

# Highnam Parish Plan 2017 – 2031 Refresh Update

## Report to Highnam Parish Council

12 September 2017

### ***Background:***

At its meeting earlier in the year Highnam Parish Council (HPC) resolved to undertake a refresh (update) of its 2007 Parish Plan. The Key Objectives of this initiative are summarised in Appendix 1. Following extensive consultation through a Drop In Event and questionnaire survey the Steering Group coordinating this exercise are now in a position to provide the council with an initial progress report of its findings. This forms the body of this report.

### ***Recommendation: That:***

HPC receives this report; provides commentary and advice on its content to the Steering Group; and requests a further more detailed report at its next meeting in October 2017.

### ***Linkages to 2007 Plan:***

The 2007 Plan had a ten year lifespan and expired in April this year. Although it had been the initial intention to keep this Plan under regular review, this did not happen. To an appreciable degree. Nevertheless, as part of this refresh exercise the extent of implementation of the 2007 Plan has been analysed. Appendices 2, 3 and 4 summarise: what has been achieved; what has not been achieved; and what is ongoing or outstanding. This has provided a sound foundation upon which to build the current refresh.

### ***Steering Group:***

This comprises Cllrs Coats, Moir, Talbot and Welch, together with Adrian Goode, TBC officer. The Steering Group has met regularly to progress the refresh work, and each individual has taken on assigned tasks, a genuine collaborative effort.

### ***Consultation Initiative:***

In May all households within the parish received a detailed questionnaire requiring parishioners to set out their views, preferences and suggestions in relation to a wide range of issues. This followed a Drop In Event and extensive publicity designed to inform residents about the extent and scope of the review. For convenience the questionnaire was split into three generic themes: Leisure, Environment, and Community. 240 responses were received, a return of @ 18%, which is considered statistically relevant. An independent analysis of the responses was undertaken by Eleanor Wear, a research student in the Geography Department of the University of Gloucestershire (UoG). A wide range of opinion was voiced

in the survey, from strong support to outright opposition to identified ideas. Additionally, many respondents took the opportunity to provide further ideas and suggestions for the Group's consideration. This analysis has helped inform the Steering Group's thoughts for inclusion in the new Plan.

Encouragingly, some twenty seven individuals from within the parish have expressed interest in supporting our ongoing work. This support will be harnessed and deployed in a number of task groups in the implementation stage of the Plan.

With the exception of FC Highnam and Highnam Players, very few other village clubs or societies have as yet formally engaged with this exercise or provided us with their thoughts and aspirations. This weakness is something the Steering Group will be addressing as we move forward.

### ***Key Findings and Proposed Actions:***

Appendix 5 forms the meat of this report. It summarises the Steering Group's considered assessment of the UoG in depth analysis of the survey responses, and sets out a series of recommended Actions for the council's consideration. It is proposed an Action Plan be developed from this report which will form the substance of the presentation at the October Open Event (see below). This will start to categorise responses into: quick win deliverables; actions requiring more consideration, research or consultation before implementation; and ideas for which there was no or very little support which are unlikely to be taken forward at this stage. It is intended that all actions will be assigned to one of the three key themes: Leisure, Environment, and Community for implementation purposes.

### ***Indicative Timeline:***

There remains a great deal of work to do before the refreshed Plan is completed. Appendix 6 sets out a critical task list and associated timeline designed to take the exercise through to formal Plan adoption

### ***Establishment of Programme Board:***

To date all the work involved in this refresh has been undertaken by the Steering Group. However, moving forward towards the implementation phase, it is clear there will be a wide variety of tasks to be undertaken; projects initiated; and relatively significant expenditure to be incurred. This needs to be undertaken in a structured, transparent and auditable manner in accordance with standard project management principles, applied proportionately to the scale of the exercise. The Steering Group are keen to ensure the Plan is sustainable; affordable; realistic in terms of what can be achieved; and sufficiently flexible to adapt to

potential changes in demographics; pressures; and circumstances during its 14 year life, and is capable of in depth scrutiny and updating in 2024, i.e. half way through its envisaged lifespan. With this in mind a Programme Board is proposed, the bare bones of which are set out in Appendix 7. It is envisaged members of the existing Steering Group will continue to provide the core of this Board together with specialist advisers, co optees and volunteers from the community with particular interest in the implementation of various aspects of the Plan. A more detailed breakdown of the envisaged respective roles and responsibilities of each layer is set out in appendix 8. It is though recommended that the Parish Clerk should be co-opted on to the Board specifically to manage financial aspects of plan implementation.

