



1. Regulation 14 – Analysis Methodology

Community Consultation

Regulation 14 Consultation - Methodology

1 Purpose

This document sets out the methodology that was employed to review issues raised by the community during the Regulation 14 consultation period. It shows how the issues were considered and what action was taken to address the issues within the Draft Plan, as appropriate.

2 Assessment and Response Methodology

The methodology employed by the Steering Group to review all responses to the Regulation 14 consultation is set out in the table below. It confirms that a robust process was undertaken to ensure that all comments were considered and, where relevant, addressed.

Stage	Methodology	Date	By Whom	Found where document (file name / Appendix)
Collation of consultation responses	Consultation report and analysis produced	16 June 2020	Consultants	Regulation 14 Community Consultation Report (June 2020) (EvidenceBaseAPPENDIX4_Regulation14AnalysisReport.pdf)
Initial analysis sift and review	<p>The Steering Group established sub-groups to draft and take responsibility for each of the report chapters. Members of the Steering Group were allocated to the sub-groups and their role included ensuring a robust and consistent process was applied to the review of all consultation responses.</p> <p>Consultation responses were divided into sections relating to the chapters in the draft</p>	16 June 2020 – 7 July 2020	Steering Group members	<p>2. Regulation 14 – First sift of comments (2_Regulation 14 Sift 1.pdf)</p> <p>Summary of recommended actions to be taken forward towards potential change to plan:</p> <p>3. Regulation 14 Sift Action Summary (3_Regulation 14 Sift Action Summary.pdf)</p>

	<p>report. Those members of the Steering Group who had responsibility for reviewing each section were those who had taken responsibility for drafting that section. Each set of responses were examined and analysed by the chapter lead and then a second member of the sub-group reviewed and highlighted any differences of opinion. Guidelines were provided to all reviewers who used the same agreed response codes as below:</p> <p>List of Responses NFA – comment only NFA - Outside the Scope of NP Agree – propose amend document Disagree – reason: Uncertain – for discussion</p> <p>A standard template was used to capture all consultation responses and the proposed action on each. These were produced by the sub-groups.</p>			
Steering Group review	The completed templates for responses relating to each chapter were issued to the Steering Group for review ahead of the Steering Group meeting. All members of the Steering Group had the opportunity to read the responses and review comments. At a meeting of the Group (held on Zoom due to Covid restrictions) each sub-group lead presented the sub-group’s analysis and identified any issues that required discussion by the Steering Group. Any areas of	7 July 2020	Steering Group	This document - Below APPENDIX 1 – Steering Group Minutes 7 July 2020 Specific document relating to Policy 1 in sift process (above) as brought up a number of times See:

	<p>query or disagreement were examined and a response agreed by the Steering Group.</p> <p>A record was made of the decisions of the Steering Group in relation to the proposed amendments to the report arising from the consultation responses.</p> <p>Policy 1 was discussed and the Steering Group agreed that a sub-group would be given responsibility for carefully assessing this Policy in relation to those responses and report back to the Steering Group. This sub-group then prepared an interim draft Policy revision to reflect the comments made.</p> <p>The revised draft plan with the amendments was then issued Steering Group members and to Thornbury Town Council.</p>			<p>3. Regulation 14 Sift Action Summary – Community comments - Page 4, 5, 7 (Vistry Homes), 8 (Savills / Barwood), 8 (Trapped), 11 (South Glos Council), 12 (South Glos Council).</p> <p>Specifically brought up in review on 7th July (APPENDIX 1 - Steering Group Minutes 7 July 2020 – Section 3b).</p> <p>Meeting held with South Glos Council and wording drafted and agreed on 6th October (see below)</p>
Town Council review of interim draft	Thornbury Town Council reviewed revised plan and agreed it, subject to finalisation of Policy 1. Sign off delegated to Town Councillor members of the Steering Group	25 August 2020	Thornbury Town Council	
Sub Group review of Policy 1 + further South Gloucestershire comments	Sub Group work incorporated further comments received from South Gloucestershire Council on 12 September 2020. A meeting was held with members of South Gloucestershire Planning and final draft agreed.	6 October 2020	Steering Sub Group + South Gloucestershire Planning officers	
Final Draft produced and signed off	Final draft reviewed and agreed by delegated councillors	21 October 2020	Thornbury Town Councillors	

APPENDIX 1 – Steering Group Minutes 7 July 2020

Thornbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Minutes

Tuesday 7 Jul 2020, 7pm via Zoom

In attendance: Tricia Hillier (Chair), Louise Powell (Town Clerk), Margaret Pinder (Secretary), Alan Pinder, Chris Griggs-Trevarthen, Jill Diamond, Felicity Harrison, Judith Dale, Gill Dunkley, Nancy North, Trevor Daniels, Mike Bennewitz, Danny Bonnett, Cllr Clive Parkinson, Cllr Shirley Holloway, Cllr Matt Stringer

Apologies: Katie Griggs-Trevarthen

1. The meeting was called to review the consultation responses to the Draft Plan consultation which finished on 25 April 2020. During the period of consultation the country went into lockdown thus the meeting was held virtually using Zoom. TH summarised the process of review which had involved each workstream area reviewing the Lemon Gazelle report and all the community responses for their area and assessing the extent to which they might result in an amendment to the Plan. Workstreams had produced reports on their assessments and only those areas where the teams were persuaded that a change was warranted (as per THs email) would be discussed at this meeting.
2. Formation of a sub-group was agreed in order to carry forward any work following the meeting. The group would make amendments to produce a revised draft for agreement. The group members are TH, LP, MP, CGT.

