



Our plan – Our future

Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

19th March 2012, 5.00pm to 7.00pm, Guildhall

PRESENT

REPRESENTING

Members of the Steering Group

Howard Horsley	Community
Bob May	Community
Cllr. Mike Grace (Chair)	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Robert Stuart	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. David Turner	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Milner Whiteman	Much Wenlock Town Council

In Attendance

Charles Teaney	Community
Gill Jones	Shropshire Council

Minute Taker

Robert Toft

1. Chairman's Welcome

Mike Grace welcomed those present to the meeting and welcomed Milner Whiteman as a full member of the Steering Group.

2. Apologies

Vivien Bellamy	Community
Mary Jacobs	Community
Simon Ross	Community
Liz Thomas	Community
Cllr. Lesley Durbin	Much Wenlock Town Council
Jake Berriman	Shropshire Council

3. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest

4. Minutes of Last Meeting

The following amendments were noted to the draft minutes of the meeting of 5th March:

Item 6 (2nd Para, Line 3): Replace "advice" with "advise";

Item 6 (6th Para, relating to Matthew Green's arrival): Move to become 4th paragraph;

Item 6 (2nd and 3rd Paras under E. Improving community services): Replace "Sarah" with "Sara".

Subject to these points the minutes were **approved**.

5. Community Survey

Mike Grace said that it was essential that the meeting should agree the final version of the questionnaire and should not alter detail further unless this was essential. He thanked Howard Horsley for ensuring that the meeting with himself and Vivien Bellamy on Sunday 11th March had been focused and productive. He noted that there would be one final meeting with Sara Botham after this meeting.

(Gill Jones arrived at the meeting)

Howard Horsley said that considerable effort had been devoted to revising the questionnaire. He noted that Sara Botham had done a terrific job and had worked through two different amendment sessions, despite leaving the Community Council of Shropshire and working on several other projects. Sara was pushed for time and could only work on one further amendment session.

He noted that the main issues raised with Sara (and which had been addressed in the revised version circulated to the Steering Group) were:

- Some questions were in the wrong order;
- Some issues occurred in more than one theme inappropriately and requiring tidying-up;
- The length was in excess of that which would be easily tolerated by the public and had been reduced from 17 pages to 8 pages (which could be printed on 2 A3 sheets). Double columns had been introduced to aid this;
- The printed version needed to have the same content (and ideally the same layout) as the web version. This presented some problems which it was hoped to resolve in the final amendment session.

Howard commented that there were still several changes to be made, notably with ordering, and he and Bob May indicated some minor amendments (Minute taker's note: These minutes exclude discussion on amendments of a minor nature.)

C. Protecting our environment

C2. **Agreed** to remove example of "on-street parking" in relation to "design which reduces impacts".

C4. **Agreed** to insert "on behalf of the community" at the end of this question (on protection of buildings, places, vistas and views).

D. Improving community services

D3. **Agreed** to replace references to "more regular" (services) with "convenient" and to request narrative details if ticked.

F. Housing – identifying needs

Howard Horsley noted that the questions, proposed by Matthew Green, involving tenuous scenarios had been removed on length grounds.

F3. **Agreed** that those answering “Yes” (to question on those in household wishing to have their own residential accommodation) should be asked “Are they currently registered with Shropshire Homepoint?” and to include a “don’t know” option with this further question.

Charles Teaney suggested that routing was needed on questions F3 and F4 to lead respondents away from inappropriate subsequent questions.

Back page – Demographics and Additional Comments

Robert Stuart thought that the back page might include a question on whether respondents were willing to take part in focus group discussions. Several members were concerned that this might lead to a loss of confidentiality. Charles Teaney proposed that a tear-off strip with a focus group question might be included. This was **agreed** by the meeting.

Front page

QR Code

Bob May noted that the QR code needed to link to the correct page on the website and queried which this might be. **Agreed** to remove QR code on the printed questionnaire since it would not be possible to complete on a smart phone.

Online Code

Bob May thought that the code should only be used to indicate instances of multiple responses or “stuffing”. Charles Teaney thought that it was important that the code should not enable the respondent to be traced. Howard Horsley thought it important that the code should be created by the Neighbourhood Plan volunteer. Gill Jones thought that most people were used to reference codes on questionnaires.

Mike Grace thought that it should be made clear that the respondent could not be identified from the code. This could be done by having a two-part code with a unique reference for each volunteer followed by a unique reference (to be assigned by the volunteer). Howard Horsley suggested the second part should be a letter since this would be seen as less obviously traceable.

General Issues

Bob May thought that Steve Cunningham (volunteers co-ordinator) should be invited to the next Steering Group meeting.