### ***Further Consultation and Publicity:***

An Open Event is planned for the evening of Wednesday 4 October in The Parish Room. This will be primarily to enable the new Programme Board to present its findings and recommendations to identified supporters. It will also provide a further chance for village clubs and societies to express their views and to set out where they may wish to receive support or can assist with implementation. However, the event provides a chance for any interested individual to attend and express their thoughts. It is also proposed that following this meeting a progress update should be posted on the Parish Website and in next edition of the Village Link.

### ***Financial Dimension:***

Clearly, implementing many of the key findings will involve capital expenditure. This has yet, to be costed out in any detail, and that will form one of the key tasks moving forward. Whilst it is envisaged most of this expenditure will be sourced from the Sec 106 Planning Gain monies secured from the Lassington Reach development, if additional funds are required a business case will be developed to enable bids to be made against other potential sources of funding which have already been identified. Responsible budget control and monitoring will be essential throughout the implementation phase, indeed for the lifespan of the Plan, as new facilities will need to be properly maintained and financial provision will be required, and it is proposed this important task be exercised by the Parish Clerk. A dedicated bank account will also be required to accommodate all income received and expenditure incurred.

### ***Linkage to Neighbourhood Development Plan:***

It is proposed this Plan runs conterminously with the NDP, i.e. for the same period up to 2031. This Plan will also complement the NDP by covering all non-development aspects

relating to the parish. The survey responses did though make specific references to issues such as the need for dedicated retirement home provision, and should the NDP be reviewed at any future date issues such as this can be taken into account.

***Conclusions and Way Forward:***

A great deal of work has been involved in getting to this point, and the exercise has proved illuminating and endlessly fascinating in terms of digesting the wide variety of opinion and ideas expressed by respondees. This encourages us to continue with this work to ensure a refreshed Plan can be adopted by the end of this year. The Parish Council are invited to comment generally on this report as this will inform the Programme Board and help in preparing further updates at future meetings in October and November.

----- + -----

*The Appendix below shows the analysis - carried out by the steering group - of the results from the Household and Drop in Event survey responses*

## **Parish Plan 2017 Analysis and Interpretation**

This document analyses the results of the household and drop-in-event public consultations as presented in University of Gloucester Report written by Eleanor Wear . For implementation purposes, questionnaire responses have been grouped and actions suggested which are in keeping with the views received from the survey.

**R1) Vision** – Apparently strong support but equal number of No Views (NV)s

Interpretation - vision needs clarity – consider bringing into line with NDP.

**R2,E3, E6, E12 Lassington Wood should be managed for nature, natural areas of Highnam often vandalised.**

E2, E3, E6 Overwhelmingly supported with no significant opposition. Trees are important to residents. Due to the overarching concern for Highnam’s setting and landscape it would seem logical that a group with the brief to ensure that the setting and character of Highnam is considered in every element of the 2017 Plan.

- Action – an Environment group be set up to have an oversight into all items within the new Parish Plan.
- Action – A management Plan should be developed with the involvement of Tewkesbury Borough Council, Highnam Parish Council, parish volunteers and local environmentalist groups.
- Action – A policy should be adopted by the Council to increase the number of trees in the parish and take greater care of existing trees.

**R3,R9, E8, L16,E14 Footpaths and cycleways need better maintenance/ use by motor vehicles/ access is often poor/ high rate of use of footpaths.**

L16 of the survey shows 90% of the respondees use footpaths regularly. R3 responses indicate that residents are dissatisfied with present state of footpaths and cycle ways. E8 Responses seem at first sight to indicate satisfaction but may reflect the phrasing of the question, which might suggest it was the surface of the path that was in question. Comments on this matter were particularly useful in helping decide actions required.

- Action – A better process of reporting footpath issues is required including those along the Newent Road.
- Action – A survey of all PROW in the parish should be undertaken in conjunction with the Gloucestershire County Council’s Rights of way team to assess the present condition of ROW in the parish and agree what action is required to ensure they are fit for purpose.

