

Westbury Neighbourhood Planning Group  
Minutes 13<sup>th</sup> April 2023  
Held at Ditchfield

1. **Present** - Chris Langdon (Chair), Mick Fletcher, Adamos Euripidou, Sue Isherwood, Tony Wescott
2. **Apologies** – Ros Wyke
3. **Minutes** of last meeting – having been previously circulated were agreed.
4. **Membership.** Dave Maguire was welcomed to the group and introductions made.
5. **Matters arising;**
  - a. Litchfields have not provided an updated statement nor a summary of the pre-app advice received. Agreed to be made available on the village website once received. (Now received and introduction by group will contextualise).
  - b. Sue had forwarded to Jay Greene the CC Chief Exec's statement and strategic land report. Sue, Jay and Christina Baron planned to raise the issue at General Synod in July.
  - c. Chris agreed to pursue a FOI request to see Mendip's pre-app advice in full [action CL]
  - d. Chris had requested, via A Sestini, an informal discussion with the conservation officer (Zoe Maclennan) followed by a pre-app approach to planners but no response had been received. Chris agreed to press for a meeting to include a minimum of 3 members of the group. Adamos should be involved if possible. [action CL]
  - e. It was noted that Chris had spoken to Gill Cook concerning the brief for a consultant to advise on issues concerning traffic, road safety, active travel etc. and seeking an appropriate expert
  - f. Sue had spoken to Andrew Buchanan concerning support for a consultant in relation to settlement character, design and layout. He had agreed that the Westbury Society core members would be happy to support [action SI].
  - g. Tony had prepared a brief for UWE student support in relation to an alternative vision for the greenfield site and a suitable student (Jenny Payne) had been identified and given an initial briefing.
  - h. It was agreed to use in community expertise for consideration of BNG, SUDS, Phosphate and involve Emma Giffard, Ann Langdon and John Ball [CL to progress]. Preparation of briefs & identification of suitable consultants had been completed and responses received.
  - i. Chris had written formally to Ros seeking clarification why the Westbury sewage works have been excluded from nutrient neutrality zone when the report commissioned by SCC has advice is it should be within the zone [action CL).

- j. It was noted that a parish meeting had been held, as planned on 19<sup>th</sup> March. It had been well attended and was supportive of the NPWG approach.
6. **PC update.** It was reported that the PC had agreed that quotes should be sought for consultancy support in respect of settlement character and transport / pedestrian safety. A special meeting had been arranged for 19<sup>th</sup> April to set a budget for expenses to support the UWE student. It was agreed that Sue would consult with Ros on the wording necessary to secure a budget of up to £250.00 for this purpose and ensure it was submitted to the clerk in time [ action SI].
  7. **Asbestos.** Adamos reported that initial work to remove the worst asbestos sheeting on the Court House Farm sheds had been completed, but only after intervention from him and Guy Timson to ensure that the work was undertaken safely. What further work was envisaged and to what timetable was not clear but potential risks to health & safety remained. It was agreed that Sue should write to Strutt and Parker as PC chair formally requesting information on the extent and timing of future operations and asking when the parking traditionally used by the church would be restored. It would be best to send a letter jointly from PC and PCC.
  8. **Consultancy support.** Chris took the meeting through the briefs he had circulated to two sets of consultants and the responses received. It was agreed that
    - a. Chris should circulate the briefs to NPWG members to confirm whether to advise the PC that they adequately summarise our requirements [action all by end of Sunday 16<sup>th</sup>]
    - b. Chris & Sue should agree a note for the PC summarising our advice that we should accept the quote from Liz Beth and seek PC funding to meet the full cost (£2,850 + VAT)
    - c. Chris should contact transport consultants to see whether their bids could be better aligned with our priorities and at a reasonable cost.
    - d. Sue reminded the group that the PC clerk had requested information and figures on quotes from 3 sources for both proposed consultancy areas by April 21<sup>st</sup>.
  9. **Crowd Funding** Dave reported on an initial exploration of the options for crowd funding to meet some of the costs of external support in relation to transport / safety. It was noted that this option had been proposed in the light of the limited resources of the PC and the view that public funding should be directed to supporting the neighbourhood plan in general and not responding to specific planning applications.
    - a. Dave summarised the choice as either one of 3 well known agents (Go Fund Me, Just Giving, and Crowd Funder) or a home-made approach. The former would cost 2.9% of sums raised but had useful features such as the ability to return funds to individuals if not used.
    - b. There was some discussion as to whether the PC should be asked to act as guarantor for a fixed sum, to allocate a specific amount or to match fund up to an agreed maximum.

- c. It was not clear from the bids received to date what sum was needed; nor whether grant support could be obtained in the time available.
- d. It was agreed that Dave would lead a task group to produce a plan involving Sue because of her knowledge of grant applications and Adamos because of local contacts. All group members would informally sound out personal contacts about the viability of the scheme and feed back.

10. **Student support** Tony reported that we had been successful in securing support via a UWE student project and a very able Masters student, Jenny Payne, allocated. Tony had already arranged an initial briefing for her and clarified the level of expenses needed from the PC. The initial brief, to be refined in dialogue with the NPWG was for her to provide a critique of the Litchfields proposals and then help develop an alternative vision incorporating the brown field site.

11. **Task groups** Chris agreed to approach individuals to lead task groups able to respond to any planning proposals received in respect of Drainage, Ecology, BNG and other matters.

12. **Next meeting.** The next meeting was agreed to be held at 7.30 pm on 4<sup>th</sup> May at Waterslade. If necessary, Adamos would join the meeting via Zoom.