



Pilning & Severn Beach Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

6 Vicarage Road Pilning Bristol BS35LN

01454 631499

plan@pilningsevernbeach-pc.gov.uk

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting Notes 19th April 2021

Olga Taylor (OT), (Chairman) Peter Tyzack (PT), Richard Edwards (RE), Julia Edwards (JuE), Gary Sheppard (GS), John Miller (JM), Ian S Roberts (ISR), Jonathan Edwardes (Hon Sec) (JE)

1. Apologies

Jacqs Graham (JG), Tony Fennell & Kate Royston (SevernNet)

2. Review of actions from the previous meeting

OT read through the previous meeting notes.

Action from those notes

Service Level Agreement from South Gloucestershire Council this has been sent to OT signed from South Gloucestershire Council. Agreement needs to be signed at the 4th May Parish Council meeting to complete the process.

Action OT PT

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Questionnaire OT reported that various editions had been created and version 2 was distributed to members before the meeting. Thanks to RE for updating this multiple times.

Consider content for the website OT asked JE about what was on the Parish Council website now. JE confirmed there was a page with contact details and an introduction.

Confirming who will be on the shared drive RE asked that this action point be considered.

OT confirmed that only full members of the steering group should have access to the shared drive.

Core list

Gary Sheppard
Heather Rickards
Ian S Roberts
Jacqs Graham
John Miller
Julia Edwards
Olga Taylor
Peter Tyzack
Richard Edwards

Jonathan Edwardes

Correspondence list

Danny Dixon
Doug Nethercott
Nigel Barton
Sue Binns
Tony Fennell
Wendy Kelloway

GS pointed out that the group needs active and not passive members on the full list

Action OT, & JE

JE & OT to contact members to tidy up the list.

Action JE & OT

GS requested that each of the Core list members give a "one liner" resume to aid who might be best suited to each activity.

Action All

Agreed that the meeting notes are an accurate record of the meeting.

3. Communications with South Gloucestershire Council

As stated previously the Service Level Agreement has been returned. South Gloucestershire Council are keen to see what we are doing. OT has made a commitment to them that she will start sharing information with them.

Action OT

RE wanted confirmation that the Terms of Reference had been agreed. SGC had advised that they would retain a copy but did not need to sign and agree it.

Contact has been made with Stuart Todd the consultant working for Danny Dixon. OT asked that any documents that go outside the group are PDFs

4. **Project Plan**

RE asked for comments, amendments and hopefully approval on Issue 0.1 Draft of the Project Plan document distributed prior to the meeting.

PT questioned some of the timings, some items could overlap speeding up the process if possible. Also does the Independent Adjudicator need to be booked in advance. RE thought that South Gloucestershire Council would arrange that as required on our behalf. RE said there was some overlap already the documents will start to be written in Dec 2021 before the Building the evidence is completed in March 2022.

GS added this is a working document and will change as the project progresses.

OT asked about the budget numbers GS explained that the figures reflect the finite grants available as the project progresses. GS has been to some consultants to get an idea of what costs could be. Giving a proper scope and working through what is needed will mean that costs can be kept down. The project plan may expand when work is undertaken identify sites for housing. RE added funds would probably be needed for a housing needs survey at an early stage.

The next stage will be to share it with South Gloucestershire Council and publish it onto the website. Items 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4 on the document were amended to be shown as completed, with item 1.3 shown as in progress. GS questioned that this is a working document for the Steering Group and does not need to be published. It was agreed it should be published but with the costs redacted.

E

JE confirmed that there is a cost for the email contact and it is approx. £7 per month and this needs to be added to the figures.

ISR questioned the initial grant is £10k but the Building evidence costs are £12k - £15 unless sites for housing are identified there will be a shortfall of £2k to £5k.

GS explained the budget will reduce to £10k unless a housing needs survey is required. Undertaking the housing research will cost in the region of £7k in theory.

ISR asked if there was a minimum number of houses identified needed to trigger the grant. No, GS explained one site for one house will be sufficient.

OT proposed that the document under discussion can be shared with South Gloucestershire Council confidentially.

Action OT & JE

The Project Plan document was edited during the meeting to show the current position and changed to issue 1. Note two versions will exist; with budgets for SG use and without budget for publication.

5. **Website development**

JE to tidy up what has been done so far. OT wants to add additional pages to the Neighbourhood Plan part of the site.

Action JE & OT

RE wants to see previous meeting notes, terms of reference etc.

