

BPC Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee

Minutes of the Special meeting held on Tuesday, 19th. September, 2017

8.00 p.m. at the Botley Market Hall

Present

Voting members : David Grinham, Chairman (DG), Cllr. Ron Clark (RC), Cllr. John Gorham (JG), Cllr. Sue Grinham (SG), Hugh Dixon (HD), Stephen Harris (SH), Bob Nimmo (BN), Derek Oswald (DO),

Non voting: Cllr. Jenni Fletcher (JF), Gerald Bradley (GB).

Opted out of voting: Rosemary Nimmo (Secretary)

1. Apologies: Cllr. Jeff Jones, Mike Turnbull, Stephen Wildin,
Cllr. Colin Mercer is away from home.

2. Declaration of Interest: There were no declarations

3. Feed in on drop-in session, 16th. September

DO reported that last Saturday's drop-in had been very useful, with 96 people attending between 10.00 and 3.00, some returning their questionnaires and others taking extra copies for family members. Various comments had been left on post-it notes and NP members had explained the Plan, answered many questions and discussed various issues. DO thanked all the committee helpers, SG, BN, RN and also Louise, who had helped to set up the room.

The Chairman spent a couple of hours at the session and felt that there had been very good interaction and feedback. He thanked DO for organising the event.

4. Proposed second drop-in on Saturday, 23rd. November.

This is arranged for next Saturday, 10.00 to 2.00, although it will clash with the HCC Uplands Farm site taking place on the 22nd./23rd. We will use the Committee Room again as it worked well last week.

Volunteers for staffing (so far) are as follows:

SW - All of the session,	SG - For 10.00 a.m.	JJ - From 11.00
DG - A couple of hours.	HD - Up to 1.30.	RC - An hour at some stage

The Secretary asked those attending to be sure to point out that this was only the first of several consultations – this does not appear in the literature and last week some people had been confused about the programme.

5. The questionnaire.

i) Unapproved changes to the leaflet.

The Chairman outlined the timeline for production of the questionnaire.

- Consultation subjects were decided at the June Advisory Committee meeting. These were BO2 with provisos, BO2 with funding for the by-pass, the by-pass itself.
- At the August meeting the Communications sub-group were asked to devise questions to cover the three topic areas. DG then arranged for these to be psychometrically assessed by a top international expert in the field. (She has done this free of charge as a favour to DG).

At the recent meeting with EBC, attended by DG, CM, SW and Tony Charles, the Borough representatives thoroughly approved this arrangement and hope to use the system themselves for future consultation.

- The final draft of the questionnaire contained as part of Q.3 – "If delivery of the by-pass was dependant on up to 375 houses being built behind Winchester Street, would you still support the by-pass?" This covered one of the specific areas the full NP committee had agreed to consult on.
- As the leaflet was about to go to print this question was removed on the grounds that two members of the committee had been told that all funding for the by-pass would come from HCC and Government sources. Written confirmation was not available.

This decision was taken by a minority of the sub-group and against the specific request of other members and the Chairman. The sub-group does not have the power to overrule a voted decision of the main committee. This removal means that one of the three approved subjects, BO2 with funding for the by-pass, is not included in the consultation.

The Chairman has since asked HCC for information about the by-pass funding. Their reply says that development at Uplands Farm (2 sites) is likely to be needed to fund the by-pass. (See Appendix 1 to these minutes). An FOI request has also been submitted.

Fortunately the remaining questions are of good quality and should produce appropriate and informative responses, although as an essential element was removed, completeness was not achieved.

ii). Unapproved changes to the online questionnaire.

The online response form, as it appears on the website, differs from the printed leaflet in two ways:

- There is no facility for providing name and address. This is needed to confirm that the responder lives in the parish and is not submitting more than one entry.
- Additional wording has been added to the preamble under the heading "Botley Bypass". This may affect the responses to some following questions.
- Additional wording has also been added to the preamble under the heading "Proposed development of land between Winchester Street and the railway line". This states that " A Neighbourhood Plan cannot override such a policy". This introduces bias and will certainly affect responses to several following questions.

