future meetings: Wednesdays 15<sup>th</sup>, 22<sup>nd</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> July, and 5<sup>th</sup> August (same Zoom ID)

*Ian Scott-Thompson*