

PAULTON COMMUNITY PLAN STEERING GROUP
Red Lion
29th April 2008 7.30pm

Apologies: PL, JN, JS.

Present: KS, AM, SN, TB, RS, MB, TB.

1. Informal discussion of collection experiences to date

JN: 4 visited

1 collected

Result 1 of 4 = 25%

4 in post boxes

AM: 54 visited

17 collected

4 posted

6 will post

17 no reply after 2 visits

2 empty houses

2 elderly/infirm not interested.

Result 21 of 52 = 40%

9 in post boxes

TB: Visited 13 no returns given

4 were still work in progress

3 elderly /infirm not interested

2 not interested

Result 0 of 13 = 0%

8 in post boxes.

HW: Visited 30

4 returns

6 will post

1 strongly against "waste of time"

Result 4 of 30 = 13%

8 in post boxes

MB: no visits yet.

1 delivered

4 in post boxes

RS: No numbers given

8 in post boxes.

KS: 59 visits
13 collected
5 posted
11 will post
3 refusals- one strong refusal “given up on the village”
Result 18 of 59 = 31%
6 in post boxes

This is an early, patchy picture of the response to the questionnaire by the villagers. The post box returns for each collector have not been included in the percentage results. When the final figures for each area is known these can be included.

All co-ordinators must make contact with their collectors to encourage and assess results – Action: All.

RS reported a doubling of website hits since the delivery of the questionnaire to 60 in 2 weeks. No emails or comments received.

2. Parish Council

KS, following query raised by JN, instigated discussion on the Parish Council’s reaction to the Community Plan. We hope for full agreement from the PC as some items arising from the report may need to be taken forward specifically by them.

RS How important is it to have PC full support? SG is an independent group but if any items are disputed these should be annotated in the final report.

SN Funds have been provided by the PC which makes it more inclusive, the SG has saved the PC the job but it is important we have their support. It would be useful to have an introductory note from the Chairman of the PC in the final report. The PC will be given the early drafts for discussion and final draft view will hopefully meet with their full agreement, however, the SG has ownership of the final report. We will need to involve Community Action at an early stage before implementation.

TB speaking on behalf of the PC he said the council was very supportive of the SG and its work. He reminded the meeting that the function of the PC was limited by pressure on the funds but the council was an open-minded group who will welcome a fresh view. Most of the problems with implementing changes were because of lack of money. He felt it was unlikely that there would be any problem with the PC accepting the report.

KS put forward the idea of steering groups from nearby villages working together, where appropriate, to implement items in the report which affected the wider population. This would give added weight to any schemes when they were presented to B&NES.

The appropriate course of action is summed up in Step 8, paragraph i), of “**Parish & Community Planning Toolkit**” quoted below:

“The Role of the Parish Council

The Parish Council should adopt the plan having agreed to the final draft. The Parish Council can act as champions for the plan in liaising with the Local Authority and other service providers, but need not take forward all the action points themselves. Any opposition to the plan should have been resolved at the drafting and final draft stage. The Parish Council must recognise that the plan represents the views of the wider community not just the Parish Council. It is important to ensure that the progress on the plan implementation is an item on each Parish Council agenda and that annually the Parish Plan is reviewed and updated. This can be done at the annual parish meeting.”

It was agreed that this wording captured the sentiments of the discussion.

The meeting closed at 9.15pm.

The next meeting is on 15th May at 7.30pm in the Red Lion