When questioned, the webmaster, CM, replied that collection of names and addresses in online surveys was not allowed under Data Protection rules. He said that the programme being used has built in checks for multiple entries, but it is not clear to the committee how this will work or how residency can be confirmed. However, the Information Commissioners Office has told us that it is definitely allowable to request such details, subject to the laid down safeguards, principally that respondents must be told the purpose for which their details will be used and how they will be dealt with later. (See Appendix 2).

It was noted that CM is the only person with access rights to enter data or make changes to the online survey and this was identified as a cause for concern.

iii). Actions to be taken.

It is essential that the online questionnaire exactly matches the hard copy leaflet in order that the consultation is valid. There was extended discussion on the problem. The following points were made:

- The differences between the two forms of questionnaire effectively mean that the results cannot be merged. (DG)
- It might be possible to use email addresses to contact people and ask them to re-do the survey (SG) but people might be unhappy about this and not bother (JG).
- It makes us look incompetent.
- If the results are statistically similar they may be useable (GB).

The Chairman said that the right action is to take down the site and replace it with the corrected version. Then a line will be drawn and previous inputs ignored, unless the responders can be contacted to re-do the corrected version and provide names and addresses for validation.

RC then proposed that the webmaster should be asked to remove the site as soon as possible, add space for names and addresses, remove the additional wording before questions 1 and 7, and re-instate it as an exact duplicate of the hard copy leaflet.

This was seconded by BN and the vote was unanimous.

It was agreed that we will ask the Parish Clerk to contact CM.

Following from this JF said that she understood that only 2000 questionnaires were printed initially, which was clearly insufficient. More were said to be coming. We need SW to confirm that all households in the parish, including all outlying areas and the new houses at Boorley Park, have been supplied.

6. Process for collating and analysing the consultation results

It is vital that no unintentional bias be allowed to affect the process. As there were strong feelings in the Advisory Committee it was suggested that, after collation, analysis of the results should be carried out by an independent third party, possibly employed for the purpose. To conform with data protection we would need to strip out all identification after collation and before passing to the analyst.

For the sake of security and integrity all hard copies when collected must be kept in a secure location. DO will undertake to provide safe storage for the collected returns. After collation and analysis they will be passed to the Parish Clerk for safe storage until such a time as they are no longer needed.

The Chairman therefore proposed;

That the paper questionnaires should be collected as agreed. They should be entered on a data base by two independent people, one to input and one to verify. Once made anonymous they can be passed to a third party, subject to complete adherence to Data Protection rules.

This was seconded by SG and agreed unanimously.

Final decisions on the system to be used will be taken at the October 2nd. meeting.

7. Future leadership and membership of the Communications sub-group.

The Communications group has been led by DO and members are CM, SG, and MT (co-opted.) SW has become involved, as Project Manager. The production of the questionnaire proved very difficult and DO has now stood down as leader, although he will remain in the group. There were no volunteers for this post so DG said that he would stand in until someone else came forward.

GB then proposed DG as interim leader of the sub-group. This was seconded by SH and agreed by all.

The Chairman expressed grateful thanks to DO for his work in leading the group in difficult circumstances. JF and RC said they would also like to join the sub-group.

There followed discussion about the remit of sub-groups and the duties of the project manager, (PM). The Chairman pointed out that the PM was not elected to the post and did not have power over the other members of the NP group. DO said that we should more clearly define the PM role. This is principally to plan the programme for the group, work to ensure that the project stays on target and help to build an effective working relationship among the members. JF suggested that we should draw a line under any

previous difficulties. It was therefore agreed that JG would draw up a comprehensive job description for the role of PM.

Regarding the remit of the sub-groups, and indeed all members of the NP, the Secretary said that everyone is subject to the agreed decisions of the Advisory Committee. It was therefore decided that this should be re-confirmed in the following proposal:

No sub-group, or any individual NP member, regardless of status, can override or alter a decision that has been voted on and agreed by the NP Advisory Committee. Any amendments thought necessary must be submitted to the Advisory Committee for approval.

