



# South West Kettering (Headlands Community) Neighbourhood Plan

February 2016.

## **Summary of Results: N.P. Consultation 17<sup>th</sup> January '16, St. Michael's Church.**

### **Introduction.**

The consultation event in the committee's view and of most of the residents it seems was, as a first-stab at least, pretty good. Residents who did attend and who expressed a view on how it was set-up and handled scored it very highly.

In regard to ideas and concerns about our neighbourhood we collected upwards of a hundred and forty post-it note comments in total. When aligned with 'what do we like' and 'what would we change' we find the two sides complementary in most aspects. In effect, 'these are the things we like and this is how we would like to see them tidied up and preserved'. In regard to things we definitely do not like on the 'change' side there is little on the positive side which is contrary to those views. Only here and there do we see opposing ideas. Trees for example are seen by some residents as lovely assets but by others as causing significant nuisance.

One aspect which became almost immediately apparent to us was that many of the issues raised fall outside of the scope of what we knew to be strictly Neighbourhood Planning guidelines and we found this worrying. We have been advised since then however that community aspirations beyond those relating to the development and use of land can be included with a Neighbourhood Plan, but set out in an attached companion document.

The following pages contain a brief summary of the ideas and concerns submitted during the consultation and which are more comprehensively presented in the appendix 1., and a brief description of the results of our survey of residents impressions of the event, which is detailed in the appendix 2.

In regard to the ongoing work of your committee, out of this consultation we now have a clear indication of the range of issues that neighbourhood residents would like to see us take on board, which is great, and of huge help to us.

As soon as we have composed the appropriate action plan we will present it to you, and get on with it.

Harry Frankland.

cont'd.



### **Ideas and Concerns Submitted.**

One hundred and forty three post-it note comments were received reflecting residents' satisfactions and concerns over neighbourhood issues. These appear to reflect five broad areas of interest with just a few particular items in addition.

The appendix 1. document illustrates the entire range of points raised, their distribution into the five broad areas of interest and the extent of popularity of each one;

Neighbourhood (our locality) comments received	57.
Parking	27.
Buildings & Development	26.
Streets	17.
Traffic	11.
Others	5.

### **Our Locality.**

Three quarters of all the points raised under this heading reflect resident's contentment with our neighbourhood, a big proportion focused on its location in regard to access to town centre, shops, support services, travel and leisure, etc., but with most of the total illustrating the reasons why residents feel that this is just 'a nice place to live'.

Those reflecting resident's concerns include some regrets (lack of open spaces, no post office, etc.), but also some particular worries, for example the 'eventual purpose' of the new railway bridge at the bottom of Headlands.

### **Parking.**

Almost all of the comments received here illustrate a problem which residents would like to see eliminated, or at least eased. Together they illustrate a very widespread and serious concern, and identify a number of the main aspects contributing to the overall problem.

### **Buildings and Development.**

The impression given here is of resident's general satisfaction with the existing mix of buildings; their appearance, purpose, etc. The comments appear to suggest that with few exceptions residents are happy with the 'style' of our neighbourhood and don't want anything new which would not blend in nicely.

### **Streets.**

Two thirds of comments here reflect resident's dislike of a number of problems associated with walking access; pavements mess, inadequate maintenance (both public and private responsibilities), etc. Other positive comments illustrate a liking for some particular issues and perhaps the hope that those initiatives associated with new pavements and roads resurfacing will continue.

### **Traffic.**

Again, the great majority of comments reflect resident's frustrations with traffic flow through the neighbourhood but here with some consideration of solutions which residents might be happy to see us pursue.

cont'd.



### **Comments on the Event Arrangements.**

Twenty eight residents filled out their satisfaction questionnaires at the close of the event. The combined result was better than ever we might have expected with the overall satisfaction rating of the arrangements we had prepared being high, and reflected too in the comments from others who preferred to offer verbal comment and advice.

Just as important to us are the indications of which aspects of the event were particularly enjoyed and of those which were found lacking in some regard or another. For certain one thing we must attend to next time is the arrangement of tables. Whilst many residents enjoyed the opportunity to meet others from the neighbourhood, whole-table discussions were often difficult, constrained by having long tables rather than round ones. Since the core focus of the event was intended to be discussion and exchange of ideas, we must do better next time.

One further impression we received was resident's particular interest in what comes next, and how soon? This we take as an instruction to 'get on with it!', and we will.