



## Manifesto 2024 Meeting

Wednesday, July 19<sup>th</sup> 2023

The Camelia Hotel: 7.00pm to 9pm

### Present:

James Miller, Melissa Aylott, Simon Jones, Helen Miller, Rob Cammidge, Jolene Hills, Lee Houghton, Tris Bembridge, Jon Humphrys, Armelle, Ian Madison, Mark Insell, Lee Hooton, Michael Palmer and Lavinia

### Contents

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Minutes of previous meeting ..... | 2 |
| 2. Leader welcome .....              | 2 |
| 3. Leader update.....                | 2 |
| 4. Local Elections 2024 .....        | 2 |
| 4.1 Candidate selections.....        | 2 |
| 5. Manifesto 2024 Debate .....       | 3 |
| 6. AOB .....                         | 8 |
| 7. Date of next meeting.....         | 9 |

## 1. Minutes of previous meeting

These were agreed and signed by the Chairperson.

## 2. Leader welcome

Welcome from James to explain the process of the meeting, getting everyone's views on all points, and we are open to all to say their thoughts and feelings. We are an open forum.

All are welcome to contact James Miller after the meeting if they wish for more information, and a cup of tea to discuss in more detail.

Jon explained the party voting system and undivided democracy.

James thanked Rob and the team at Camelia Hotel for hosting the meeting.

James thanked Mark from the Leigh on Sea News, who came down to write a report about us.

## 3. Leader update

James has sent out invitations to the next Campaign meeting, which is due to take place on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> September (venue TBC). All are welcome if they wish to contribute.

James has booked advertising in the Echo, Oracle and Leigh on Sea News leading up to the next election.

Candidates are welcome to start campaigning now and are free to use their social platforms to promote themselves, the party and the manifesto.

## 4. Local Elections 2024

### 4.1 Candidate selections

It was confirmed that Tris Bembridge has been selected to stand as our new Chalkwell candidate. All were welcome to put themselves forward to becoming a candidate. Those that have confirmed their candidacy are:

- James Miller (Leigh)

- Jon Humphrys (Victoria)
- Melissa Aylott (Thorpe)
- Jolene Hills (St Luke's)
- Lee Clark (Kursaal)
- Simon Jones (Prittlewell)
- Sim Spooner (Eastwood Park)
- Dean Eckett-Harris (Southchurch)
- Dee Curtis (Milton)
- Jane Wilkes (West Leigh)
- Tris Bembridge (Chalkwell)
- Sian Evans-Jack (Blenheim Park)

## 5. Manifesto 2024 Debate

5.1 Where Southend holds a direct interest in a development (e.g. The Kursaal), do you support a set percentage of the development to be completed, reviewed case-by-case, in a specified period of time?

### Comments:

This original motion was brought about from Brian Ayling. Too many developments across Southend have been left derelict and no longer in use for Southend residents. The Kursaal, Marine Plaza, Southend Marine Activity Centre and Southend Cricket Pavilion are to name just a few. We wish to develop policies that will ensure that Southend is never left in these positions again. It was noted that Dee Curtis has been working hard to retain assets of community value.

Mark observed that there are many legal ramifications with what is possible and would be interested to know how it would be done. He also highlighted outside issues that may hinder a project such as 'acts of God', etc, and asked what would be done in those circumstances.

It was accepted that each development would be reviewed case-by-case, rather than implement a specified percent.

**Voting:**

- Tris: 85
- Simon Jones: 90
- Carla: 90
- Armelle Binns: 90
- Ian Madison: 80
- Jolene: 90
- Mark: 50
- Lavinia: 50
- Helen: 90
- Rob: 90
- Michael Palmer: 90
- Lee: 100
- Melissa: 100
- Jon: 85
- James: 90

**Result**

100% of members voted to support this policy

84% was the mean average for this policy indicating strong support

**Conclusion**

100% of members supported this motion and it will therefore be adopted in our Manifesto 2024.

5.2 Where Southend holds a direct interest in a development, do you support the motion that all developers are required to have secured 100% of the funding?

### **Comments**

This is a continuation of the need to ensure Southend Council only selects developers who will complete projects.

A robust financial position is seen as one of the fundamental tenets of drastically increasing the chances of developments being completed.

Turnstone, the developers for Seaway, required £10m of earmarked Council funding to prop up their proposals, while Swan Housing, the Council's original partner have suffered such severe financial difficulties they have had to be taken over by Sanctuary Housing, who have not yet confirmed whether they wish to proceed with the development.

A comment was that if we put so many stipulations into contracts developers will no longer wish to work with us. The response was that the message Southend Council should be sending is that we are a serious partner to work with who will only work with those that have a proven track record, a realistic business plan and solid financials. And we would rather not be involved with any of them rather than partner up with those that promise no more than plans that lay dormant for years on end.

### **Voting**

- Tris: 100
- Simon: 100
- Carla: 90
- Armelle Binns: 100
- Ian Madison: 100
- Jolene: 100
- Mark: 100
- Helen: 100

- Rob: 100
- Michael Palmer:
- Lee: 100
- Melissa: 100
- Jon: 97
- Lavinia
- James: 90

### **Result**

100% of members supported the policy, which means it will make the Manifesto 2024.

The strength of the vote was 98% (mean average) indicating that members were overwhelmingly in favour of the policy.

5.3 Where Southend holds a direct interest in a development, do you support the motion that all developers are required to be subjected to progress reviews with the potential consequence of losing the contract if they have failed to meet the minimum agreed terms?

### **Comments**

In principle, holding progress reviews with the power to cancel the contracts was seen to be favourable, however, there were too many unknowns as to how this would be implemented.

### **Voting**

- Tris: 100
- Simon: 49
- Carla: 90
- Armelle Binns: 90
- Ian Madison: 80
- Jolene: 100
- Mark: need something that says an acceptable reason for not doing. Need wording that would hold up in court. With caveat 100
- Lavinia:

- Helen: 100
- Rob: 90
- Michael Palmer:
- Lee: 100
- Melissa: 100
- Jon: 49 until the caviate are agreed.
- James: 49

### **Result**

75% of members voted in support of the policy.

The strength of the vote was 83%.

### **Conclusion**

The motion did not pass and will not currently feature on the manifesto 2024.

5.4 Do you oppose tree felling when there has already been a tree preservation order set by the Council?

### **Comment**

A previous meeting asked the question whether we would be against tree felling as a whole, however, that did not pass unanimously. The motion had been adapted to include 'where there has been a tree preservation order' from the council.

Sixty three trees were recently approved to be felled even after a TPO based on the findings of particular substance in the ground that had appeared on new report.

The Council do have the power to reverse their own TPOs based on new information at the time.

It was unanimous that tree felling should be prevented, however, there were serious questions over which caveats would be acceptable and which would not.

There was the idea that no trees should be felled and instead moved and re-planted elsewhere.

### **Voting**

- Tris: 100
- Simon: 40
- Carla: 100
- Armelle Binns: 100
- Ian Madison: 95
- Jolene: 49
- Mark: for the development: 100 AOB e.g. health and safety risk: 49
- Lavinia:
- Helen: 49
- Rob: 40
- Michael Palmer:
- Lee: 100
- Melissa: 100
- Jon: 49 until the caveats are agreed.
- James: 49

### **Result**

50% of members supported the motion so it will not feature on the Manifesto 2024

70% was the mean average of the vote indicating strong support for the motion.

### **Conclusion**

All members were in favour of protecting trees where it is possible to do so, however, those voted against wanted to agree a motion that acknowledged the caveats. This will be put onto the next agenda.

### **6. AOB**

Nothing to report.

7. Date of next meeting

TBC