Proposed by DG, seconded by SG and agreed unanimously

(It is noted that, as a sub-committee of the Parish Council, the members are also subject to the PC's standing orders).

8. Improvements to the consultation process for future rounds.

HD thought that the proposal just agreed would do much to solve any future problems.

GB asked if we were consulting local groups and DO explained that contact with stakeholders, including local voluntary groups, was going well and he will seek to expand this.. Jonathon Appleby is keen to see the Mill involved and JJ is liaising with him. We should do more to reach out to and involve younger generations through social media and other methods. We must look for likely candidates with the necessary knowledge and enthusiasm to assist with this.

9. Any other business

Data protection

DG said that it was vital we adhere rigorously to the data protection rules. The Parish Clerk has provided an example of the rules as used by another NP group and the ICO is always willing to give advice.

NP Workshop

The CPRE are holding a workshop on neighbourhood planning at Sparsholt College on 5th. October. The cost is £30 per head which we should fund for anyone wishing to attend. The Chairman will go if possible – this should be a very useful event so will anyone who wishes to attend please let him know.

10. Date of next meeting

This is confirmed as Monday, October 2nd. 7.15 at the Committee Room.

* Please see Appendices below

Rosemary Nimmo, Secretary

26.09.17

APPENDIX 1

From: Jo <jo@uplandsfarmestate.co.uk>

Subject: Re: Consultation on proposals for Uplands Farm Estate in Botley and Hedge En

Date: 18 September 2017 16:08:27 BST

Please see response to your query below:

In response to local housing and education needs, Hampshire County Council as a landowner is developing proposals for new homes, a secondary school and associated development on the Uplands Farm Estate in Botley and Hedge End. As Highway Authority and in response to growing transport demand in the Botley area, the County Council has also submitted a planning application for a Botley bypass. As part of the development proposals, land at Uplands Farm is to be made available to enable the future development of a Botley by-pass. Both development sites will be required to make appropriate planning contributions towards Highway improvements in the locality, this is likely to include a contribution towards the construction of the Botley by-pass.

Jo Hatton Jones

Communications and consultation

Uplands Farm Estate - on behalf of Hampshire County Council

07990 078365

APPENDIX 2

Subject: Response from the ICO[Ref. ENQ0701421]

19 September 2017

Case Reference Number ENQ0701421

Dear Ms Grinham

Thank you for your email of 18 September 2017. My understanding is that your Parish Council wants to conduct an online survey of its parishioners and in order to confirm the respondents live in the locality of the Parish you want to confirm names and addresses of the respondents.

In order to comply with the Data Protection Act (DPA) you'll need to ensure fair processing is given to the Parishioners, this means you need to tell them what you are collecting the information for and what you will be doing with it and if there's a lawful reason to do so. It's important to be clear from the offset and to deal with any concerns you may have from the Parishioners.

The main principles here are [principle one](#) which says 'Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully' and [principle two](#) which states 'Personal data shall be obtained only for one or more specified and lawful purposes, and shall not be further processed in any manner incompatible with that purpose or those purposes'.

Obviously all the principles are to be adhered to and the security of data ([principle seven](#)) is very important. You need to be clear and transparent about why you need the data and how you want to use it so the Parishioners will be able to see exactly what you're doing with their information and why.

With regard to using a [third party](#) to collate the information you receive, again you would need to be clear from the outset that you intend using a third party and why as well as having a clear understanding with any third party of their specific role and what will happen to the personal information they process on your behalf. **If you can anonymise the personal data sent to the third party, you can negate any potential disclosure or inappropriate use of the data.** The [retention periods](#) for information isn't specified within the DPA, it only states to keep data as long as is necessary but not excessively, so you would need to work out how long it's practicable to retain the information and why.

I hope this information is helpful to you. If you would like to discuss this case further please contact me on 01625 545 281. If you need advice on a new issue you can contact us via our Helpline on 0303 123 1113 or through our [live chat service](#). In addition, more information about the Information Commissioner's Office and the legislation we oversee is available on our website at www.ico.org.uk.

Yours sincerely,
David Dutton, Case Officer

Information Commissioner's Office

0303 123 1113 ext 5281