

## Westbury sub Mendip Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

Meeting 4 on 28 Nov 2022

### Minutes

1. **Present:** Chris Langdon CL (Chair), Adamos Euripidou AE, Liz Hughes LH, Tony Westcott TW, Sue Isherwood SI, Ros Wyke RW, Mick Fletcher MF (Minutes)
2. **Apologies.** None
3. **Minutes** of the Oct 27th meeting had been agreed via email by all who attended the last meeting.
4. **Matters arising**
  - It was noted that Litchfields had advised they would not be able to present new proposals to the PC before January.
  - SI had contacted Jay Greene (church commissioner) asking for examples of where “Coming Home” had influenced the CC approach. **Agreed SI** to pursue a response.
  - **Agreed LH** to approach local vicar to see whether she could find information on how “Coming Home” was affecting CC approach to development
  - **Agreed all** should check before the next meeting that they were able to access and use the shared drive set up by CL
5. It was noted that MF with help from Mark Smith had set up separate pages for Neighbourhood Plan and Roughmoor Lane on the village website, uploaded content and circulated a link via a news post and WhatsApp. **It was agreed** that in order to be transparent, agendas, minutes and key papers should be made available this way but that to add documents that were not relevant to decisions made risked confusing the audience.
6. After a brief consideration of the process proposed by SALC for developing a neighbourhood plan (papers stored on the shared drive) it was **agreed SI** should ask Andre Sestini for his observations on it.
7. LH outlined the issues involved in preparing a simple outline of the NP process and **agreed** to circulate a draft for comment in two week’s time. Her aim was a flow chart that enabled villagers to understand the stages of preparing the plan with clear indications of when and how they could contribute and how their views would be taken into account. It was essential that the plan process was sufficiently robust to pass inspection by an appointed planning inspector. RW suggested we look at the Norton St Philip plan as this had been tested twice recently. LH questioned whether we needed to consider the area to be designated for the plan and whether there ought to be consultation on it. *[Note: Andre Sestini had advised that in earlier work the PC had determined that the plan area should be coterminous with the parish and there was no need to revisit it]*
8. CL circulated possible summaries of key features of Westbury including graphical presentations of information. It was **agreed that CL** should produce a further simplified summary to help villagers understand the potential scope of the plan but avoid any value

statements. While the meeting felt that the plan could include 'aspirations' in relation to issues outside the scope of the formal planning system it was recognised that its legal force related primarily to the development control process. Any process needs to sell the vision as to why it is worth developing a neighbourhood plan. There are three or four audiences – community, developers / local authority planning team, third party org – AONB, EA, etc, and inspectors who will rule on final doc and process followed.

9. It was **agreed** that it makes sense to test out consultation approaches with two separate groups. Grp 1 – process map (simplified) and typical content /feature list. Grp 2 – process map and no content. **Agreed each member** of NPWG to interview 2-4 of community. **MF** to suggest a sample to ensure reasonable spread across the village (mainly location / age). **LH and CL** to present one page summary of process / content to support grp 1 interviews RW suggested initial questions might follow the structure of a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. Agreed that a test of approaches should be attempted before end of Dec to inform next NPWG meeting
10. Date of next meeting was agreed as Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> January at 7.00pm to be hosted by CL at Ditchfield, Lynch Lane, BA5 1HW.