

Thornbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Minutes

Tuesday 4 April 2018, 7pm at Thornbury Town Hall

In attendance: Tricia Hillier (Chair) Chris Griggs-Trevarthen
Mike Bennewitz (Vice Chair) Judith Dale
Louise Powell (Town Clerk) Jill Dimond

David Fordham (stand-in secretary) Felicity Harrison
James Baglin Trevor Daniels
Nancy North Danny Bonnett
Cllr Shirley Holloway Cllr Matt Stringer
Cllr Clive Parkinson
Mark Goodman (LG) Sarah Martin (LG)

Apologies: Cllr Maggie Tyrell Alan Pinder
Margaret Pinder, Katie Griggs-Trevarthen
Carol Weatherley Gill Dunkley

1. Welcome, Minutes of Last Meeting, Matters Arising

The minutes of the meeting of the 13 March 2018 were approved. The actions from the previous meeting scheduled for completion by 3 April had been completed with the exception of three which would be reviewed under AOB.

There were no other matters arising which were not on the agenda.

2. Issues Report review

Lemon Gazelle had completed the initial analysis of the questionnaire responses, circulated a report of their initial analysis of them and developed them into a draft Issues Report which would be circulated after the meeting. Mark Goodman (LG) opened LG's report with the headlines from the Survey – over 500 responses had been received – around 1 in 30 of the population which was felt to be good - and these had included 2,500 comments which had been distilled into the Issues Report. He said that, in the process, he had discovered that Thornbury was 'quite a passionate place'!

He continued by saying that we now needed to set the Survey comments in the context of the 'rules for Neighbourhood Plan development' so as to establish the art of the possible within this framework. LG had also conducted a 'reality check' of Community Aspirations using earlier research completed by the Steering Group as well as the completed Survey information. He emphasised that traceability was important and this came up several times during the meeting – do not delete information, explain why it is not to be followed up and archive it so that it can be accessed by the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner later in the process.

MB queried where any 'out of scope' items should go. Mark said they had used an Action Plan method in developing other Neighbourhood Plans. Items can be placed in it, analysed and passed on to the most relevant Authority for possible future action. This means that, when

challenged, the route taken by any Survey comment either into the Neighbourhood Plan or on to some other Authority's Action List can be traced.

Sarah Martin (LG) stated that the Issues Report was complete and ready for issue. TH proposed that we review the position at the end of the meeting to agree whether in addition to circulating to Group members, it should be made available on the website. SM took the meeting through some of the key Issues that she had identified. She confirmed that her preparatory work for the next stage of our activities would be complete and available before the next Group meeting to facilitate our discussions.

3. Framework for Development and Evaluation of Options

SM explained the next stage of the process and illustrated how themes from the Issues Report can be analysed so that the likelihood of their acceptance by the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner can be assessed. She took us through sample Theme/Issue/Possible Option slides based on the comments received and explained the 'traffic light' system she proposed we used to establish whether the Topic was a 'Land Use' issue, whether it conforms to national and South Gloucestershire planning policy and whether it can be traced directly to comments received. The spreadsheet also included an area for 'Other Strengths and Weaknesses' where our feelings about significant pros and cons should be recorded and one for 'Comments'. Again, back to the traceability point, she emphasised that each Topic should be addressed even if it is only to record why the Group felt it was not a suitable one to follow through.

SM had also produced initial groupings of Topics under the general headings of Housing, Town Centre, Services, Transport and the Environment to assist us in refining the Issues further and developing Options which might address a group of Topics. She would complete this process before the next meeting. She emphasised that the Topic groupings were by no means exhaustive and that she would expect us to generate significantly more as our discussions progressed.

CG-T suggested that we should pursue all our thoughts as there may well be ways of phrasing our chosen Options to ensure that key Issues gain traction in the planning process. The Neighbourhood Plan is the place for the Community to set its priorities to guide the planning process. So, as an example, perhaps the Plan can establish that Thornbury's global growth requires specific levels of infrastructure provision to be achieved – distancing itself from individual developments but bringing pressure on the Planning Authorities to meet the level of provision specified as, or preferably before, developments are permitted.

NN asked whether NHS data on health provision was available. **[Post Meeting Note:** TH supplied the following answer all of which may not have been communicated during the Meeting: The NHS uses demographic data to assess demand for services. It could be requested via the Clinical Commissioning Group but it is unclear if it will help us.]

It was agreed that the Survey Report should be placed on the website together with the Issues Report. **TH to supply the Survey Report and the Issues Report, JB to upload.**

4. Activities for the Next Period

TH identified that, recognising the amount of work to be done, four meeting dates had been set between now and the end of May. MB suggested that we might tackle one policy area per meeting over the period. LG suggested two should be possible. There was general discussion of options and availability of Group members and the decision was that policy areas would be discussed:

18 April	Housing
01 May	Town Centre Services
16 May	Transport Environment
23 May	Revise and review all policy areas
Meetings would all be in the town Hall at 7.00pm.	