JE is expecting a newsletter to be coming from JG.

GS wants to see the link to the Gov website and the scoping document when it is agreed. It could be referred to as a mission statement.

Alterations to be made to the web pages for the next meeting.

Action JE & OT

6. **Logo**

JE says is marvellous and we should adopt it.

Logo adopted and to be implemented across templates and website

Action JE & OT

JM suggested perhaps a t-shirt could be produced with the logo on it

7. **Key issues document**

OT thanked RE very much for his work on this document. RE hopes that the content can be agreed at this meeting, and explained the different colours as being; black font is the original draft, blue font is the initial comments that came in and the green font is the final comments made by the last deadline the group had.

GS suggested the document name should be changed to "Responses to Neighbourhood Plan Scope" and make the document more succinct for public consumption. In its current form OT noted that this is an internal document to the group to make sure that all the relevant aspects are covered and not for publication. GS thought that it would be a good way of framing the project to avoid it getting out of control.

JM wondered how the group will cope with a minority view on a subject RE responded that this sort of issue will get examined when the evidence building is undertaken. For instance, with the sea wall an up-to-date flood survey would be needed. All comments on the document are valid until such time as there is evidence to answer the comment. Going further, listening to the concerns of residents where reasonable will be a key factor in producing the Neighbourhood Plan. It may also be that the evidence is already to hand and the question and answer need to be put together.

A cleaned-up version of the document will be made available for the website removing the General agreement line and comments.

RE had this in hand and a cleaned-up version was shared with the meeting

RE reiterated that he would like to see the document adopted at this meeting as a starting point, OT agreed that this document along with the Scope/Mission Statement are the basis for the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group activities.

RE considered that the the Scope/Mission Statement would stay consistent, whilst for the key issues document, as the project progresses, some items will inevitably drop out of the final Neighbourhood Plan. OT commented that the basic questions of "What?" is answered by the scoping document, "How?" the key issues document and "When?" the project plan. This is the foundation of the group.

OT shared the updated Key Issues document with the group. GS suggested the word "survey" be used in the title and reiterated the formatting issue from earlier. GS suggested that the document would benefit from bullet pointing and agreed he have a look at the formatting.

Action point GS to liaise with RE regarding the formatting of the document.

Action GS & RE

8. Consider views on how we move this into the "building an evidence" phase; identifying; priorities, initial actions and responsibilities where appropriate.

RE had prepared a list of potential initial actions against each of the 9 areas of the key issues document and read through each at the meeting for the benefit of discussion.

1. Recognising need for additional housing
 - a. have a discussion with Stuart Todd and get his recommendations.
 - b. look at ways to initiate a housing needs survey
 - c. Numbers of jobs in the parish, predictions for Western Approaches etc and potential growth in the future.

GS commented that the more work that is done before we ask for surveys the cheaper the project will be. GS agreed that a formal meeting needs to be had between OT, GS and RE at least with Stuart Todd to get an initial sense of direction with the project and find out what is already available that can be used by the group. OT also hopes to bring in SevernNet to advise as well as South Gloucestershire Council.

GS noted it might more cost effective to buy pre-existing information rather than get new surveys undertaken.

ISR As South Gloucestershire Council are formulating their Local Plan now, it is possible this work has been done already. RE agreed, however the figures for our area are well out of date in what has been drafted so far. ISR considers that the planning inspectorate will turn that down straight away as was done with the core strategy, ending up with eighteen months of work and a weeklong planning committee meeting to resolve.

RE considers that a benefit of this Neighbourhood Plan being written alongside the South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan is it enables the group to have dialog with them as they produce it. ISR thinks we will end up funding the information that South Gloucestershire Council need for their plan. GS replied the grant the Steering Group are getting comes from South Gloucestershire Council therefore they are contributing towards it. ISR wanted to know if the Neighbourhood Plan group needs to create a scoping document to get that grant. GS agreed that we do but that we need to understand what is in that scoping document first. This is part of the conversation to have with Stuart Todd to work what is required to meet the criteria

to get the funding and then get the answer we need to identify our Housing needs or Local Plan needs and where applicable picking up what already exists. It may be that the scope needs to be expanded to accommodate the local schools and other resources. OT reiterated that having a meeting the Stuart Todd is the next important thing to do.

GS considered that volunteers are required to start getting information for example from the schools and what they are expecting in demographics over the next few years. Is there capacity to cope with 500 homes being built in the area? It is possible the schools may want to participate with supplying the information.

