



A Roos Parish Council initiative

ROOS PARISH PLAN

‘Refreshed’ 2012 Appendices



Roos Parish Plan 'Refreshed' 2012

Appendices

1. Key stages: Development and Consultation.
2. Roos Parish Plan Questionnaire Analysis.
3. Questionnaire - Supplementary Comments.

Appendix 1: Key stages: Development and Consultation



NOVEMBER 2010

A Humber and Wolds Rural Community Council (HWRCC) Questionnaire on outcomes of the 2006 Parish Plan is completed.

A meeting of former Parish Plan Committee members with Peter Hirschfeld (HWRCC) and Karen Wood (ERYC) discussed the current status of Community Led Parish Plans and their role in relationship to overarching bodies, such as the East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC).

DECEMBER 2010

Roos Parish Council submitted the Questionnaire response to HWRCC and requested that the Parish Plan Committee reconvene to 'Refresh' Roos Parish Plan 2006 on behalf of the Council.

Subsequently, The Rooster parish newsletter was used to inform and consult with the community. The parish council received regular progress reports as it featured as a regular agenda item.

JANUARY 2011

An announcement in The Rooster stating that Roos Parish Council had decided to update and refresh the Parish Plan first introduced in 2006. It invited any member of the parish who wished to discuss its development, or wished to volunteer their assistance in any way, to contact either the Parish Council or the Chair of the Parish Planning Group. Steve Midgley and Keith Tyson subsequently joined the group.

An application for funding for an Awards for All Grant was drafted and submitted by the Parish Council.

The 2004/5 Parish Plan Questionnaire was evaluated and updated where appropriate and new topics introduced.

Draft Questionnaires were checked by HWRCC and the Rural Communities Officer of ERYC to ensure relevance and that account was being taken of current legislation and government policies.

A grant of £1000 was awarded by Renewable Energy Systems (RES) as a contribution towards preparation of the Questionnaire.

FEBRUARY - MARCH 2011

The Rooster published a progress report noting the application for funding to Awards for All.

Formal, preparatory work was suspended awaiting a decision from Awards for All

JUNE 2011

The Rooster published an article which analysed and commented upon the successful outcomes of the 2006 parish plan.

Attention was drawn to the changing political context suggested by the Localism Bill and ERYC's preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF). Together these would determine the parameters for strategic development for the next 15-20 years.

It was learned that Awards for All had refused the application for funding as it was a revision rather than a new initiative.

JULY 2011

Roos Parish Council was informed that the draft questionnaire would be available for distribution in the autumn.


SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2011

A parish wide consultation presentation was planned. Invitations were issued to groups and organisations across the parish. An announcement in The Rooster invited any individual who wished to participate, or engage in discussion to attend the meeting to be held on Monday November 7th at 7.00pm in The Memorial Institute. The Parish Plan Group prepared a Powerpoint Presentation which evaluated the successes of the previous Plan and helped establish a context in which all the key issues could be discussed. Peter Hirschfeld (HWRCC) and ERYC Councillors Cracknell and Hodgson provided an overview of regional and national issues followed by small group discussions which helped inform and refine the Questionnaire. A comprehensive report was published in The Rooster.

It was reported that further sponsorship for printing 550 copies of the Questionnaire had been obtained from Vivergofuels.

DECEMBER 2011.

The Parish Plan Questionnaire was printed, distributed to and subsequently collected from, every household in Roos Parish.



JANUARY - MARCH 2012

Questionnaire data was inputted into a SNAP Questionnaire Analysis programme provided by HWRCC. A number of trials and further consultation with HWRCC resulted in the outcomes being presented in a 'user friendly' readily understood format.

MARCH 2012

The Questionnaire Analysis was submitted to the Parish Council for comment. Preparation of a draft report and an action plan commenced.

JUNE 2012

A Draft Parish Plan is submitted to Roos Parish Council.

August 2012


Final Draft and Action Plan approved by Roos Parish Council.