- Action – A survey is required to assess accessibility for dog walkers, wheelchair users and children’s buggies.
- Action – Parish Council should adopt policy to resist all attempts to allow motorised traffic on PROW in the parish. (E9)

**Continued on next page**

#### **R4, E10, E9 Dog mess issues, litter is a problem in Highnam**

Survey responses were difficult to interpret, R4 suggests more bins required (58% v 20%), however E10 is mixed in its response when asked if there is a dog mess problem. (31% to 39%) The questions are slightly different. R4 probably is correctly suggesting that more dog bins properly placed would lessen the dog mess problems in Highnam, whilst E10 is probably correct in suggesting Highnam has less of a problem as compared with other villages.

Comments confirm concern voiced recently about dogs running free and acting dangerously especially close to the play area.

E9 responses regarding litter suggests that overall people do not consider litter a problem in Highnam by 53%. This is probably because Highnam people and volunteer litter pickers pick up litter that gets dropped. There are litter hotspots, comments list: Newent Road, outside shop, Oakridge, play area, Lassington Wood access, near allotments adj. to Monkey Back Hill.

- Action – The Environment Group to assess if new dog mess bins would be effective and precisely where they should be sited.
- Action – The need for controls on dogs on the recreation park should be considered.
- Action – The need for further action to deter litterers should be studied by the Environment Group.

#### **R5, E11 Recycling services**

No significant dissatisfaction, no action required.

#### **R6, E13, E3, L4 Footpath around the spine road , landscaping, native wildflowers ,See also E1**

Very strong support at 77%. R6 demonstrates a slight impatience that this item that was on the last Parish Plan (PP) was not carried through. Comments suggest another example of concern for the green spaces beside the road and need for a buffer between the built-up village and the countryside. Question L4 relates to provision of a path constituting an exercise track and had 75% support so the specification should respect the need for sympathetic landscaping.

There were significant comments which asked for the path to be properly accessible to pushchairs and wheelchairs and safe crossing points.

- Action – Spine road path should proceed but efforts be made to landscape it in such a way that it is in keeping with the rural nature of its surroundings. ( E13 79% support)
- Action – A programme of wildflower landscaping should be a policy of the parish council. The best expert advice must be obtained to regulate grass cutting to encourage existing plants and still allow paths for walkers.
- Action - The specification of the new path should include the requirement to be low impact where practical.
- Action - Accessibility and safety - especially road safety - issues to be a priority.

#### **R7 Action should be taken to curb speeding vehicles.**

With 84% of respondents agreeing that action is needed, the Parish Council cannot fail to prioritise this issue. Comments on this item were useful with various ideas put forward.

- Action – Community Group to produce a comprehensive plan to deal with the problem of speeding in the parish.

### **R8 Lighting improvements required in the village.**

The majority of respondents appear to think there is a problem, but the number of those taking the opposite view is significant so there is no clear outcome. As this was an item on the previous PP it should be investigated and action taken if there is sufficient support in the areas affected.

- Action – Community Group to study the areas most likely to need lighting enhancements and produce recommendations.
- Action - Before any implementation the residents in the neighbourhood should be consulted to gauge their level of support.

### **R10 Need for a dial-a-Ride in Highnam**

This was an item which was not resolved on the last PP. At 74% of respondents saying they support the scheme this cannot be ignored. Although there is support for Dial-a-Ride, knowledge of the scheme is poor.

- Action - The Community Group should research the issue with a view to running at least a pilot scheme to include Highnam.

### **R11 R12, C7, C8, R22 Need for a social club / pub/ café/youth club C10, Use by residents of Rodway Golf Club facilities**

A number of questions were posed in the survey about the need for a community informal meeting point. On the issue of whether a social club was needed opinion was strong, but sadly divided equally between those for and against. The number of NVs, suggest that perhaps if an actual proposal was put then things would become clearer. On the issue of a pub 62% did not want one and over half were strongly against it. This could be explained by the design of the village, since it has no centre or village green where one would expect a pub to be.

On the issue of the café, the responses suggest that there is support for the idea, some probably hidden in the NVs and some 'disagreers'.

