



Allhallows Parish Council

42 Quickrells Avenue, Cliffe, Rochester, Kent, ME3 7RB

Tel 01634 566256 email: allhallowspc@gmail.com

www.allhallowskent-pc.gov.uk

Cross Park Consultation February 2018

The consultation on potential projects at Cross Park was agreed by the Allhallows Parish Council to seek resident's views **before** any decision was taken by the council to support or reject these suggestions. There has been no decision taken and the results of the survey will be reported to the March 14th (6:30pm) meeting of the parish council for discussion and endorsement where required.

The survey was timed to fit after a Turners Group presentation (30th November 2017) on their proposal for 81 additional chalets on Allhallows Park (Kingsmead) and an indication of some of the village community facilities that they are proposing to finance and with an exhibition organised by Land Logical (8th February) to open up discussion with residents about the type of work that could be carried out at Cross Park, at no financial cost to the residents. Their suggestions had ranged from a 2-metre cover on a limited part of the park to an infill that would rise above the current land levels and house heights. The exhibition was a result of the parish council requesting further information from Land Logical that could be put to residents so that they could be informed. The parish council had sought legal advice to see if it was even possible to do this work, if not it would have stopped at the initial stages.

The suggested work had been documented on the parish council web site and mention of it in several editions of Village Voices - delivered to all houses in the village.

A leaflet was produced by the parish council to publicise the event (Land Logical details were to encourage attendance rather than try to supply the detail) the opportunity was also taken to inform residents about the Turners Group community facilities and remind people of contact details (email, website and postal address for non-online users for their comments). Meeting date/times and a call for additional adult help at the Brimp Youth Centre were also mentioned. The leaflets were delivered over a few days and over a week in advance of the Land Logical Exhibition/

Further parish council web information and the survey was launched on the 9th February, to encourage people to attend the Land Logical exhibition if possible for face to face talks. Pointers to this information was also published on the "allhallows village appreciation group" Facebook group as the membership would be able to feedback any issues and questions could be answered. As we were in a consultation period, answers to questions about the Land Logical work were strictly neutral so as not to skew the voting one way or another and questions on the technical details of the project and process being followed was kept to the facts (it must be reported that this was very difficult, with accusations flying around that actually may have been people's perceptions but mostly wide of the mark). For those without access to the internet or not willing to use online tools, the clerk's home address (official parish council address) was widely circulated in the leaflets and Village Voices. It had never been the intention to print the survey on paper due to the cost of printing, delivery and the processing. At the time the survey closed, there had been only two paper surveys received (one of those was handed over at the February council meeting). There was no additional budget or time (as the survey had started already, to revisit that decision and no way to manage duplicate submissions).

Although there will be lessons to learn if this process is used again, it has been conducted fairly and honestly (and there was no direction or interference from parish councillors in the process). It had been intended to use survey controls to limit the survey to one specific device and just insist on a Post Code to identify the submitter, but there were requests from two individuals to change those settings to enable multiple submission but add a name, which would be used internally but not form part of the results to maintain anonymity - these changes did generate an error in survey processing that was not resolved until the first night of the survey, but apart from two individuals who had an issue, which was fixed later, there did not

appear to be any further technical issues. The policy therefore was to accept all the surveys (complete or not), if question 3 - "Do you support the project continuing to environmental impact assessment and planning where you will be able to comment on the details?" had been completed. There has also been an assessment of duplicate entries - there was one clear example as the same name had been entered on both forms. Forms with none- ME3 9—postcodes were assessed and separated out from the results unless I could make an Allhallows connection some other way.

Now to the results:

Background

It is estimated the around c.600 leaflets were distributed around Allhallows (in addition to copies of Village Voices)

There are 1,875 members reported to be members of the closed Facebook group

There are 691 unique addresses and 1,341 names in those properties on the Electoral Roll.

At the close there were 133 online forms submitted online and two paper forms (the final results will be confirmed after a delay for the post to arrive - and the weather to clear)

159 submitted surveys

Incomplete/Partial Records:

No Q3 40 (not counted in figures)

Q3 Complete (counted in figures - 22/0 4/1 1/3 2/4 5/5 1/7 1/9) - 36

Complete Records - 123 + Incomplete including Q3 = 159

Non-ME3 9 Postcodes or not Allhallows identifiable - 3 deleted

Apparent Duplicates - 6 deleted

The use of scaled responses, rather than just YES/NO FOR/AGAINST was intentional to track strength of support or opposition.

Q3) Do you support the project continuing to environmental impact assessment and planning where you will be able to comment on the details

(rationale was that even the parish council have not seen a specific proposal at this stage and even it is was supported by residents and the council it would still have to go through an environmental impact assessment and then, if it still continued, a full planning process with full consultation within and outside the village would take place, where a number of questions raised would have to be answered and fully quantified - they are not currently)

It will be no surprise that the result of this question was clear:

Strongly Object											Strongly Support	Weighted Average
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
114	15	5	3	3	4	0	4	1	1	2		0.86/10

The answers to the facilities to be funded by Turners and provided by the Parish Council were less clear (apart from tennis and bowling, which lean further to the negative), with weighted averages around the mid-point The parish council may wish to consider further if planning permission is granted for Turner's expansion as these are their identified shortfalls and they are making them available to all the residents at their cost (over £450k and that could be used a match funding for further grants as well)

Would you support the provision of a footpath (Cross Park to Recreation Ground)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
38	9	5	6	5	25	4	7	11	2	25	4.46/10

Do you support the provision of a Bowling Green?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
52	10	6	6	3	33	7	5	5	1	7	3.32/10

Do you support the provision of Tennis Courts?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
52	10	6	6	3	33	7	5	5	1	7	3.06/10

Do you support the provision of a community centre extension to the Pavilion?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
41	11	1	5	5	18	2	10	14	5	23	4.5/10

Yours sincerely



Chris Fribbins, **Parish Clerk**

01/03/2018