September - October 2012

Design and Publication

Roos Parish Plan

Questionnaire Analysis



ROOS **COMMUNITY LED**

PARISH PLAN QUESTIONNAIRE 2011

ROOS - TUNSTALL - HILSTON - OWSTWICK

Appendix 2: Questionnaire Analysis

Process.

- Completed Questionnaires were collected from Households.
(A notice published in The Rooster invited Householders to contact the Chair or any member of the Parish Plan group to arrange collection of any missing questionnaires).
- A total of 205 were collected, a small number of them had not been completed.
- Each Questionnaire was allocated a number as it was received.
- Responses to Question 13a Planning and Land Use were entered onto a master map.
- Comments made upon the Supplementary Sheet were copied together with the occasional comment written alongside a question in the Questionnaire.
- Members of the Parish Plan group entered responses into the Snap Analysis programme provided by Humber and Wolds Rural Community Council (HWRCC).
- This process identified a number of technical issues not least that the HWRCC analysis did not provide data in a 'user friendly' easily understood format. These issues were resolved in collaboration with HWRCC and should the need arise to enable returns from Roos, Tunstall, Hilston, and Owstwick to be separated and examined individually.
- Steve Midgley and Brian Wells have subsequently arranged the data to fit the format of the original Questionnaire and added priority lists where appropriate.
- Analysis of Q13a is awaiting information from ERYC.

Cllr. Willis Ainley, Chair Roos Parish Plan Committee

PART 1: Completed by the Head of Household only

The purpose was to provide a more detailed overview of the Parish.

PART 2: Completed by individuals aged 14 years or over

The purpose was to seek individual opinion and establish the priorities of residents across various age groups.

Part 1: For completion by the Head of Household only

Question 1 & 2

Where is your home and how many people including children normally live in your household?

	No.of Homes	Under 14 years	14 years and over
Roos	156	34	283
Tunstall	23	0	49
Hilston	6	0	12
Owstwick	9	1	17
Other	0	0	0
Total	194	35	361

Question 3

Has any member of your household moved from Roos Parish in the last five years?

Yes	23
No	166
Total	189

Question 4

How many left for one or more of the following reasons?

For each reason enter the number of persons for whom it was true.

Employment/Education	12
To live independently/or with partner	19
Lack of suitable property to buy	1
Lack of rented accommodation	1
Total	33

Part 2:

For completion by individuals aged 14 years or over

Each individual in your household should select a number (1-6) and all answers for that individual should be put in the same numbered box.

1. Your Personal Profile

Question 5

What is your gender?

Gender	No.	%
Male	169	47.5
Female	187	52.5
Total	356	100

Question 6

What is your age group?

Age(years)	No.	%
14-18	15	4.3
19-24	5	1.4
25-40	33	9.4
41-60	123	34.9
61-80	154	43.7
81+	22	6.3
Total	352	100

Question 7

How long have you lived in Roos Parish?

Time(years)	No.	%
Less than 5	49	13.9
5-10	60	17.0
11-25	127	36.0
More than 25	117	33.1
Total	353	100

Question 8

What is most important about where you live? Tick one box only.

Importance	No.	%
Its Location	71	19.9
The Community	86	24.2
The Rural Setting	199	55.9
Total	356	100

2. A Sense of Place

2.1 The Rural Environment

The Government's Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 requires implementation of its policies by ERYC and Parish Councils.

The Parish Plan Questionnaire of 2005 identified that the Rural Environment was very highly valued by respondents.

Since that time Roos Parish Council has maintained a proactive approach towards the protection and enhancement of the Parish, e.g. recent renovation of Roos Pinfold and planting of bulbs in grass verges etc.

Question 9

Should this policy be maintained?

Maintain Policy	No.	%
Yes	323	95.6
No	15	4.4
Total	338	100

An outcome of ERYC policy has been the development of the Local Country Mile project which supports groups of volunteers interested in monitoring roadside verges and hedgerows.

Question 10

Should the Parish Council encourage the establishment of such a group?