2. Identifying potential areas for development

- a. Action to look at where sites have been identified.
- b. Other potential sites.
- c. Consider potential uses of the land might be and the pros and cons for each site.
- d. Consider where they are within the boundaries we already know about.

So, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group ends up with a feeling for where development can take place and what it should be for.

ISR asked if the group could ask South Gloucestershire Council for an early copy of the "Call for sites" document.

[Post meeting note – this has been obtained and the Parish Council will be discussing it at the 4th May meeting.]

3. Public Transport services

- a. A lot of this section currently does not fall under planning.
- b. One exception would be Severn Beach railway station where there is an identified need for parking, pick up and drop off and bus stops.
- c. Looking at other areas of the parish where infrastructure / planning would benefit public transport.

4. Car parking

- a. Identify areas for car parking.
- b. Assessment of what the car parking would be for.
- c. What the pros and cons are for each site.
- d. Scoping out the possibilities and seeing what options there are.
 - i. For public transport and commuting
 - ii. Visiting

5. Cycling ways and footpaths

- a. The group needs to see the definitive map PT has a copy.
- b. Identify where the shortfalls are in walking and cycling routes.
- c. PT's transport document already picks up on many of these points, these needs to be fleshed out to go in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- d. Sustrans have done work on this.
- e. SevernNet has Sam Marsh who may be able to assist in the future

6. Green spaces and trees

- a. Identifying existing spaces that need protection.
- b. Consider areas that may be lost could be relocated.
 - i. Play areas.
 - ii. Forests
 - iii. Estuary sites
- c. JE says that chimes in with a workstream he has with Sue Binns.

7. Community facilities

- a. Key services
 - i. Schools
 - ii. Pre-schools
 - iii. Doctors

Approaching these organisations and seeing how they would respond to an expansion of housing in the local communities. This will be developed during the evidence building process.

ISR wanted to know if there is any demographic information for the parish e.g., age groups. RE referred ISR to the Village / Parish Plan in 2009 as being the most recent information but it is well out of date and needs refreshing. OT noted that there will be Census information for the ward which should help. PT stated South Gloucestershire Council do have a certain amount of data about demographics that could be asked for, possibly via Robert Griffin or Danny Dixon / Stuart Todd. GS agreed this could be useful information that already exists in the public domain as stated previously.

8. Retail and small businesses

- a. Identifying existing facilities within the parish
- b. Identifying where there are gaps in provision.

9. Large Commercial developments

- a. PT and the Parish Council will have a good handle on this already.
- b. Start-up dialog with SevernNet.
- c. List of the major companies at Western Approaches and make introductions – PT has been doing this partly already telling companies that there is a Neighbourhood Plan in the early stages of preparation. SevernNet do have tabs on all the companies there and will forward items on the Parish's / Neighbourhood Plan's behalf. PT also said the Business Rates office at South Gloucestershire Council will hold details of businesses on their database. OT also has been approaching some of the future developers at Western Approaches when drumming up support for Pilning Station Group.

RE asked that this is written up into an action plan and identifying resources to take each section forward. OT warned there is a danger of moving too far forward too quickly and "reinventing the wheel" causing abortive work.

GS commented that the list we have just gone through is a good starting point for the meeting with Stuart Todd. It would be good to get his determination on the issues raised.

Action Point The next step is to have a meeting with Stuart Todd and to draw on his knowledge.

Action OT, RE & GS

Action Point RE to write up his handwritten notes and distribute them.

Action RE

OT and GS commented again on the need for volunteers to fit the various tasks required. RE added as jobs become more defined it should be possible to get the right volunteers for the tasks.

9. Engaging support from South Gloucestershire Council and other sources of advice

- a. Conversation with Danny Dixon or Stuart Todd
- b. Other sources as noted above

10. Finding additional Steering Group and volunteers to support the next phase

- a. See above.

11. Grants and funding

- a. GS would like to start the grant application process this may flush out things the group needs to know. It is a staged process so can be taken in smaller parts.

12. Formal decision on progressing with the Neighbourhood Plan

- a. PT stated that the Parish Council had voted to do it so this will be a supportive vote from the group. Carried unanimously.

13. Any other business

None

14. Date of the next meeting

- a. 17th May
- b. Tuesday 22nd June
- c. Post meeting note: there will be a meeting on 6th May with Stuart Todd

There being no other business the meeting closed at 20:50