David Turner noted that the notes on the questionnaire needed to reveal the rationale to people receiving an additional questionnaire where a page had been obliterated (because the housing needs section had already been completed by a member of their household).

Howard Horsley was willing to see the questionnaire through to its final draft but thought that a Town Council member should authorise its printing. **Agreed** that the sign-off and printing authorisation should be done by David Turner in lieu of Mike Grace, after finalisation at the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of the Town Council on 26th March. The final document could then be given to the Town Clerk (Sharon Clayton) to arrange for printing which might then be completed by 30th March. Mike Grace noted that Sharon had arranged two sets of quotes for the printing procurement based on different sizes of questionnaire.

Agreed that the front page of the questionnaire and the two-page covering note should be printed in colour and that the paper should be 80gsm.

(Howard Horsley left the meeting)

ACTION: David Turner, Howard Horsley, Bob May and Charles Teaney to correspond by email to produce a final draft of the two-page covering note which would then be finalised and signed-off by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of the Town Council on 26th March.

6. Developing the Plan Themes

Robert Stuart thought that the survey returns would yield more qualitative than quantitative information. He wondered what uses could be made of the results and how the information could be used to develop a coherent plan.

Mike Grace noted that the work of the theme groups could develop in parallel with the survey. The document he had circulated sought to address some of the ways in which this could be done. He thought that the crucial question was how to involve the community on what was produced through the survey and other research.

Charles Teaney thought that individuals needed to be identified to take forward specific tasks – some of which involved external research such as drawing on other planning documents.

Bob May proposed that the paper produced by Mike Grace should be used as a brief for team leaders until it needed to be changed. This was **agreed** by the meeting.

Robert Stuart noted the need to produce a plan which would be likely to be approved in the referendum and which would be consistent with other plans. Bob May suggested using existing plans as models.

Charles Teaney thought that analysis of questionnaire results might begin as soon as a week after the early questionnaire results came in. Mike Grace noted the need to check with Sara Botham about the processing of returns.

ACTION: Mike Grace to ask Howard Horsley to liaise with Sara Botham regarding the processing of questionnaire returns.

Bob May thought that the plan would be used to influence decisions taken in other areas. Gill Jones noted that there was scope for acting locally by using precept and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding. Mike Grace thought that a key issue was how simple or complex the plan should be.

7. Project Programme Review

Charles Teaney noted that there were still many tasks to which no person had been assigned, resulting in many "Who is This" entries on the Tasks List. He felt that someone who knew about the structure and content of plans needed to be identified to produce "boilerplates".

Mike Grace noted that the issue of final authorisation of the plan with Shropshire Council needed to be discussed with Jake Berriman.

ACTION: Mike Grace and Charles Teaney to look at outstanding issues on the project plans, including the ordering of tasks and activities.

8. Media and Communications

The Steering Group had received a query from Mark Sackett of RPS, on behalf of Wenlock Estates, asking if he could see an advance copy of the questionnaire. It was **agreed** that this was not appropriate but that a summary of survey results would be made publicly available.

ACTION: Mike Grace to write to Mark Sackett.

David noted that information from the Primary School event had still not been made available.

ACTION: Mike Grace to ask Liz Thomas to go through the notes from the Primary School, tidy these up for publication on the website and pass them to David Turner by 2nd April.

Agreed to produce laminated outdoor flyers to publicise the survey.

David noted that volunteers for the video clip promoting the survey needed to be identified.

ACTION: David Turner to liaise with Liz Thomas in the next week on photo opportunities for the video at the Primary School.

ACTION: Milner Whiteman to identify long-standing Wenlock residents as potential interviewees.

(Robert Stuart left the meeting)

The press release drafted by David Turner announcing the start of the survey was **agreed** by the meeting. David noted that the actual start date would be inserted once it was known.

It was **agreed** that the Mayor (Lesley Durbin), Mike Grace, Bob May and possibly Sharon Clayton might be interviewed by local radio.

Charles Teaney thought that local clergy might be asked to include notice of the survey in parish notices. **Agreed** to ask Holy Trinity Church and the Methodist Church to do this. Milner Whiteman offered to contact Revd. Stephen Lowe.

9. Outstanding Actions

Mike Grace noted that he had made a presentation to a DCLG enquiry week session on Neighbourhood Plans on 15th March. A video of his presentation would be made available on the website.

10. Budgets

There were no requests to approve additional expenditure.

12. Date of Next Meeting

This was **agreed** to be 2nd April, starting at 5.00 p.m. in the Guildhall. It was also **agreed** that future meetings would be held fortnightly thereafter for the next few meetings and that anyone interested could attend meetings of the Steering Group.