



alastair strang <alastair.strang@gmail.com>

Summary plan and process

David Brown <brown.davidjohn1@gmail.com>

19 April 2015 at 19:46

To: alastair strang <alastair.strang@gmail.com>, Bob and Madelin Coulson <the.coulsons@virgin.net>, "Andrew Lindsay >" <a.lindsay284@btinternet.com>, Jane Deans <janeannedeans@googlemail.com>, JOHN CHARLESWORTH <charlesworth369@btinternet.com>, Elizabeth Love <lzbthlv@gmail.com>

Attached my comments on the Process and **Pre Summary Plan**
Please do not take this as any criticism of the team.

I am slowly recovering but felt these comments as a resident my be useful

I have not sent via the Parish Clerk because matters there appear to be taken very personally!

David Brown
brown.davidjohn1@gmail.com



PNPLN Pre Sub.docx

159K

Response to Publication of the Brereton Parish Neighborhood Plan

General

- 1 I note that recently the Parish Council have taken to issue relevant information to residents on the progress of the BNPlan, also that responses should be returned to the Clerk to BPC. This is a welcome step considering the Working Team have had to forage for themselves in respect of the issue, circulation and collection of survey responses prior to this!
2. Unfortunately I have been unwell and not able to read the plan in the library so my comments are on the pre submission document and process. I consider that many other residents for one reason or another will NOT read the full document.
I trust that you will take my comments in the constructive vein they are offered and that I fully appreciate the immense work and time put in by the Work Team to get the Plan this far. However now the Parish Council is taking deeper interest in the day-to-day matters I trust that they will be taking some additional burden off the team
3. The pre submission document sets out and summaries, consolidates the input, views, needs and expectations of residents in the survey documents. If I am correct this is the first feed back on the consolidated findings.
The report states that the policies, objectives etc were agreed with the community but this (I believe) is the first opportunity to present them in a consolidated format. As such I would expect that residents each receive a full copy of the report to illicit their views and support. I fully recognizes the additional cost and support required to achieve this but it does appear to be within the spirit of the Legislation that each resident and stake holder and the requirement to be seen to afford each stake holder with equivalent opportunity to respond. Whilst the use of the web site and local facilities may meet the need of many it will not reach many of the community!
4. I have reviewed the pre submission document and the response document and observe that there is no opportunity for personal responses outside of the set questions. Section 7 General Questions also refers to specific items.

Some of my comments would if allowed qualify support across

5. Throughout the document there are commitments from the Parish Council as to how it will support the aims of the policies etc. However there is very little in the Plan which is not already within the remit of the Parish Council already. The Plan simply restates the Parish Council remit in a convenient form and includes the priorities an aspiration of residents. Unfortunately for my reading of Parish Council minutes and attendance at meetings the Council has been reactive on many of the relevant issue raised by the Plan.
6. The Work Team whilst set up by the Parish Council and supported financially will need to be replaced by an active implementation team which is representative of all settlements. This the Work Team found extremely difficult and it will be **no easier** in the implementation stages.
7. **The Plan fails in that it contains no positive plans for the implementation stage. Unless this is achieved then the Plan may be doomed to a reactive document to be resurrected only to oppose Cheshire East Council actions.**

This is an activity requiring the Parish Council direct and urgent action or the £20,000 spent on the plan could have been spent more usefully on direct improvements required by residents