Establish Groups	No.	%
Yes	306	92.2
No	26	7.8
Total	332	100

2.2 Planning and Land Use

Roos is identified by ERYC as a Secondary Rural Service Centre of Withernsea which is likely to allow for some building development of an average of 2.1 dwellings per annum.

Question 11

What type of accommodation do you think is required? Tick more than one box, if appropriate.

Accommodation	No.	%	Priority
Rented	66	18.3	4
Starter Home	183	50.7	1
Sheltered	47	13.0	5
2-3 Bedrooms	82	22.7	2
4+Bedrooms	20	5.5	6
Holiday/Leisure	10	2.8	7
No need for any of these	77	21.3	3
Total of Possible Respondents	361		

Question 12

Do you think the Parish Council should continue to resist “backland” development as suggested in the Village Design Statement, e.g. in gardens? Note: Backland development occurs behind existing road frontages already developed.

Resist“Backland”Development	No.	%
Yes	202	60.5
No	52	15.6
Don’t Know/NotSure	80	24.0
Total	334	100

Question 13

Do you think the existing village building development boundary, as shown on the map on back page, should be extended to accommodate new development?

Boundary Extended	No.	%
Yes	92	27.1
No	187	55.2
Don’tKnow/NotSure	60	17.7
Total	339	100

If your answer is Yes, then please go to the Supplementary Question 13a on the back page, before continuing.

2.3 Allotments

Question 14

Does your household require an allotment? Only one person should answer.

Yes	24
No	166
Total	190

Question 15

Should the Parish Council identify and possibly purchase land for community benefit, e.g. for allotments?

LandPurchase	No.	%
Yes	236	71.7
No	93	28.3
Total	329	100

2.4 Conservation Areas

Question 16

Do you live in a Conservation Area?

ConservationArea	No.	%
Yes	79	23.2
No	180	52.9
Don'tKnow/NotSure	81	23.9
Total	340	100

Question 17

Are you aware of the statutory duties and responsibilities applicable to Conservation Areas?

(Planning issues relating to minor works, e.g. windows replacements, tree surgery etc).

Responsibilities	No.	%
Yes	186	56.2
No	145	43.8
Total	331	100

2.5 Renewable Energy

Two separate wind farms have been granted planning consent in the Parish together with another in the neighbouring Parish of Burton Pidsea. An Application for a single turbine is being considered in the adjacent Parish of Rimswell.

Question 18

Should Roos Parish Council maintain its policy of opposing any further such development in this and other parishes?

Oppose Further Development	No.	%
Yes	269	79.1
No	71	20.9
Total	340	100

3. Community Assets

Question 19

Which Community Assets do you particularly value?

Respondents were invited to make more than one response.

Community Asset	No.	%	Priority
Roos Memorial Institute	212	58.7	5
Roos Playing Field/Pavilion	168	46.5	8
Tunstall Village Hall	63	17.5	11
Post Office	288	79.8	1
Churches	195	54.0	6
Mobile Library	92	25.5	10
The Rooster Newsletter	248	68.7	4
Doctor's Surgery/Dispensary	287	79.5	2
Public Houses	193	53.5	7
Local Shops	266	73.7	3
Garages	116	32.1	9
Total of Possible Respondents	361		

Question 20

Which of the following would you prioritise for refurbishment or development?

Respondents were invited to make more than one response.

Priority	No.	%	Priority
Roos Memorial Institute	159	44.0	1
Roos Playing Field/Pavilion	101	28.0	4
Tunstall Village Hall	41	11.4	5
Roos Parish Churches	130	36.0	2
New Build Community/SportsCentre	107	29.6	3
Total of Possible Respondents	361		

Question 21

Should the Parish Council provide financial support to ensure the ongoing viability of Community Groups and Associations?

FinancialSupport	No.	%
Yes	273	83.0
No	56	17.0
Total	329	100

Question 22

Would you like more information about the RES Community Fund established to fund local projects?

More Information	No.	%
Yes	174	53.9
No	149	46.1
Total	323	100

4. Safer Communities

4.1 Emergency Planning

Question 23

Are you aware that Roos Parish has an Emergency Plan to deal with flooding, disasters and other adverse conditions?