C10 shows that it is possible that Rodway Golf Club is underused as 45% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed and 39% had no view. The reason for this is not clear, but suggests that a large part of the population is not aware of the facilities being offered.

There are some 11 comments which suggest that for some Highnam can be a lonely place. This suggests that there is an issue warranting attention here, leading to the conclusion that a number of issues have a common basis, including R22, which asked if a club or similar meeting place should be established for young people. There was strong support for this proposition at 72%. There were useful comments which suggest the same theme as the need for a meeting place mentioned in other responses.

- Action – The Community Group should be asked to come up with fully researched options for a café type facility in the village.
- Action The Community Group should produce options for providing of a meeting place or club for young people, preferably with young peoples' representatives involvement.
- Action - A working party to consider the issue of loneliness in the village and make proposals on how it might be alleviated.
- Action - The working party tasked with searching for a social hub for the village, should have the extent of use of Rodway Golf Club within its terms of reference.

### **R13 Welcome pack for newcomers to the village.**

With the village expanding, this was going to be particularly relevant, and is supported by 60% of respondents.

- Action The Community Group to produce a welcome pack for incomers, aimed at all new residents whether in the new development or the existing village.

#### **R14 Noticeable police patrols, should support, promote, encourage the NHW scheme**

There is strong support for a more noticeable police presence on the streets of Highnam. (71% support) Although this issue is not under the control of the parish council, the support for increased policing needs to be made clear to the Police Commissioner's office.

The public support for Neighbourhood Watch is overwhelming at 96%.

- Action - Parish Council should draft a letter to be sent to the Police Commissioner bringing the results of the survey to their attention.
- Action - The Parish Council should adopt a policy to promote and encourage the NHW scheme as deemed appropriate, and shall in any case, donate an annual grant adequate to support the work of the scheme in the parish.

#### **R16, C6 The importance of the village Post Office (PO) and Stores, Convenience and Use.**

The percentage of respondents considering the shop important and worthy of support was overwhelming at 96%. Of those using the PO and Stores 86% find it convenient for their needs. There were some comments which were useful in understanding the background. There were comments and criticisms of the shop and pointing out that the shop must adapt to the needs of an increased population.

- Action - The Parish Council should adopt a policy stating its view that the village needs a PO and shop sufficient to fulfil the needs of its population.
- Action – The Community Group should research the issue - because of the overwhelming survey result - and seek contact with the PO & Store's owners. If they are agreeable it is an opportunity to pass on comments and share visions for the future development of the business.

#### **R17 Need for more allotments**

A majority (47% against 19%) feel there should be more allotments, and interestingly the precise average of these two had no view. It is understood that the Allotment association do not seek more allotments; however this does not mean that the issue should not be looked at, given the support in the survey.

- Action – The Community Group should look at the feasibility of providing more allotments, and undertake a detailed survey of this issue amongst residents to establish if there is a latent demand for allotments.

#### **C1, R18, C16, C2, I or my club are regular users of the Community Centre (CC) Complex, Should CC be improved?, Highnam is well served for Community buildings, The CC buildings are fit for purpose.**

This is complex group of questions, aiming to assess the present views and scale of usage of the CC and gauge the appetite for upgrading or improving them.

Responses to C1 show twice as many agree that they or their club regularly use the CC than disagree. Most noticeably the largest number of respondents were in the No View column.

Continued on next page:

This is a reflection of the rather poor nature of the question since the answer can really only be yes or no. Presuming that the 44% who agree or strongly agree are regular users it could serve to scale the usage to some degree.

R18 should be interpreted as supporting improvement, because with twice the number supporting the proposition than opposing it and a high number of no views it suggests that existing users would like improvement and a large pool of people might use them if improvements were made.

C16 is hard to interpret because the response to the proposition that 'Highnam has an adequate provision of community buildings is very positive (76% against 12% that disagree and with few 'no views'). Comments to this include comments that community buildings are in the wrong place, since they are across the Newent Road and distant from most housing.

The wording of the question, leading to varying interpretations, and the position of it in the questionnaire (appearing after a question regarding the school) may have affected the responses. C2 is interesting for the comments perhaps more than the stark figures. What appears to be showing here is that since the CC is all we have, users must somehow make it work for them. Comments of users betray the problems however, and complain of poor building design which limits scope of use, poor storage, inadequate cleaning and so on.

