

# **Ringmore Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

## **Minutes of meeting**

**Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> September 2018, The W.I. Hall, 7.00 pm**

### **Present**

Richard Baker RB Chairman  
Jen Williams JW  
David Vincent DV  
Malcolm Findlay MF  
Mike Wynne-Powell MWP  
Mike Campbell MC

### **1 Apologies**

Were received from David Milne Smith and Rosemary Piercy

As Rosemary Piercy was unavailable it was agreed to audio record the meeting and for Rosemary to write the minutes from the recording.

### **2 Finance**

The total new grant is £4,425 and has been paid into the Parish Council bank account.

The only expenses since the last meeting were the hire of the WI Hall £8 and membership of DCT £25.

We have not yet been invoiced for the DCT report.

### **3. DCT Report on the NP Questionnaire.**

DCT's report was examined line by line and the following comments were recorded:-

1. Everyone thought the cover page and photograph was excellent and captured the small rural nature of the parish
2. Overall the Steering Group (SG) found aspects of the report helpful
3. There are several instances in the report which we are grateful for, but do not think they are suitable for publication because either they are opinions not from the questionnaire or they may confuse certain residents, I will try to highlight those in the detail section
4. The report looks at answers to each individual question but does not comment on whether various answers come from one particular age range or residential location. It maybe that Challaborough residents have an opposing view to Ringmore village residents.
5. For publication purposes we felt that the report maybe too wordy and therefore lacked impact. Perhaps the use of some bullet points in certain paragraphs may make it more readable.
6. The report refers to census information in several paragraphs, where this is a comparison to national statistics it may be valid but where it compares the questionnaire to Ringmore census there appears to be a significant mismatch in the numbers which may lead to confusion or erroneous conclusions viz: The census is said to quote 210 residents in 105 households. We know the electoral register is 160 and this may have varied slightly since 2011 but not that much. People who do not know the parish often believe that the whole of the Challaborough area is part of Ringmore Parish, this is not the case only the area to the west of the stream that runs into Challaborough beach is actually in Ringmore. This maybe the cause of the confusion. Therefore would it be better to use the electoral roll figure and delete the census figure or could the census figure be corrected easily ?
7. There are a few instances where the questions say "if you answered yes/no to the previous question, then answer this question". This results in percentages being quoted are for a very low input population, in turn this magnifies the percentage and could lead the casual reader to conclude that the high percentage of all respondents felt that way. Eg.p18 Q18 "re-routing/one way system for holiday traffic 13%" This actually refers to only 4 respondents and not 13% of all respondents. We think that since the total respondents was approx 100 that using the number of respondents in all cases makes it very easy to calculate the percentage.

8. We felt that in the Executive Summary some reference should be made to the age range of respondents since this is an important feature, likewise whilst a summary can't cover every detail, there is no mention of the "tourism response"....tourism is the major industry of the parish but brings traffic problems.
9. We note the comments of DCT's Housing Enabler and these maybe of use to the SG. However this is the opinion of one person. We do not think that these opinions should be expressed in the report since they were not part of the questionnaire and the DCT report will form part of the evidence base. The SG has now seen them and will bear his/her advice in mind at the appropriate time.
10. The report makes certain assertions or assumptions which are not the result of the answers to the questionnaire. We feel that we should simply stick with the facts.
11. We think it would be useful to compare the size of Ringmore Parish with other rural parishes, if possible....this should give an inspector or some other independent person a better understanding of the size of the parish.
12. Should the executive summary state that the level of response to the questionnaire is well above average and quote the average...this gives credibility to the process.
13. In the executive summary boxes G,H,I the report says "a PRIORITY FOR THE PARISH" We think that it is for the SG and then the Parish Council to judge whether these items are a priority. There may be other priorities for the parish which were not the subject of the questionnaire. The parish does not own any land nor does it have funds beyond its annual budget, so some of these items may be on a wish list but cannot easily be fulfilled. Whilst people may wish, if we were to ask for volunteers to run a Mother & Baby club, we might not get any of the wishers wanting to give their time to do it, although we might try. Can we make these statements avoiding the word priority ?
14. The executive summary table uses adjectives like strong, reasonable, significant,. We are guessing that the use of each adjective depends on the % response in favour of these items...could you give us a table of which adjective is used for each range and is the use of the word the same in the negative and the positive ? ie strong support = strong opposition
15. Exec Summary J...The JE is a valued asset.... (delete highly)
16. P6 para 2 and in all other instances...village hall = WI Hall. The other hall in the village is called The Parish Room. Some ladies will be upset if we don't give their hall its proper name.
17. We accept what you are trying to say here, is it possible to make it shorter and more succinct ?
18. We thought the copy of the map was poor and admit this is difficult. I append our copy from SHDC with permission to use it, which maybe slightly better.
19. P9 para 2..is this a candidate for bullet points of key themes.
20. P9 we think the piece on Questionnaire Development is also important to give credibility to the process, in addition to those points listed an individual house to house (electoral roll) visit was made with the questions posed by the Garden Party notice board titles. This had a 40% response.
21. P9 Survey Response...this is a repeat of information in the Exec Summary...is it necessary ?
22. P10 Q1 last para. Assumption about "retired people"...people over 65 are not necessarily "retired" nor do they necessarily have more time than others. Some do, many don't.
23. P11 Q4 last sentence....not necessary and unproven, may not be true.
24. P12 Q5..if 97 people answered this question why does the graph add up to 103 ?
25. P13 Q7 DCT Enabler quote...delete...see above
26. P14 first para as item 24 – assumption without evidence
27. P15 DCT Enabler italics...as items 24 and 25 delete
28. P18 delete last para "comments"if necessary add to Q35
29. P21 Q21 delete "comments " in italics and add to Q35 if required.
30. P21 Q22 title Village Hall = Parish Room
31. P22 Q23 delete "comments" and add to Q35 if necessary
32. P22 Q23 "dancing" delete words in brackets. These are the combined comments of 4 people...not statistically significant
33. P23 Q25 first response ""**Nothing**" delete comment starting ' one couple....! irrelevant
34. P26 Q31 should the age comparison be shown, have you done an age comparison on other questions which might yield valuable guidance to the SG ?
35. P29 1<sup>st</sup> para last phrase "priority"....could use "order of commonly held views and opinions"
36. P30 Q35 ...Typical comments from 36 respondents etc....however if you add supplementary items from points 27/28/30 above you may need to adjust this figure

These comments will be forwarded to DCT

4. It was agreed that DCT should be invited to come to Ringmore for a “tutorial” on how to proceed from here.
5. It was noted that the winner of the questionnaire raffle had not come forward to claim their prize and consequently the matter was now closed.
6. It was agreed that a detailed examination of the DCT report and how it might influence the Neighbourhood Plan would be discussed at another meeting.

**There being no other business, the meeting closed at 8.50pm**