

Coombe Bissett and Homington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting

4th August 2020

By Zoom

Present: Steering group - Christine Cooper (CC), Steven Gledhill (SteG), Pauline Cullis (PauC), Alastair Lack (AL), David Parson (DP), Amy Burnett (AB, DinT).

Apologies: Tim Mynott (TM). Pippa Crosthwaite (PipC)
Actions highlighted in bold.

Survey

Overall, the results of the survey are encouraging because they indicate that peoples' views have not changed significantly throughout the consultation carried out for the Plan.

The responses to the survey gave clear overall support for the Old Vicarage with Kenora Paddock and the rear of Avalon coming in second and third. Kenora Paddock may be a less well-known site and therefore less contentious so attracted less opposition, and that may explain the higher level of response as 'maybe'.

The next stage is for the Parish Council to decide which sites it wants to take forward into the draft Plan. One possibility would be to allocate the Old Vicarage and address concerns raised in the comments by respondents to the survey via caveats in the Draft Plan, together with the other two supported sites. This would mean that Wiltshire Council can screen the Plan to determine whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required to provide a view on which of the two additional sites would be most appropriate. The AONB would be a statutory consultee to the environmental screening and provide another layer of review and consultation on the sites, in addition to asking the community of their view in the survey.

Two other sites that were given a potentially suitable assessment by AECOM were the Bundy Field and East of Shutts Lane. However, these did not score over 50% (the level of support needed for the plan to pass referendum with a majority vote of those who turn out).

There have been concerns and rumours on duplicate responses from some respondents to the survey. Indeed, AB picked up some instances where respondents had submitted more than one response, which was either indicated through the same email being used or through similarity in the wording between different responses to questions. CC followed up with the respondents where emails had been provided and clarified whether this was done in error. The default position for analysis in these cases was to retain the site preferences (yes/no/maybe responses on whether they support the sites for development) using the first submitted response (indicated by a timestamp on the responses), and if there have been any other comments made on freeform questions these have been included, but only if they do not duplicate comments already made for these respondents.

Next steps

SteG said that the Parish Council will want the raw data and a summary version. AB suggested that there could be a SWOT analysis of how each of the sites has positive and negative aspects or opportunities for community benefit. CC suggested that the table that was carried out for the Topic

Papers which included various elements to consider in a table could be used, including Wiltshire Council's and the AONB's views.

There are some outstanding AB comments in the database arising from the analysis which the steering group could help respond to. This might include identifying specific action points or action points to carry forward in the Plan.

The group agreed that the steering group would review any AB comments in the database, comment on the pivot tables of categorised information by question and create a half-page summary of what the responses indicate, which could be used as a basis for thematic sections in the Plan or to update the respective Topic Papers. The group discussed the following division of tasks:

DP	Assess qu. 10 (views) and qu. 11 (LGS) with TM
AL	Assess qu. 13 (footpaths)
PipC	Assess qu. 12 (flood spring areas)
SteG	Assess qu 8 (retirement), qu. 9 (comments on sites) and (qu. 14 general comments) with PauC
PauC	Assess qu 8 (retirement), qu. 9 (comments on sites) and (qu. 14 general comments) with SteG
TM	Assess qu. 10 (views) and qu. 11 (LGS) with DP
CC	CC to add emails to names of contacts for the Plan communications (qu. 15); work on the site SWOT/site summaries

AB to share a copy of the raw database (with names and emails removed) for Steering Group comment to:

- Read through the comments made by AB in red and indicate whether there is any correction to how the data is presented or if there is an action point to follow up on or a general one that should go in the Plan itself
- Check there are no duplicates in how the data is presented in the Pivot tables and suggest an amendment to how it should be presented if so/corrections
- Give a summary view of the responses and recommendation to the group/narrative that could go into the Plan topic page
- Think about whether any of the Topic Papers may need to be changed in light of the results of the survey – this could be using some of the summary text written by the Steering Group

NB: SteG left the meeting before the actions had been agreed. CC to follow up with SteG on availability on the above. Also CC to follow-up with PipC regarding reviewing the comments in the flood spring suggestions due to her role as Flood Warden.

Steering group members should send the summary and the database with their comments by 17th August to AB and CC to give sufficient time to cross-check everything into a final database before the

next Steering Group meeting on 20th. At the next meeting, potential Policy criteria - do/not for sites and topics could be considered.

Subsequent to the meeting it was established that the Parish Council are due to meet on 11th August to discuss the sites to take forward into the Plan. **CC to provide summary information will be provided to SteG in advance of the Parish Council meeting to discuss sites.**

Next meeting

20th of August, 6:00 PM at AL's house* (pending Covid/social distancing situation – otherwise online). This will be to review the summary analysis and any comments arising from the PC meeting on the 11th of August.

**Postnote: NB – this meeting was postponed due to the availability of steering group members and concerns over social distancing for a face-to-face meeting; comments were invited by email.*