

Thornbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Minutes

Tuesday 16 Oct 2018, 7pm at Thornbury Town Hall

In attendance: Mike Bennewitz (Vice Chair) Chris Griggs-Trevarthen
 Margaret Pinder (Secretary) Trevor Daniels
 Louise Powell (Town Clerk) Jill Dimond
 Felicity Harrison Alan Pinder
 Gill Dunkley Cllr Clive Parkinson
 Cllr Matt Stringer Cllr Shirley Holloway
 Cllr Maggie Tyrell
 Lemon Gazelle consultants: Sarah Martin, Mark Goodman

Apologies: Tricia Hillier (Chair), Judith Dale, Nancy North

1. Welcome, Minutes of Last Meeting,

MB welcomed Lemon Gazelle to the meeting.

2. Matters Arising

There was one matter arising which was not on the agenda. LP confirmed that a holding response had been received from Patrick Conroy of South Gloucestershire Council to the letter from the Chair. (Item 2 on September minutes). Some items had not been reached on last month's agenda. It was agreed to consider communications and the design guide (Items 5&6 of previous minutes) under AOB.

3. Review of Plan Policies

Lemon Gazelle invited discussion about the updated draft which contained the first draft of potential policies. MP raised the issue about the structure of the report. We had just followed the headings that had been given to the issues and options. There had been much repetition and not all of it could be attributed to using different writers for the sections. It was agreed that the Steering Group would consider the structure at its next meeting.

It was agreed to look for omissions, to consider only major issues and the notes in red from Lemon Gazelle. Some omissions/concerns were identified and discussed:

- a. **Sustainability Policy.** Although we had proposed a Sustainability Policy, what had been produced was not an overarching policy but a few policies covering some of the topics – principally energy generation. CG-T identified electric charging points and use of sustainable materials among the omissions. MP also noted that the Environment group had wanted a sustainability policy to go at the head of the report since it covered many aspects which appeared in all the sections. Lemon Gazelle suggested that it would not be necessary as the full report would be subject to either a full Strategic Environment Assessment or a more lightweight Sustainability

Appraisal once South Gloucestershire had sight of the draft report. It was agreed that amendments could be made to the current policies to pick up the missing elements once identified by the Steering Group.

- b. **Employment Land.** AP identified the lack of any reference to designating employment land. Policy 10 is criteria-based but does not identify any sites. It was left undecided whether it was necessary or practical to identify specific sites.
- c. **Unidentified Sites.** AP suggested that it was necessary to have a policy which identified what should be done with any future sites which might come available in addition to the three specific sites mentioned in the text. It was agreed that there should be a policy which covered any future brownfield sites coming available with the town.
- d. **Buckover and New Nuclear Build.** These were two key potential future developments which were not mentioned in the text of the report even though they had the potential to affect Thornbury during the period of the plan. It was agreed that there should be some text references to both issues even though there was nothing which could be done through the Neighbourhood Plan to influence any decisions about them. TD agreed to draft a form of words for consideration.
- e. **Tenure.** TD was concerned that there was insufficient emphasis in the report about different tenures. Many people were concerned about the lack of rental properties in the town but the references tended to be low-key in the report. It was agreed to add Build To Rent to the list in policy 5.
- f. **Green Belt.** There is no mention in the report of the constraints on development within Thornbury by the positioning of the Green Belt, making the town 'lopsided'.
- g. **Over-development.** GD pointed out that many people in the town were concerned with over-development. Discussion took place about meaning of the term. It would be necessary to consider carefully about how to phrase any issues to make sure they are acceptable to planners / inspector.

Action: Steering Group to consider above points and make notes on plan to forward to Lemon Gazelle. Lemon Gazelle to amend policies as discussed today and identified at next meeting.

SM reminded the group that it was important to keep some things in mind during the next review of the draft report:

- Ensure that the plan remains positive
- Eliminate repetition

Discussion ensued about the use of the word 'speculative' which had been picked up by Lemon Gazelle. It is a word which has more than one meaning within the planning context and also has some negative overtones. If the intention is to identify development which had occurred on land not identified in the Core Strategy, it would be better to say that: 'not within any approved plan, nor in any prospective plan' for example.

