

2021.5.27 MINUTES OF MEETING
Colerne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Held via ZOOM

Time		Location	Via Zoom
Present	Steve Ayres (SA) Jacqui Bradburn (JB) Hilary Holman (HH) Peter Mellett (PM) Jane Mellett (JM) Bob Jones (RJ) Sue Jones (SJ)	Apologies	Bob Child(BC) Gary Brain(GB) Mary Mellett (MM)
Next Meeting	1st July 2021 Via ZOOM	Chair: Recorded via zoom:	Jane Mellett
Agenda	Item <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apologies (above) 2. Minutes of Last Meeting 3. Matters Arising 4. Editorial decisions on rewrites 5. Acceptance of final drafts for the design stage 6. SEA 7. Finance 8. Process hereafter. 9. Any other business. 10. Date of Next Meeting 		

2.	Minutes of Last Meeting: Approved.	
3.	Matters Arising: The meeting accepted the changes made to the positioning of the topic papers and related text. (in line with the proposals of the editorial group meeting; see item 4 below)	
4.	Editorial Decisions:	

	<p>Following a meeting of the editorial group (7.5.21) to explore implementation of the SG's decisions regarding the structure of the Plan, it was concluded that the best way forward was to -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) to make the Topic papers a separate item, designed in keeping with parts A & B., demonstrating equal status. The two papers will also be fully 'linked' into the Submission version Part A. ii) Topic Paper 3 is now no longer a Topic Paper . It is a Review of future Sport and Recreation provision, placed in the Evidence folder, but importantly linked to Section 6 of Part A, following on from the policy section on Health and Wellbeing. iii) Topic Paper #2 now includes an important statement provided by JeB emphasising the requirement to involve the local community in any master planning process. v) JM to ensure that AECOM SEA consultants do have the latest versions of the Plan to work on. 	RJ,SJ, JM, HH, SA
5.	<p>Acceptance of final drafts for design stage: JB and PM pointed out that the latest changes that have been made were the result of responses from Reg 14 consultation;in particular the Statutory Consultees and the Reg 14 SEA , in addition to the community.</p> <p>JM reported that the SEA consultants considered that the Plan's "Spatial Strategy" has not actually changed, despite the loss of one allocated site. Re the PC responses to the pre reg14 Plan; JM reported on behalf of MM that as resulting changes were made before going to Reg 14Consultation, these were not formally part of the Reg14 response. However, they will be included separately in the Consultation Statement.</p> <p>The PC now need to be asked to approve the submission wording of the Plan following the changes made in response to the Reg 14 Consultation. JM to contact the PC chair to address how and when this can be done. The SG emphasised that the PC has been represented all along the way in this process and therefore had full opportunity to comment in the past. The current expectation is for an understanding of what they are approving and for what purpose. All current wording will be circulated to them.</p> <p>The SG still needs to explore with the PC just how it is going to support the PC in the implementation of the Plan.</p>	JB, PM JM MM JM

6.	<p>SEA</p> <p>JM and RJ met via Zoom with the AECOM SEA consultant on 26.5.21. Main points discussed were -</p> <p>a. Topic Paper#1 and the allocation of sites. They need to ensure they comment on our actual wording rather than are contradictory. Positive response to the reworking of the site evaluation process.</p> <p>b. Discussed the 7 out of 15 sites they originally decided to focus on. Agreed that following the Reg 14 responses they will also look at the fields north of the C151, as well as the Cleaves Avenue field within the Green belt.</p> <p>Revised SEA due early July. They will send a draft version before then.</p> <p>SJ asked if the Examiner will visit the parish in his role. This is not thought to be likely, BUT</p> <p>PM fed back some very positive independent response from a writing colleague - commending the clarity of the writing and the design work that both evoke a very clear picture of the parish for an outsider</p>	JM & RJ
7.	<p>Finance – update</p> <p>HH has written to the PC, in response to the additional unexpected costs for the Thickwood site required by the statutory bodies. The PC has a reserve of £2,000 already set aside for the NPSG, and the SG is requesting use of some of this reserve. RJ emphasised that there was no overspend in this.</p> <p>The SG members were concerned at the cost of the Heritage Assessment consultant's costs, and these are to be queried.</p> <p>The SG asked JM to contact the PC chair concerning how the NP wording and costs are understood by the new PC, offering to attend the meeting to answer questions as needed.</p>	<p>HH</p> <p>JM, via Place</p> <p>JM</p>
8.	<p>Process Hereafter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Design work. There may be several versions of this till it is fully functioning. Topic Papers should be sent to SA and SJ for them to check and the Part A to RJ for checking. ii) Mary has 17 hours left. She will ensure all the back documents and links and references work fully to support BC's design work. iii) Upload all papers submitted to the local authority onto the PC website. iv) The anonymised version of the community responses will be uploaded also <p>iv) The SG considered whether hard copies of the Submission version should be made available in different places. It was decided to lodge a copy for people to view with the PC. We can decide what is best to do for the Referendum once that process is in motion, assuming no changes are required by the Inspector.</p> <p>JB emphasised the importance of the appearance of the Plan as the major communicator for the community, and so word only copies of the Plan will not be that useful.</p>	<p>SA,SJ,RJ, BC</p> <p>MM</p>

	<p>v) It would be good to ensure the text versions and the design versions' wording is kept the same from now on, in case it is decided that others need access to hard copy.</p> <p>Each set of Plan papers costs £27(possibly more now).</p> <p>vi) JM to check with Jeff and Henning if we need to send a hard copy to the Inspector.</p> <p>vii) SEA report needs to be received. JM will share with the SG the draft SEA report.</p>	JM
9.	<p>Any other Business:</p> <p>i) Parish Magazine slot booked for July edition to announce the pending submission of the Plan</p> <p>JB suggested we get BC to give it some design element with pictures to enliven the impact for readers.</p> <p>RJ suggested we use this as an opportunity to emphasise the underlying strategy of the Plan</p> <p>It was suggested we try and book 2 pages inclusive of design.</p> <p>JM to do a rough draft to share with rest of SG. to include mention of the community response spreadsheet that can be viewed to see what responses have been made.</p> <p>ii) - The Colerne Design Statement is being used as an example of good practice by Place in a training for Government planners re community involvement in Planning.iii) - The SG considered and noted the comments made by GB in his latest email.The meeting was saddened by the apparent lack of understanding that the Plan spans till 2036 and the underlying strategy ensures there will be no overproduction of housing in advance of the brownfield areas becoming available. It was confirmed that there has been no overspend by the SG in the production of the Plan.</p> <p>JM was asked to respond in brief to GB, copying the PC chair.</p>	BC JM ALL
10.	<p>NEXT MEETING:- 7.30pm via ZOOM Thursday 1st July 2021</p>	JM