## ST JUST IN ROSELAND PARISH – THE WAY FORWARD COORDINATING GROUP

## 4th MEETING - Wed 21 Aug in Memorial Hall Annex 1830hrs

**AGENDA** NB this meeting is likely to exceed the 60mins target

- 1. Welcome. (Chair)
- 2. Matters Arising from Previous Meeting. (Sec). Nothing not covered by agenda
- 3. <u>Public Participation</u>. Opportunity for members of the public to raise any matters (time limited set by the Chair at the outset with the maximum being 10 min in total)
- 4. <u>Consultation Format</u>. (Sec). In line with the feedback 'make it simpler', the main changes are: portrait (vice landscape); 'Importance' options removed; 'About you' much shorter; comments box only at end of each section (not after each statement); softer cell boundary lines. The 'short' tab fits on 2 pieces of paper. <u>Decisions Required</u>. Is CoGp content with this format? Any other format changes recommended?
- 5. <u>Consultation Statements</u>. (Sec). All WGs have had the opportunity to suggest changes to the statements. The attached draft (.docx) is in track changes to enable CoGp members to see the requested changes (not all supported by Sec!). Key here is how long the survey should be. To fit on 2 pieces of paper, Sec suggests removal of those marked '\*\*' (see .xlsx tab 'Short' for consequence of this). It is important that the statements are 'balanced' both individually and collectively: please review all statements in this context. Please come to the meeting with an indication of roughly how many you are inclined 'agree' and how many 'disagree' with (for example, Sec found 16 disagree/20 agree incl \*\* statements). <u>Decisions Required</u>. What should be the final wording of each statement? Is CoGp content with the .xlsx 'Short' tab as a whole?
- 6. <u>Consultation Cover Document</u>. It is recommended that this be included with the Consultation Statements as 'guidance'. <u>Decisions Required</u>. Does CoGp support this? What changes are recommended?
- 7. <u>Comms</u>. (Sec). We are clearly not getting our message out: zero emails to <u>Sjir24.info@gmail.com</u>. Should we hold a Public Meeting just before/just after (or both!) the distribution of the Consultation Survey to promote engagement (and responses!)? <u>Decisions Required</u>. What action (if any) should we undertake to promote awareness of the initiative and a good response to the Consultation?
- 8. <u>Consultation Distribution, Collation & Analysis</u>. How are we going to distribute the surveys, collate the responses, analyse the responses and develop ideas for Phase 2? Printing is sorted. We need volunteers to deliver to each property in the Parish. (Completed surveys are to be handed in to the Post Office.) We need circa 6 pairs of people to collate results into a .xlsx template (already developed) that will allow analysis. Once analysed, the results go to WGs for the development of proposals for Phase 2 consultation. <u>Decisions</u> Required. Does this 'work'? Who are the volunteers?
- 9. Timeline. Potential timeline:
- 21 Aug CoGp decisions finalise texts & format
- 26 Aug Final version circulated to CoGp and WG Chairs for proof checking
- 30 Aug Printing and compiling
- W/c 2 Sep Distribution
- 30 Sep Deadline for responses
- 12 Oct Collation & Analysis complete
- 16 Oct Review by CoGp
- 30 Oct Proposals for Phase 2 considered by CoGp
- 9/10 Nov Phase 2 consultation in Memorial Hall

<u>Decisions Required</u>. Is this realistic & desirable?

- 10. AoB. Coordinating Group Membership do we have the right numbers and balance?
- 11. Date of Next Meeting. 16 Oct

## Alan Macklin

Secretary, St Just in Roseland Parish - The Way Forward