TH proposed that, if anyone had thoughts or views on a policy area and could not attend the relevant meeting, they could forward comments to her to raise at the meeting. Members would be free to comment after the meeting on the positions established as the analysis spreadsheets would be circulated. These would be used to record views generated, discussion and decisions made.

LG team re-emphasised that we must resist the temptation to jump into the development of Policies at this stage of the process.

In response to discussion of the pros and cons of further consultation, MG suggested that one obvious time for this would be once the Options had been developed as shown on the LG schedule. The downside was an 8 to 10 week delay in the programme. CG-T suggested that without any interim consultation reaction might be hostile to being faced with what might appear to be a 'take it or leave it' set of Policies at the Final Consultation stage. Another possibility would be to have a series of Open Meetings, at which interested Community representatives could be 'engaged'. This might offset the hostility sufficiently. It was agreed that, provided this could be done properly so that opportunities were not opened for potential opponents, this 'engagement' route was the preferred option.

5. Communications Update

- a) **Website:** JB confirmed that the Document Library was now live and had Agendas and a complete set of approved Minutes. The Library permitted the upload of other documents when required.

Photographs were still needed and both potential sources which had been approached had yet to yield any. JB asked for contributions.

The Calendar was now also available showing key meetings, events and activities.

A General User Access protocol had now been developed which would permit permitted users to update most areas of the site.

The MailChimp application would be available shortly to assist with surveys.

The Requirements for the initial website were not sensibly complete and working – this stage would be ready for sign-off shortly. **JB to notify the Clerk and TH when the initial website requirements had been met.**

Social Media: There had been little activity or change since the last meeting.

TH congratulated JB and thanked him for his hard work on this important aspect of the Group's work.

- b) **Developer Meetings:** LP indicated that it had been difficult to find contact addresses for potential participants. She was awaiting response for our SGC Gateway to get assistance. We may need to provide a letter to SGC and invite them to send out the letters on our behalf because of GDRP requirements. The result was that, to permit the developers time to prepare their submissions, the meetings were more likely to be in June than May

In response to a question from DB about who we should invite to make sure the list

included potential developers and well as those who had developed here before, SM indicated that the information should be available from the SGC's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and that, as a landowner in Thornbury, SGC itself should get an invitation to present to the Group. It would be useful to ensure that we got local contacts for the developers rather than national headquarters' addresses. MT offered to facilitate LP gaining either the address information or co-operation from SGC to approach developers on our behalf. **LP to discuss the developer addresses situation at 13 April with MT and agree any action needed.**

MP and TH had made revisions to the draft letter to developers that Lemon Gazelle had provided to suit the Thornbury case. **LP to circulate revised letter to Group Members for final comments.**

6. Matters Arising and AOB

LG confirmed that there had been low engagement from areas of the town where there was significant new development. The newcomers to the Community were not engaged with the Neighbourhood Plan process and this needed to be addressed in the next engagement/consultation stage. **Action: Address the need for engaging the newcomers as part of next engagement process**

LP confirmed that there had still not been any responses from schools. She proposed that special efforts might be needed to get the views of 17/18 year-olds. The post-examination period at the end of the Summer term might provide a period of opportunity when specific schools could be targeted. **Action: LG to develop a plan for schools engagement**

JD confirmed that the questions to be posed to developers were still being discussed but progress was being made. **Action continues. JD to present the questions for developers for approval.**

JD indicated that her son had done some initial work on both draft ideas and a quotation but felt they were not yet at the stage to be formally presented. **Action continues. JD to forward the proposal for the Logo and the quotation to TH and LP.**

7. Date of Next Meetings

Wed 18 April 2018 7pm, Town Hall. For future meeting see paragraph 6 of these Minutes

Meeting concluded at 9 .00pm

D Fordham

ACTION LOG FROM MEETING

up members to be sent a copy of the Lemon Gazelle report	Powell	Complete
sentation dates to be transferred to a Gantt chart on Excel	ennewitz	Complete
email communications list to current group members and share email addresses	Powell	ate
the Ground Rules for Working within information pack for all group members	hillier	
Internal Communications Protocol to discussed with website developer regarding proposal for automated email potential for website updates	Baglin	ate
per meeting arrangements to be set up	ond/Louise Powell	
ons for developers to be presented for approval	ond/Louise Powell	ues
to be populated with previous minutes etc and work completed to set up MailChimp	Powell / James Baglin	ate
on to quote for Logo to be produced	ond	Continues
at Lemon Gazelle to review survey responses to establish if new residents of Thornbury had participated	hillier	Complete
upply the Survey Report and the Issues Report, JB to upload.	hillier/James Baglin	13/04/18
otify the Clerk and TH when the initial website requirements had been met.	Baglin	When met
discuss the developer addresses situation at 13 April with MT and agree any action needed.	Powell/ Maggie Tyrell	13/04/18
rculate revised developer letter to Group Members for final comments.	Powell	18/04/18