

## Westbury sub Mendip Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

Meeting 3 on 27 Oct 2022

### Minutes

1. **Present:** Mick Fletcher (Chair), Adamos Euripidou, Liz Hughes, Tony Westcott, Sue Isherwood, Ros Wyke, Chris Langdon (Minutes)
2. **Apologies.** None (TW arrived 25 mins late owing to travel problems)
3. **Minutes** of the Sept 21<sup>st</sup> meeting had been agreed via email by all who attended the last meeting.
4. **Matters arising**
  - a) MF confirms that he is happy to act as co-chair for this working group.
  - b) Roughmoor Lane Update. SI has been in communication with Pauline Roberts (Lichfield Lead). They are hoping to meet with MDC shortly and then aim to meet the parish council in December. (Update Lichfields have just come back with three suggested dates between 25 Nov and 6 Dec.) CL wrote to Andre Sestini at Mendip DC to check if any contact and he confirms no meetings had been held or planned as at mid October. It was agreed to approach the Church Commissioners directly to see if they are implementing the community engagement principle as described in the “Coming Home” document and to reiterate that WsM would like to be part of any programme. Clearly Lichfield are not applying any co-working for a plan B.

Action **SI to write to Jay Green** (Church Commissioner) to ask how CC are implementing the Coming Home document.

**LH to write to WsM vicar** Alex Holmes to ask if she has any information on implementation of “Coming Home” or can find out through diocese teams.

**RW is meeting Bishop of Bath & Wells** in an upcoming function and will also seek out information about how the church are changing their approach to reflect adoption of the “Coming Home” document.

- c) The item on agenda on housing survey meetings had been added in error. No meeting had taken place.
- d) Previous minutes had not noted the outcome of the meeting some of the NPWG had with Andre Sestini – Planning Policy Lead at Mendip DC. The meeting notes were agreed and are available for review and his core advice is being followed:
  - i) Critical that any neighbourhood plan has the evidence for its proposals – if sufficiently robust process not followed the plan will fail. Advice on process at each stage is available.
  - ii) The Neighbourhood Plan should have clear objectives so ensure that the right priorities / actions / policies are developed.
  - iii) Planning legislation is likely to undergo major review by government and neighbourhood plan scope / content may need to change but whatever changes arise there will need to be clear objectives.
  - iv) RW made the group aware that with the transition to a new Somerset Unitary Authority the existing MDC local plan will continue to apply until a new Somerset

Authority local plan is in place – currently not likely until 2028. We can expect that the emerging SCC local plan will start to carry weight in planning decision by 2026. The WSM Neighbourhood Plan if developed over the next 3 years will be in time to influence / respond to the emerging local plan for Somerset.

- e) SI attended a Somerset Association of Local Councils (SALC) meeting (slides were distributed) and confirms that support is available and at some point we will need to decide what support is most relevant / needed.

## **5. Refresh Steps for establishing community objectives (Inform, Consult, Assess Feedback)**

The last meeting agreed we would target the next 6 months to establish a set of clear objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan – based on community priorities and to achieve this we would follow the agreed four step process.

The community would want to know what the whole NP process is and we would need to present what the stages might be and possible content. There would also be a need to manage expectations.

Agreement that we need to communicate with the whole community: All points will be recorded; some will be delivered; some will be prioritised; we need to be clear on what we can focus on go with the majority view.

The inform process will set out the process about the objectives for the NP not the detail of what people want in a plan.

## **6. Agree Content for Inform Stage**

What sort of control can NP bring to the village? Some planning controls applied at local plan level (or county eg Highways parking standards) and some additional controls can be applied at Neighbourhood Plan level (with evidence and within parameters of local plan).

Some felt that the Stanton Drew NP read well, with a clear process and perhaps a good example of the content / topics that might be covered. TW noted that the last chapter covered a number of aspirations that were not ultimately included in the main policies within the NP.

General agreement that the WsM NP should also include proposals to make progress on community aspirations that might not normally be seen in the “Development Control “ element of a normal NP. Perhaps there should be two parts – one to cover the planning policies to protect the village and one to set out aspirations not part of physical development but valued by community.

There are perhaps three audiences for the NP;

- Developers who are required to meet its requirements;
- The community who want to see how valued features are protected / aspirational priorities are progressed and
- Local partners – AONB, Wildlife Trust, Education Authorities etc.

Comment that we need to take care to understand what is within the power of the NP and what sits outside of what can be influenced. However this should not limit aspirations - community action can be very effective – eg Buses, Traffic survey.....

There was much discussion concerning communicating the process being navigated, but also that the community will want to know what that means to them and when/ how their views will be heard.

General agreement that this might refer to content / indexes of existing NP and cite examples across the range of what content might feature.

People need to see what is being attempted and understand what stage we are at now and what will happen next but also need content to stimulate interest / see relevance.

Broad agreement that communication needed to explain process, present example content including some aspirational examples and then also explain next steps / when views can be heard or captured. The communication should repeat the main message “what do you value about WsM”.

Action **LH to draft a doc on process** that paints a picture of the whole NP process and then the intention to first focus on establishing shared community objectives.

**CL to draft a doc to demonstrate** content that shows example content of what an NP may include in line with discussions above.

## 7. **Agree Communication of Inform Stage** (agreeing objectives of NP)

Objective of communication is

- People understand a NP process is underway
- They understand the rough shape of this process
- Understand they have a role
- Then ask for what they value
- Bring the community together

Use all kinds of communications – leaflets, WhatsApp , letters, Eyes and Ears team, website, PEW magazine, face to face meetings (one to one, small groups, large groups)

Repeat the message What do you value?

The inform stage will communicate relevant info – what the process for whole NP looks like / the plan to establish clear objectives first / content to help build knowledge / when feedback will be heard / collected.

Following some reflection on discussions as outlined above a post meeting note has been agreed as follows:

To pilot an initial set of questions by each interviewing 2 or 3 members of the community – chosen at random – not our usual friends and contacts - with an agreed proforma. Target to do this and compare notes within next two months.

## 8. **Agree pro-active steps ref RML**

See above actions and also

Action **SI to arrange for WsM parish council to communicate** via website / WhatsApp messaging re latest on Roughmoor Lane – including lack of new proposals or any willingness to engage.

**9. Archiving Files from NPWG**

The brief received was to find out what application we might use to store all documents and ensure we have only one version of each that can be effectively edited without conflicting versions and protection from deletion in error. All NPWG to have editing rights.

CL outlined research / consultation with IT professionals and concluded that Onedrive should achieve objectives. It will be necessary for each of us to have a Microsoft account – the system has initially been accessed successfully by MF and AE. CL to run some other tests and then set all members of group up with relevant link / instructions.

10. **AOB** – none

11. **Date of next meeting** – Monday 28<sup>th</sup> November 6.00pm. Hosted by Mick Fletcher