Action: Steering Group to consider how best to express concerns highlighted in the current draft

4. Aims and Objectives

Lemon Gazelle went through their advice about constructing aims and objectives. The key thing which the steering needs to do is to make sure that the strategic level objectives feed down to the chapter objectives and the policies. Equally it is important to check back up from the policies to the objectives. MP had included some 'Aunt Sally' first drafts of vision and strategic objectives which had not yet been considered by the group. It was agreed:

- a. that the next meeting would concentrate on looking at Vision and Objectives and then consider what structure would best suit the report. This should reduce some of the repetition which is currently seen. MP agreed to do the restructure following the meeting, incorporating the additional text on Buckover and New Nuclear Build.

Next Steps

- b. After the restructure it will also be necessary for the Steering Group to look again together at the 'red' comments by Lemon Gazelle and the points made in section 3. above and determine what further needed to be done, both by the group and Lemon Gazelle.
- c. CG-T proposed a working group should look at site allocations to check the ones currently identified.
- d. MP proposed that a working group would be needed to look at the Action Log and determine how these could be taken forward
- e. MB confirmed that he had placed a bank of photographs on the private section of the website. These will be available for the report. MB confirmed that he had ensured that privacy had been considered when taking the photos – he had eliminated car number plates for example in street scenes.
- f. There will be a need for maps. South Glos had said they would provide but had wanted detail first before checking their resources. OS maps could be used under licence.
- g. The supporting documents which accompany all NDPs are being created by Lemon Gazelle as they are mostly generic reports.

5. AOB

- a. **Communications.** AP raised his concern that we had not been good at keeping residents informed about what we have been doing and suggested it may be time to go out to another consultation. Lemon Gazelle pointed out that as we were fairly close to the statutory consultation on our draft plan, it raised the possibility of consultation fatigue if there were too many in a short time. In addition, it was extremely difficult to get good outcomes if people were consulted on difficult choices as there was a tendency to get an equal split of opinion. It was better for the Steering Group to come up with policies and allow residents to respond to those. It was agreed that we would not formally consult at this time but would publicise what we had been doing and alert the community to the coming consultation. AP agreed to take on the role of Communications co-ordinator and to

write a piece for the local magazines/papers, MB agreed to update the website and CG-T agreed to update/maintain the Facebook and Twitter pages.

Action: Residents to be informed of current progress and alerted to coming consultation – AP, MB, CG-T

- b. **Design Guide.** CG-T identified that this was a piece of work we had considered in order to give more teeth to our design policies. There are some published guides such as Building for Life 12 but our intention was to make it a more local guide. The group considered that this was potentially a substantial piece of work which may need to be done by consultants. Equally it could be a smaller work done in-house. CG-T agreed to consider and bring a proposal as to its need / scope etc to the next meeting.

Action: CG-T to make proposal regarding Design Guide in advance of next meeting

- c. MB noted an approach by Trapp'd who were about to do a traffic survey. They asked for any information we might have which we could share. MB had pointed them to the already published Issues and Options report on our website. It was agreed that only publicly available information could be shared.

6. Date of Next Meetings

27/11/18 7pm Town Hall

18/12/18 7pm Town Hall

Meeting concluded at 9pm

M Pinder

ACTION LOG FROM MEETING

Action	Responsibility	Deadline
Next meeting agenda to concentrate on Vision, Aims, Objectives and structure of draft report.	Margaret Pinder/Louise Powell	20/11/18
Proposal regarding Design Guide to be provided to next meeting	Chris Greggs-Trevarthen	20/11/18
Draft paragraphs regarding Buckover and New Nuclear Build to be provided to next meeting	Trevor Daniels	20/11/18
Communications update to go out	Alan Pinder, Mike Bennewitz, Chris Griggs-Trevarthen	31/10/18
Policies to be revisited in light of today's discussions	Lemon Gazelle	20/11/18