

Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Working Group meeting 18 August 2022

Present: Sue Isherwood, Ros Wyke, Tony Westcott, Chris Langdon (Chair), Adamos Euripidou, Liz Hughes (minutes)

Agenda

1 Apologies – Mick Fletcher

Decision to ensure we have a shared understanding of the prescribed process for the Neighbourhood Plan.

2 How we manage future meetings

Decision to rotate the minutes and keep minutes to decisions and actions. If issues are contentious the working group agreed that more detailed notes should be kept.

Decision that the attendance of NP working group should be consistent and better to have gaps of attendance than swop people in and out.

The Parish Council has agreed¹ a Terms of Reference for the Neighbourhood Plan. The NP should be about more than housing although housing is one aspect of the NP. There was a previous discussion between members of the Parish Council and other participants involved in the Lichfields lobby about whether the links with the Church Commissioners on the RL development, should be handled by the NPWG. The majority view from this previous discussion was that that it made sense to combine but to recognise that the NP has a broader remit and the parish council have agreed a terms of reference accordingly .

A decision needs to be made at a later date for how frequent the NPWG meetings should occur which will probably be dependent on phase of NP.

Decision that Chris Langdon will be chair and Mick Fletcher will be asked to stand as Deputy Chair.

3 Past history – Ros Wyke

A WSM Parish Plan was published in May 2005 as a consultative document that set out village wishes for development. Many of the issues raised in the plan remain issues now – e.g. road safety.

Other village neighbourhood plans have failed due to prescribed process not being followed and evidence / consultations not being robust enough. In 2013/14 Tony Shepherd took forward a WSM Neighbourhood Plan development process which also stalled because of process problems and the difficulty of finding someone competent to produce a broadly based housing needs survey. Housing surveys are difficult and there is a statutory requirement to consider social housing needs although this is protected data. Also there was concern not to identify location of land for development in case this was divisive. Land

¹ Date Parish Council adopted the TOR for the NPWG on 6/7/22

was identified via the Mendip local plan process and commented on by the Parish Council but not the NPWG.

Possible offer of help from Andre Cestini, Snr Planning Policy manager at Mendip County Council. Andre has offered help on Lichfields Brownfield site as well as being an advisor to this group.

Ros Wyke declared an interest in her role at Mendip County Council and the new Unitary Somerset authority – she has an oversight role on planning.

Action: follow up the documentation that came out of the process previously under working group. Sue Isherwood to identify list of docs and who has them

Discussion on whether the NP should define areas of land for development. There were differences of opinion as to whether this is desirable or not. It was agreed that we need to be clear how robust the NP is for changes that may occur in the future with the Local Plan or other planning processes.

Next few years there will be an update on Local Plan Parts I & II .

Actions: Tony to digitise the old WSM Parish Plan

4 Where we are now i) Lichfields update ii) what we have established

(i) Latest from Lichfields is that they want to speak to Mendip in Sept and will present a new plan to WSM thereafter. There was generally a feeling that Lichfields are not interested in co-creating.

Action: agreed to have a communication (soon) with Andre to encourage Lichfields to implement the Church Commissioners desire to honour the Coming Home document. Also to discuss with him the boundaries of Church Commission land, the highway issue and the NP and Andre's knowledge about this. RW to ask Andre for a date in the next two weeks.

(ii) What have we established

The plan needs to be evidenced, the work for Roughmoor Lane produced a lot of evidence. There may be a need to critique some of these data, as not all requirements for the NP are met by that evidence. E.g. Transport survey needs to look at other parts of the village e.g. Station Road etc. Agreement that task group work from Roughmoor Lane working groups be included in knowledge base for NP but further work likely to be necessary to present evidence to meet NP process requirements

5 What advice we can call on/what we're going to need – first questions

- what area is the NP covering?
- can we map out the plan towards completion to project manage this? Can we make this transparent to the community
- can we keep communications succinct and establish a shared document set?
- what is in and what is out of the NP
- can we ensure climate, environment, sustainability and landscape are incorporated
- what is the budget for the NP? (there is £5K in the budget already)

*Agreed the next meeting should look at the geographic scope of the NP.
Agreed we should reregister with the Council*

6 Initial scoping

By way of an example CL identified the following areas of scope in example NP's reviewed:
Natural Environment; Built Environment and Heritage; Housing; Transport; Traffic & Parking; Local Economy & Tourism; Community Wellbeing

Agreed we should aim for an ideal scope and then see what the costs could be and funding availability

7 AOB

None

8 Dates of next meetings

Meeting with Andre: RW will check what slots Andre can do the week of 5 September

Next working group meeting: Wednesday 21 September 7 -8.30pm 2 Glencott The Hollow
End