Emergency Plan	No.	%
Yes	290	85.5
No	49	14.5
Total	339	100

Question 24

Do you know who to contact in order to activate it?

Contact	No.	%
Yes	138	41.2
No	197	58.8
Total	335	100

4.2 Policing and Anti-Social Behaviour

Question 25

Which, if any, of the following anti-social issues concern you in the Parish?

Respondents were invited to make more than one response.

Anti-Social Concerns	No.	%	Priority
Dog Fouling	211	58.4	1
Litter	136	37.7	5
Fly Tipping	163	45.2	3
Vandalism	98	27.1	6
Dog Control	58	16.1	7
Damage to Grass Verges by Vehicles	187	51.8	2
Mud on the Roads	157	43.5	4
Total of Possible Respondents	361		

Question 26

Would you support a Neighbourhood Watch scheme in your area? Only one person should answer.

	No.	%
Yes	159	91.9
No	14	8.1
Total	173	100

4.3 Roads and Traffic

Question 27

Which of the following issues do you consider to be of concern? Respondents were invited to make more than one response.

Issue	No.	%	Priority
SpeedingTraffic	209	57.9	1
Parking	118	32.7	3
LargeVehicles on LocalRoads	117	32.4	4
Road Surface Maintenance	189	52.4	2
Width of Roads	88	24.4	5
Visibility at Road Junctions	86	23.8	6
Total of Possible Respondents	361		

5. Community Services

5.1 Public Transport

Question 28

RequirePublicTransport	No.	%
Daily	36	10.3
Weekly	15	4.3
Sometimes	125	35.7
Never	174	49.7
Total	350	100

Question 29

If so, what would you use it for?

Reason for Use	No.	%	Priority
Getting to Work	21	5.8	4
Getting to School/FurtherEducation etc	17	4.7	5
Access to Services e.g.Health Services (Hospital,Doctor,Dentist etc.)	85	23.5	2
Getting to Shops	96	26.6	1
Leisure/Pleasure	84	23.3	3
Total of Possible Respondents	361		

Question 30

Would you use and support more flexible arrangements, e.g. Initiatives such as “ring and ride” schemes?

Flexible Arrangements	No.	%
Yes	159	52.0
No	147	48.0
Total	306	100

5.2 Connectivity

This term is used to describe internet and mobile phone coverage and use.

Question 31

Does your household have internet access, if so which type? Only one person should answer.

	No.	%
Conventional Dial-Up	5	2.7
Conventional Broadband	110	59.8
Radio Broadband	3	1.6
Satellite Broadband	10	5.4
Mobile Telephone Broadband	13	7.1
No Internet Access	43	23.4
Total	184	100

Question 32

What internet speed do you achieve in your household? Only one person should answer.

To ensure consistency in the data provided, please use the following link to measure your speed.

<http://www.mybroadbandspeed.co.uk/speedtest>

kbps

Please specify your Service Provider.....

Question 33

What do you use your internet for? Tick more than one box, if appropriate.

Internet Use	No.	%	Priority
Business/Work	79	21.9	4
Social/Domestic	177	49.0	3
Leisure/Pleasure	208	57.6	1
Shopping/Personal Banking etc	185	51.2	2
Total of Possible Respondents	361		

Question 34

How do you rate your mobile phone connectivity in the area?

Mobile Connectivity	No.	%
Excellent	11	3.4
Good	68	21.3
Adequate	86	26.9
Poor	140	43.7
Don't have a mobile	15	4.7
Total	320	100

Question 35

Which Mobile phone Network do you use?

Mobile Network	No.	%
BT	10	3.1
Vodafone	74	23.3
Orange	79	24.8
O2	99	31.2
3G	21	6.6
T Mobile	16	5.0
Other please specify:	19	6.0
Total	318	100

5.3 Recycling

Question 36

Following the Council's Recycling Initiatives: How often do you think the following bins need to be collected?

Only one person should answer.