The scale of the 'no views' is significant in the responses, and suggests that many people are disconnected from the CC.

The imminent change in the structure of the management of the Community Centre Complex may be the opportunity to look in detail at this asset. The increasing population makes it essential that Highnam gets this matter right for the future.

- Action – The Community Group to work with Highnam Community Centre Trust to look in detail at the subject of Community Centre provision. The Group should be given wide terms of reference so that no options are off the table

### **R19, Need for Tennis courts**

This item appeared in the last parish plan but there was no outcome. The responses suggest that there is support at 39% but this is almost matched by the 35% who disagree or strongly disagree but we can assume that the 26% with 'no view' would, in this case be non-users. Overall, tennis courts are probably not a major priority in the parish. Comments on this item are also significant because they point up practical issues which would have to be faced such as location, maintenance, lighting, parking and overall responsibility for running the courts. In view of the majority support the feasibility should be investigated.

- Action – The Leisure Group should consider the feasibility of tennis court provision, but have in mind the comments from the survey regarding location, maintenance, lighting, parking and overall responsibility for running the courts.

### **R21 Protection of green spaces in the village of Highnam.**

This was the strongest response in the survey with 80% strongly agreeing and 17% agreeing making 97% of respondents determined to protect the green spaces in Highnam from development, damage or any sort of encroachment.

- Action – The Environment Group to map the amenity areas, public open spaces and suggest ways in which these can be secured for the future.
- Action - In view of the strength of this response, any future revision of the Neighbourhood Development Plan should include this provision.

**R20, L9, L10, L12 Children's and young people's play areas should be improved, provision of additional play facilities on Recreation Park / Mary Grove.**

The general proposition to improve play facilities is well supported at 52% against 18%. This item originated on the 2007 plan and was implemented but the location and some of the equipment may be due for renovation now, so the question was topical.

There is strong support for provision of additional play facilities including some for older children at the recreation park at 57% against 18%.

Support for play facilities at Mary Grove was less strong 32% in favour and 35% against with 33% no view. The Parish Council may have to consider the requirements of the new residents of the village on this matter due to their proximity in Lassington Reach, but it is clear that Mary Grove is a cherished peaceful location for residents and this must be respected.

L12 sought to discern the level of support for specifically young persons' leisure facilities and although this may refer to games and exercise opportunities. At 52% as against 19% this idea was popular. Comments included suggestions such as BMX track, skate park roller booting and bowling.

- Action - Recreation Park – The Leisure Group up to develop proposals to enhance and expand the play area on the recreation park. The working party to liaise with those undertaking landscape improvements, access and footpaths. All aspects of future maintenance responsibility to be within the terms of reference.
- Action - Mary Grove - The Leisure Group action to develop proposals to install a small play park for young children on Mary Grove. Working party to liaise with those undertaking landscape improvements, access and footpaths. All aspects of future maintenance responsibility to be within the terms of reference. Quiet character of Mary Grove to be respected.

**L1, L11, L17 ' I would value the provision of additional leisure facilities'**

L1 Responses to this general question suggest that respondents who had views held them fairly strongly, but the number of 'no views' suggests that the question was not sufficiently direct to obtain a response these respondees. There were a number of comments showing concern regarding anti-social behaviour and litter, and concern about cost and possible lack of use.

L11 related to members of clubs who might be interested in additional facilities possibly supported by the parish, using match funding. There was little support for this with more saying no than yes, and giving 70% 'no view'; however the nature of the question - being general and hypothetical in character - probably led to uncertainty.

L17 Proposed the need for additional sports/leisure facilities such as tennis courts, bowling green. There was some support for this 43% as against 30% who opposed it. There is some indication from the comments that although the proposition was welcomed in principle, some ideas would be hard to realise in Highnam, for example floodlit playing fields and a swimming pool. The location and setting of the village will always limit opportunities for fitting in extensive or intrusive facilities.

Action - The questions L1 and L11 were too general to be used for action, but the comments should be noted when leisure facilities are being assessed.

