

## Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Development Plan Advisory Committee

### Record of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> August 2017 at Stoke Golding Methodist Church Hall

	<p>Chairperson Roy Mitchell welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Stoke Golding Neighbourhood Development Plan Advisory Committee (SGNDPAC).</p> <p>Committee members present: - Jim Hope and Roy Mitchell</p> <p>Minuted by Anne Fullagar</p> <p><b>This meeting is not quorate as only 2 committee members present</b></p>	Tasks allocated
	Also present Alan White, Karen Jones, Bernard Lamb, Graham Vallis, Brian Ninness, Jane Ninness and Diane Sinclair.	
	A version of the Rural Community Council's analysis and interpretation of the Household Survey was available. Some graphs have incorrect scales or need relabelling before the final version can be distributed.	
1.	<b>Apologies:</b> Sarah Beale, William Alston, Rob Gaskin, Pauline Goodsell, David Goodsell, Sue Mitchell and Ruth Fisher.	
2.	<b>The Minutes of Previous Meetings already circulated</b> The previous minutes had gone to the Parish Council. Some errors had been corrected. These corrections were highlighted.	
3.	<p><b>The survey response</b></p> <p>Several questions were raised about the survey.</p> <p>Was the 29.9% response demographically similar to the demographic of the village? RM said it was similar to the 2011 census demographic. There had been an increase in the number of households. In 2006 it was 796 and now about 1000. However, it was felt that newer properties probably had a similar demographic to the village as a whole.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that the views of the younger age groups may not be fully represented by the 29.9% response rate. Their views are important because the plan will have more impact on them. However, every household has had an opportunity to respond.</p> <p>Did the 29.9% response give an acceptable margin of error? The margin of error is +/- 5% which the RCC considers acceptable. GV asked if this confidence level applied to all the age groups.</p> <p>In the H&amp;BBC 2009 Core Strategy we were expected to have 60 new houses. So far 161 houses have been approved.</p> <p>RM asked if we were happy to move on to consider the questions that he had raised. There were no objections to moving on given that this was just a preliminary meeting and there would be a meeting of a quorate SGNDPAC and another consultation with the village community, which would be well publicised.</p>	RM to circulate age band response %
4.	<p><b>The Chairman sought views on the apparent contradiction of the answers to questions relating to the separation of Dadlington and Stoke Golding – 13(e), 17 and 33</b></p> <p>The response to 13(e) indicated 71% of responses indicated agreement with the statement not to extend the village in the direction of Dadlington. However, answers to 17 put the site beyond Morris homes in the direction of Dadlington 6<sup>th</sup> on the list of preferences for development. At the same time 92% of responses rated green areas around the village and between neighbouring villages as important or very important.</p> <p>There was a lot of discussion. Some felt that question 33 was a different question to the statement 13(e). BL expressed concern that the online version of the survey could autofill rankings of sites for development. AW said responses to 17 showed few households ranked more than 5 sites.</p>	

	<p>Asked if any household could send in more than one response, AW said that households had been allocated a survey number and there were no duplicates. There could be only one submission from one IP address. A team of people inputted the data. There was a random allocation of surveys to individual members of the team. The team was made up of people not on SGNDPAC. There was a low risk that the data could be distorted manually.</p> <p>There was a query about whether there was postcode bias in ranking sites for development. Whilst people might not want a site near to them developed there should be an evening out of responses from the whole village area.</p> <p>There was a discussion as to whether no housing development was an option. Many people accepted that some infilling could occur. Could we say that the housing needs could be provided by windfall or infilling? JH expressed his concern that the use of “by windfall or infilling housing” had enough flexibility to accommodate Stoke Golding's allocation from the next core plan, which is unknown.</p> <p>H&amp;BBC plan will go to 2026. Our plan will go to 2036. The H&amp;BBC Core Strategy proposed 60 houses - 3 houses/yr. At that rate we would provide another 30 houses to 2036 – a combined total of 90 houses. We have already had 161 houses approved.</p> <p>Returning to the original question the chairman asked if there was strong evidence that the survey respondents did not want housing to go into the green space between Stoke Golding and Dadlington from answers to 13(e) and 33. Could he put this in an initial draft?</p> <p>Those present felt that they were too small a number and not representative of the village. They were just interested people.</p> <p>RM said he would begin to put together a draft plan for consideration. JH said that there needed to be a lot of discussion and consultation with SGNDPAC. Some people felt that the process needed moving forward, so an initial draft would provide something for SGNDPAC and the village to discuss. DS felt that a draft was premature. It is holiday time. Publicising the next meeting should lead to a larger and more representative gathering. GV suggested going into schools to feed back responses and generate interest.</p>	<p>GV said that further analysis was needed</p> <p>JH &amp; RM to confer</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Next Meeting</b> Methodist Hall</p>	