Bin Collection	Weekly	Fortnightly	Monthly
Green Waste	98	79	11
Brown Garden Compost	21	136	27
Blue Recycling	22	104	62

6. Parish Council

Question 37

How do you rate the performance of the Parish Council over the past 5 years?

Rating	No.	%
Excellent	45	13.4
Good	166	49.6
Adequate	64	19.1
Poor	10	3.0
Don't Know	50	14.9
Total	335	100

Question 38

Should the Parish Council review its procedures to allow members of the public to contribute information, at the monthly Parish Council meeting, prior to the council making a decision?

Review Procedures	No.	%
Yes	253	83.2
No	51	16.8
Total	304	100

Question 39


Do you use any of the following Initiatives? Tick more than one box, if appropriate.

Initiative	No.	%	Priority
Roos Village Design Statement	30	8.3	4
Roos Parish Plan	33	9.1	3
Roos Parish Paths Leaflet	22	6.1	5
Roos Parish Information Leaflet	36	10.0	1
Roos Parish Website	35	9.7	2
Riparian Ownership Information	15	4.2	7
Conservation Area Information	20	5.5	6
Total of Possible Respondents	361		

Supplementary Question 13a: Planning and Land Use

Preferred locations for future building development in Roos.

Please put a X outside the present Village Development Limit (shown in red) to indicate your preferred location for future building development



Roos Parish Council gratefully acknowledges the support of:



Appendix 3: Supplementary Comment Sheet - Responses

Number of Questionnaires returned	205
Number of Respondents making written comments	36

1	5	In 1989 I receive a letter saying that the road was going to be re-laid. This never happened. What they did was the main street from Roos to the crossroad then the road from the crossroads to Hornsea and Burton Pidsea. They missed the stretch between and has still never been done. (This is signed)
2	9	In these austere times, when savings are paramount, I do not understand the mentality of those who wish to see more expenditure, on a plan which is less than six years old. Even the National Census is only conducted every 10 years. Come on Roos PC start saving money, not wasting it on unnecessary paperwork.
3	10	If any future development takes place in the village the parking facilities should be a priority. No parking on verges etc. We are trying to get extra parking on Eastfield Estate but to no avail as ERYC say no grass can be taken up.
4	14	Re: Question 4.2. I would like to add that we do find Roos quite a safe-area to live in!
5	46	1.The bridge over the Roos Drain has been transformed with the addition of unnecessary large road signs + the road is far wider now than people envisaged. Much tighter controls are needed to protect our rural environment. 2.ERYC waste money on replacing plastic bollards which will obviously get skittled down again. The wooden ones are far better.
6	47	Empty houses should be compulsory purchase and then sold on to local family. Restrictions should be imposed on caravan parks or pay their way. Would like to see weight limits on the main road. Stop purchase of property for rent out.
7	48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Want to retain village in terms of its rural tranquillity. Don't want to see extension of 'street lighting'. We really enjoy star light panorama we get here. ● Love community aspects of village life = tradition ● Love having two thriving & different public houses, the school, church, shops. Really lucky. We need to sustain these but don't want too much expansion.
8	53	4.3. Roads & traffic Parking outside school !!!!
9	56	Include in RES Fund Projects Extend street lighting in South Park to cover all South Park. Improve internet access by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) BT to supply village with fibre optic cable b) Set up satellite dish & feed community with access. (See project set up at Robin Hood's Bay)
10	59	Person 1 – If starter homes are built then these should not be bought to let. It defeats the object trying to be achieved.