## **L2, L3 Provision of a multi-use-games-area.**

This proposition was generally not popular at a resident or club level.

Amongst residents, 41% were opposed against 25% who supported it and would use it 'no view's, were at 33%. Among the comments a number of practical concerns were expressed about management, maintenance, monitoring, disturbance, and securing at night. There were also concerns about 'bringing in outsiders' which whilst sounding isolationist probably relates to issues such as car parking and anti-social behaviour.

Clubs and their members did not appear as keen as the general population with 27% against and 9% for with 64% not having a view.

On these results clearly a MUGA could not be justified at this stage.

Action- No action proposed for MUGA.

## **L5, L6, L7, L8, L13 Provision and possible location of outdoor exercise equipment.**

This was put into the survey as something which was under consideration before the refresh was commenced.

L5 asked respondents if they would use the equipment if it were provided. 38% said they would against 37% who said they would not. In this case 25% had 'no view' and this might indicate that they were not familiar with the equipment. Many towns and villages have equipment of this type, and because they are popular from young adulthood to the elderly they tend to be well used. In addition they occupy little ground space and are not intrusive.

L6 Asked if the equipment should be located on the Recreation Park, and this was favoured by 40% against 31% with still a relatively high number of 'no views'.

L7 Asked if equipment should be located at points around the spine road and here there was a clear indication that this was not popular, with 45% disagreeing with the idea against 23% in favour.

L8 Asked if equipment should be positioned on Mary Grove Public Open Space (POS). Here was a clear view against installing exercise equipment - 50% as against 30% in favour. The view coming through from the survey is that Mary Grove is cherished as a peaceful area and clearly this must be respected.

The overall conclusion is that outdoor exercise equipment would be supported on the recreation park but not elsewhere.

Comments do suggest however that simple wooden pull-up bars and sit-up benches might be supported.

L13 asked if there was any interest in the provision of leisure related facilities at Staunton's Hill.

Most respondents (68%) did not have a view - many not knowing where this area is. One comment pointed out that the open space at Staunton Hill is owned by residents. The views of those who had knowledge of the area were clearly opposed to the idea. No action should be taken.

- Action – Leisure Group dealing with play equipment under R20, L9, L10 above should have this in their remit and liaise with those dealing with the general layout and landscaping of the recreation park. A group of good quality outdoor exercise equipment should be provided.
- Action – Leisure Group to assess with the Environment Group if simple, wooden, passive exercise items could be provided at appropriate points along the exercise circuit.

#### **L14 Use of other open spaces around the parish for leisure related purposes**

This was a difficult question for people to answer as it was general and hypothetical in nature. This was opposed at 27% versus 10% who agreed.

The leisure use which would find acceptance was seats and benches which is strongly supported in L15 with 79% support and little to the contrary.

- Action – The Leisure Group should consider the provision of seats and benches on open spaces around the village in liaison with the Environment Group.

#### **C3, C4 The doctor's surgery**

C3 Asked if the doctor's surgery facility was convenient for patients' needs. This was a question open to wide interpretation but the fact that 78% responded that it was is telling. This suggests that it is the location in the village which makes it convenient for registered patients. This point is illustrated by many comments lamenting the long lead times for appointments, and being sent to Eastgate for some urgent appointments. Parking is also a point of dissatisfaction.

C4 is for those who might be registered elsewhere but would prefer to register with the Highnam Surgery. 81% had no view on and of the rest, the majority of people rejected the idea. There is no issue to action on C4.

The practise is undergoing major changes over the next year or so during which time it will merge with the Cheltenham Road practice. Currently a councillor is nominated as a liaison point for the Highnam Surgery.

- Action - The parish council should liaise with the surgery and offer any support that it can to improve its performance.

#### **C5 The children's nursery on Lassington Lane.**

C5 This question asked if the nursery is conveniently sited and suits the needs of parents with pre-school children. The majority (45%) responded positively with a large number of 'no views'. There were 3 comments that the location was poor as it was near a busy, congested road. The majority clearly approved of the nursery and accepted its location.

- Action - No action proposed for this.