3. Survey section review of responses

- a. The sections on Main Vision and Objectives, Identity and Coherent Development and overview of plan as a whole were reviewed by MP and TH. The overwhelming responses to these sections were positive and supportive of the plan as a whole. Some issues were raised about the need to revise the context and some factual errors which have occurred as things have changed or been amended during the life of the plan. These will be corrected in the revised draft.

- b. The main issues in these sections raised by developers and South Gloucestershire concerned Policy 1 and Policy 2. CGT had produced a helpful paper looking at the developers' technical objections to our policies. After discussion it was agreed that the sub-group will look at the comments and try to reword the policy so that it makes clear its objective is to protect the rural character and landscape setting and not a blanket ban on all development. No further action was recommended on Policy 2 other than clarifying what is meant by the term 'major development' – the policy is fully supported by South Gloucestershire.

- c. The section on Housing was reviewed by AP and CGT. Several policy areas were discussed with most areas agreed not to need further action, other than some clarification as needed. There were several comments about our use of the Passivhaus standard and the Code for Sustainable Homes. We agreed that our use of these terms needed to be checked for accuracy and if necessary, an amended standard to be used. A proposal by a respondent that we included community scale renewable energy generation in Policy 6 was agreed to be a valuable enhancement of the policy. It was agreed also to discuss Policies 6 and 7 with South Gloucestershire to make sure they reflect SG's current standards.

- d. The section on Town Centre was reviewed by JD and FH. Most of the comments within this section were either outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan or comments supporting the Town Centre by providing a wishlist of good suggestions which they would like to see. These suggestions may be of assistance to the group looking at matters outside the scope of the plan (ie Section 12 of the NP). No changes were felt to be necessary for the most part but some useful suggestions for clarifications. South Gloucestershire noted our omission of the

high number of listed buildings within the town centre and proposed amendment of Policy 10 to reflect the impact of these. South Gloucestershire also suggested that Policy 13 needed to provide more justification for the land uses specified. We will seek advice from SGC to 'examine the evidence base available' as they propose. Other SG suggestions were agreed as helpful.

- e. Services and Facilities section was reviewed by NN and GD. Three main issues were discussed and resolved. Comments about drainage were agreed to be dealt with in policies 3 and 17 and therefore did not require any further action. The desire for allotments was raised several times and it was agreed that these were dealt with in Policy 17. Comments by developers about the need for staged infrastructure were discussed. The conclusion was that we disagreed with their responses and that the issue had been a major concern during our consultation. Policies to remain.

- f. Sustainability was reviewed by JD and DB. Respondents to this section wanted strengthening of the low carbon objective in 9.3. There were also comments about increasing connectivity for biodiversity. DB agreed to send a form of words to the sub-group which will consider the wording of either the supporting text or policies in order to find the best way to express these points. One main area of improvement needed is in the green spaces map. South Gloucestershire pointed out that it was not comprehensive. It does not include any green spaces in the new build areas of Thornbury. None of our maps show the new housing areas. We need an updated map showing the true picture of the area. JD and DB agreed to assist with this.

- g. Transport section reviewed by TD and MB. Many of the comments from respondents in this section were outside the scope of the NP. South Gloucestershire's comments were felt to be helpful apart from their comments on Policy 23 which were rejected as watering down the intention of the policy. In the event of major changes to travel modes etc, it will be possible for SG to override the NP or for the NP to be revised. It was agreed to remove text referring to 2storey carpark as it clearly contradicted our other policy about preserved views. Need to check with SG about the Town Centre boundary map to ensure it is accurate with regard to the inclusion of the Leisure Centre. The comments about cycle ways made in the responses would be useful to the Town Council group following up Section 12 of the plan.

4. Project Plan

- a. TH pointed out that, despite the Covid19 lockdown, we are only 2 months behind our revised project plan. It was agreed that none of the changes proposed amounted to substantial ones requiring further consultation. The next feasible meeting when the Town Council could sign off the amended plan is in August. The amended plan will need to go to councillors on August 19th. The next NP meeting on 18th August will sign off the plan to go forward. It is anticipated that the agreed plan will be with South Gloucestershire Aug/Sep, with their required consultation taking place Oct-Dec. This would suggest passing to the Inspector Jan-Mar21.
- b. The earliest possible date for a Referendum is early May 2021 under the government's Covid19 regulations. However, once the plan is approved by the Inspector it will have formal status until the Referendum. Even our revised plan will have some status as an emerging document, having been through public consultation.

5. Next Steps

The subgroup will meet via Zoom to consider and make all amendments. This will include contacting South Glos to discuss those points raised by them for discussion. JD and DB will try to produce an amended green spaces map which is more inclusive. The amended plan will go out to all members for review in time for us to have a final version for sign off on August 18.

6. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesdays 18 August 20, 7pm via Zoom

Meeting concluded at 9pm

M Pinder

ACTION LOG FROM MEETING

Action	Responsibility	Deadline
Subgroup to review all comments and amend as agreed	Chris Griggs-Trevarthen, Tricia Hillier, Louise Powell, Margaret Pinder	31/7/20
Send out amended plan to group, Lemon Gazelle for review	Louise Powell	7/8/20
Responses to sub-group on revised document		12/8/20
Final version to group	Louise Powell	14/8/20