11	61	<p>I would be keen to see more shelter belts and increased hedging to protect the village and its wildlife.</p> <p>Farmers should be discouraged from over-cutting hedges.</p> <p>Tree planting should be encouraged – the most recently planted kerbside & verge trees have not taken well due to their being badly planted. A more coherent approach is needed and would be better managed locally.</p>
12	81	<p>Would like to see North and South Ends joined by building houses along the main street this would also encourage traffic control. Introduce a 20mph speed limit but only in front of the school and only at specific times i.e. Mon – Fri 08-15 to 09-15, 12-00 to 13-00 and 15-15 to 16-15. (If that happens to be when the children are arriving/leaving the school)</p> <p>Outside of these limits keep the 30mph.</p>
13	86	<p>Qu.17 is misleading. If you live in a conservation Area there are no restrictions on replacing your windows from wood to plastic!</p> <p>However there are restrictions if you are a listed Building!</p>
14	88	<p>Economic Growth: With Localism not far away the parish needs to identify areas of economic growth, ideally in the hands of local people, businesses and the Local Authority.</p> <p>The parish has the ability to be sustainable , just look@ the local employment and output from local industry.</p> <p>Locally we can lead/direct our community into work, how – innovation – best use of community funds. I believe as councillors we have a duty to try a new approach to make our communities prosper – regeneration through a local approach letting our residents, local businesses, organisations into 'driving seat' to promote local growth. Community fund(start up packages0 not individual in T's & C's @ moment, may be a way forward especially if linked to 'renewable energy' I have discussed the principle with Richard Evans at RES – he has not commented either way; only to confirm that regeneration is perhaps a way forward. Growth of our parish & it ticks government boxes. (This is signed)</p>
15	91	<p>I would rather see the boundary extended than more housing within the boundary. This would prevent houses being too crowded and keep some space within existing buildings.</p>
16	92	<p>Any further building done in Roos should be done in a style that fits in with the village, with adequate space around each property to allow for parking/gardens.</p> <p>Maintaining the rural environment should be a priority – planting of trees/bulbs/hedges/using native plants/trees.</p> <p>Maintenance of the roads in Roos Parish area is also important. A lot of the roads, especially some of the smaller roads have poor surfaces, especially at North End, Tunstall & Hilston.</p> <p>It would be really nice to have some allotments in the village - I think it would add to the sense of community.</p> <p>I would like to see the Roos Parish Paths info extended to include local Bridleways. We have some good local businesses & I regularly use the shops, pub& motor mechanic. What I do dislike is the field full of wrecks at North End Garage - it's an eyesore& probably a health hazard. How did the Parish Council ever let the proprietor get away with it?! Maintaining our church & Memorial Institute should be a priority of the Parish Council & I would support any initiatives related to this.</p>
17	100	<p>I feel that all planning applications should be decided upon their own merit not on where someone decided to draw a red line on a map or whether it's a back garden, but judged upon the need for the individual requirements of the proposer.</p>
18	104	<p>Planning and development regulations need more frequent consideration and parishioners kept more informed of changes.</p>
19	108	<p>As a resident of Hilston we are unable to receive any internet service through a BT line and the possibility of the line being upgraded in the near future seems very remote. We would appreciate any help in achieving some form of connection.</p>
20	122	<p>We pay Roos council tax for this parish why isn't North End, Roos considered in any of your future plans or are we all in this area "nonennaties". Don't we get a say in what we want in this area of Roos.</p>
21	123	<p>Getting high speed broadband would be very beneficial to our family.</p>