#### **C9 The bus service for the village runs sufficiently frequently and meets my requirements.**

Despite a high number of respondents supporting this statement, there is clearly an issue to resolve. If we look at the strongly disagree they are twice the number of strongly agree. Add to this a total of 27 comments pointing out that the service is infrequent, insufficient and unreliable and cannot be relied upon if you are attempting to make a connection to another form of public transport. Others point out that the curtailment of the late bus from Gloucester means that Highnam residents can no longer use public transport to return after an evening out in the city. See also Wear Report Recommendation regarding Bus Service.

- Action – Community Group to lobby to improve the frequency of services and restore the late bus service from Gloucester.

### **C11 Use by residents of Over Farm Shop.**

There is some evidence that it is not as popular as it might be. 35% Agree / Strongly Agree whilst another 35% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The 30% that did not have a view were likely to be mainly non-users.

- Action – It is not clear that any action can be taken on this issue.

### **C12 I would welcome the provision of additional employment opportunities in Highnam.**

Those in agreement and against were roughly balanced with slightly more against, 47% did not have a view. This is because of the general and hypothetical nature of the question, however it is clear that there is no pressure from the village to provide additional employment as a priority.

### **C13 Greater emphasis should be given to the provision of retirement homes or bungalows within any new development within the parish.**

### **C14 Greater emphasis should be given to the provision of Social or Affordable Housing in the parish.**

C13 -There is an overwhelming response strongly agreeing/agreeing with this with 81% in agreement which is one of the highest scores in the survey.

Comments point to the need to free up other homes for families in the village. This result is an indication that people want to stay within the village in later life.

C14 – There is opposition to this proposal at 53% (including a high proportion of strongly disagree) against 29% in favour.

- Action – The issue of housing for residents in later life has such strong support that must form part of any updates to the Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- Action – The issue of social and social and affordable housing must be considered during any updates to the Neighbourhood Development Plan bearing the views of this survey result in mind.

### **C15 The village primary school is well placed to provide good quality educational facilities to serve the community.**

A strong positive response was received for this proposition at 84% whilst the remaining 16% had no view. This positive response however was to the proposition that the school was 'well placed', so being in the centre of the village and in walking distance of those in the main development it could not be better placed; this probably explains the overwhelming response. There is concern about its ability to cope with a larger population. A comment was also received pointing out that it was very well resourced but is shut up during evenings, weekends and holidays when it could serve as a valuable resource for the community.

- Action – There is little to base action on here, but the Community Group should pick up on the last point regarding use of facilities outside school hours which is in operation elsewhere. A discussion with the School Governors would be necessary.

### **E1 Highnam is an attractive place to live.**

E1 gives the most overwhelmingly positive response of all with 97% either strongly agreeing (the most) and agreeing that Highnam is an attractive place to live.

Most interesting were the comments. The greatest numbers of comments, (20), were against Highnam losing its village feel, or becoming a suburb of Gloucester by allowing too much development.

Several comments came from those who valued the beautiful surroundings, views, green spaces, peace, lots of trees especially the oaks and access to the countryside.

- Action – Ensure that the importance of setting and natural landscape is part of the ethos of working parties involved in creating and implementing the new Highnam Parish Plan.
- Action – where possible build the spirit of the responses and comments received for E1 into any updated Neighbourhood Development Plan.

### **E2 I would support a small nature reserve/educational area adjacent to the allotment area pond on the recreation park.**

There was significant support for this concept with 78% strongly agreeing or agreeing.

- Action – The Environment Group to invite local environmentalist groups to draw up plans to use this area as described and incorporate it into the overall plans.

### **E5 I would support a landscaped picnic/bbq area on the recreation park.**

There is support for this proposal - 51% against 31%. There were comments from those concerned about litter and attracting too many people from outside the parish, which are very fair concerns, given the limitations for parking and the like. Also the area is environmentally sensitive.

- Action – A BBQ / picnic area respectful to the setting, environment and wildlife should be provided overlooking the play and exercise area. Environment group to work with all stakeholders to ensure that design prevents litter from being a problem whilst providing this facility.

## **Conclusion**

This document proposes actions based on an interpretation of the results shown in the University of Gloucester report.

This document starts to structure the workload into areas which the Programme Board can allocate to the three themed groups, each of which will require their own terms of reference.

Ultimately Project Groups will need specialist skills, many of which will mean co-opting members from outside the council.