

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Stage Two Survey Sub-Group

Summary of main decisions

Newsletter

It was agreed that a newsletter should be prepared and distributed in advance of the surveys outlining the work undertaken by the SG since the last newsletter (March 2017) and giving information about the forthcoming Stage Two consultation.

Covering letter

A covering letter is essential to accompany the surveys to point out the difference between the two surveys and instructions for completion etc.

Order of questions

Agreed that topics would be presented in alphabetical order.

Survey format

1. Agreed that the survey should be A3 folded with a centrefold map for reference.
2. Points of grammar and consistency addressed throughout to make a coherent document.
3. '.. or disagree' removed from questions, and instead all answer options given as Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, bar those regarding internet/mobile which were agreed to be Very Satisfied etc., and Excellent, Good, etc.

Addition and deletion of questions

1. Questions on key views and Place Appraisal drafted and added.
2. Question on principle of producing green space list added.
3. Questions on suggestion for locations added in EBT and Sports and Rec.
4. When tested on non-SG members and survey sub-group members, it became clear that some people do not understand the question about the W Water and pub garden/car park site. Much discussion took place and advice sought from Brian Wilson. At one point deleting the question and amending the previous question to list possible sites for inclusion within the development boundary (DB) was considered, however Brian advised against this, stating that the normal procedure would be to establish whether the community was happy or not to redraw the DB, then do a call for sites from landowners, have those sites put forward independently assessed in planning terms and finally to ask the community their views on a short list of sites. With all this taken into account it was decided to delete the W Water/pub garden & car park question. The Housing & Planning Sub-Group were consulted, only one reply was received, from the Chairman, who was happy with this decision.

Map

1. Also following initial feedback, changes were agreed to the map to make the village centre map clearer and the sub-group was very grateful for Bill Egerton's expertise which enabled a very clear map to be drafted to assist the reader in answering the questions in the survey.
2. The use of grid references was considered but not thought necessary.

Revision of context statements and questions

1. All context statements and questions were scrutinised where felt necessary these were amended for clarity or to remove any leading phrases, and to accurately reflect national planning policy and the opportunities available under the NP process.
2. In the absence of minutes from the Heritage Sub-Group, it was unclear what criteria was used to draw up the draft list of local heritage assets and as a result queries were raised with that sub-group. Heritage Sub-Group provided evidence of a valid basis for the scoring criteria which was based on Historic England guidance. The context statement was amended to describe this process accurately.
3. In addition, following their most recent meeting the Heritage Sub-Group amended the draft heritage assets list in that they decided that two individual properties could be grouped under street scene descriptions.
4. Also on the point of the local heritage asset list, it was queried with Brian Wilson whether there is any value within a Conservation Area of a local heritage list; his answer was that there is some potential added value, especially given that the Borough Council's Conservation Area Appraisal for Sutton Poyntz is both dated and rather thin.
5. Whether or not private properties should be included on the green space and heritage lists was discussed and it was agreed to leave this for discussion at SG.
6. Advice was also sought from Brian Wilson as to whether the community could be asked about locations outside the Neighbourhood Area. The answer was no, so key views were adjusted to reflect this and one was deleted. The only location remaining in the whole of the survey which is outside the Neighbourhood Area is a suggested hazard point at Verlands/Winslow Road: it was felt this could remain, as if supported it would maybe become an action point rather than a NP policy.
7. It was agreed to ask for a postcode rather than an address in the IT/comms question.

Use of survey monkey

This was considered at length but not thought either necessary or appropriate for this type of survey, especially with the map. Over 95% of previous returns were in hard copy, and as hard copies are provided, it is likely that this method will be the most commonly used for the Stage Two Survey too.

Distribution arrangements and availability of the Place Appraisal

1. It was agreed that when the surveys are distributed, the door is knocked and the distributor to explain the surveys and the Place Appraisal to them, and show them a copy of the Place Appraisal and that they can borrow it by arrangement. Each distributor to be given three copies of the PA for this purpose.
2. A second 'knocking up' to be done nearer the deadline for the return of the surveys.
3. The newsletter, covering letter and surveys also to be emailed to the SPS email circulation and to all landowners as before.