22	131	18. What is the point of anything if the government can override any decision taken at parish or county level (e.g. wind turbines) 13. There is plenty of land available conveniently enveloped in the Conservation Area
23	134	1.The provision of more young family housing is essential to maintain the school. 2.Provision of water supply to church and churchyard 3.Smooth safe surfacing of path from South End to churchyard.
24	141	1.This is not Beechwood Views it is Pilmar Lane Nos 48-62 and wishes to remain so. 2.Why is this paddock part of the Conservation area? Surely a perfect site for starter homes. (This includes a diagram/map and an arrow referring to the paddock on Rectory Road)
25	142	I feel that a play area for older children would be a welcomed addition to the village, for example, a scooter park which when constructed would require minimal additional cost & supervision.
26	146	We have just moved to Roos and are keen to learn of the Parish Council initiatives and becoming members of the community. (This is signed)
27	149	1.We feel very strongly about the imposed abuse of our village by the proposed 'industrial' wind turbines. 2.If funds are available from whatever source, the village community could benefit from the installation of water (mains supply) to our church. Besides the obvious benefits, a toilet could be installed. 3.At present we do not have a 'Village Green', a central place where one could meet, sit and communicate. Possibly the pinfold could be used, or perhaps a new area identified? 4.Broadband is painfully slow – a fibre optic cable would be superb! (This is signed)
28	160	1.The internet is a major problem for my son's homework also it makes it impossible to work from home. BT have told us that "are far from the exchange" to achieve a fast & reliable service. 2.Although I am not against wind turbine development 'enough is enough' as the character of the village is been destroyed and soon we will be living in an industrial wind farm site as we will be surrounded on all sides.
29	176	We live in a Conservation Area and are very concerned that residents are making changes e.g. new windows, satellite dishes, barns with double glazing units that do not agree with conservation rules. If people do not ask for permission it appears they can do what they like. Should there be a regular conservation review of the parish to ensure conservation policies are adhered to? This should at least be part of the village walk about by the parish councillors. The reason for conservation is to ensure the village retains its character but unfortunately many residents seem to disregard this.
30	181	The low road from Tunstall to the main Roos to Withernsea Road seems inadequate especially since the entrance to Sand le Mere has been located there. Because the volume of traffic has increased the road is not wide enough and some of the bends are blind.
31	184	Question 18 refers to renewable energy but I think the parish should have an established position with respect to other forms of energy development. There is the possibility of gas cavern development at Owswick. Rathlin Energy recently sent out flyers stating that they are going to carry out seismic tests for gas and oil in the area. I believe a stand needs to be made against such development because if we are not vigilant our rural setting will be destroyed and lost for future generations. Roos Parish alone has the influence – I suggest working closely with other parish councils – some form of confederation that can speak with a stronger voice
32	187	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 13a If the Questionnaire is for "All" Roos Parish, why does Hilston, Tunstall & Owswick not appear as an option to "X"? This may mis-inform the outcome. ● We would like the parish council to maintain its stance against installation of street lights. (For all 3 respondents)

33	193	<p>LACK OF STREET LIGHTING – MAIN STREET</p> <p>Surely with 2012 fast approaching serious consideration should be given to obtaining adequate street lighting for the section of the B1242 passing through the village. It seems ludicrous that residents are still seen groping about in the pitch blackness some reliant on the light of a small torch. Thank goodness for the security /spotlights provided by the Post Office and the Roos Arms making passing motorists aware that village life does exist along this 30mph stretch of road.</p> <p>When I originally moved to Roos and queried the lack of lighting on what tantamount to the main east west road I was told by a neighbour lighting would spoil the view of the night sky. Need I say more! I trust the Emergency Planning Committee have emergency lighting equipment readily available should a serious emergency situation arise within the pitch blackness of Main Street.</p>
34	194	<p>Greater consultation and opportunity for public debate on village matters.</p> <p>Need for inclusion of matters like</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Street lighting in Roos – need for more/no more? ● RES Community Fund – plans for monies? How will they be distributed? ● Parish Plan Committee- who/how are members elected to committee? ● Q13a-What if Hilston is my preferred location for development? How can I express this on a plan for Roos only?
35	197	<p>I think it would be a good idea to have an area on the website for ‘useful contact’ to include who to contact re the hiring of the Institute/playing fields Councillors numbers etc</p> <p>I think it would be good for residents to get a better broadband connection, should any turbine money need spending.</p> <p>I support the suggestion to buy a village marquee for future village events.</p> <p>I would really like to see allotments in the village and more tree planting.</p>
36	203	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor condition of some pavements - Connection to Hull when bus pass can be used i.e after 9.30am.

Supplementary Question 13a Planning and Land Use.

No of Questionnaires returned **198**

Number of respondents indicating preferred sites. **47**

Comments written alongside the map are usually along the following lines:

‘If the Questionnaire is for “All” Roos Parish, why does Hilston, Tunstall & Owstwick not appear as an option to “X”? This may mis-inform the outcome. - What if Hilston is my preferred location for development? How can I express this on a plan for Roos only? - None at all’.