

Appendix A:

RESPONSES TO SUMMER TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS OF EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE FROM CONSULTATION ON LAST LOCAL PLAN

Expectations prior to consultation on Adopted Local Plan

- that planners would explain background to Plan and give the chance for views to be heard
- typical LPA!
- would play a part in a wise and well balanced Plan.
- give planners their expectations and ensure the protection of the countryside.
- high expectations as Kennet had previously taken on board the views of others at other consultation exercises and were willing to consult and involve the general public

Were they realised?

- yes, it got people from different areas talking and enabled people to appreciate where other people were coming from
- yes, the Council wouldn't let anyone dictate to others.
- yes, information was available and the Council told the truth, rather than what people wanted to hear
- not entirely, felt that the Council took on board input on details but not strategic decisions (e.g. Quakers Walk).
- forward planning team were good at listening to what was said.

From exit questionnaire in 1998

- council staff made positive responses to criticisms and were willing to change positions.
- felt they knew more about the whole process which meant they were able to make positive contribution to the discussions
- the questions presume that we weren't confident!
- got to know the officers better and understood that there was a common will to achieve similar objectives.
- feel 'barriers' have been removed - there is more mutual trust.
- notwithstanding strong support for the new consultation process unconvinced that it will prevent reoccurrence of past mistakes.

Rating of following priorities in undertaking consultation

Cost – Cross section of responses with some people thinking that costs were a major priority whilst others suggesting the opposite

Time – Most of the responses indicated that spending time on consultation was a high priority.

Quality – Generally a medium to high priority

Dependability – All responses suggested that dependability was a high priority

Did the methods used to facilitate the consultation work?

- well balanced
- concerned about the amount of paperwork
- stop having meeting after meeting to discuss individual sites
- planning for real exercise was good but need to 'lighten up'.
- need to educate the public.
- steep learning curve
- felt it was hard work at time.
- always room for improvements!

From exit questionnaire in 1998

- too much concentration on certain issues clouded others
- very relaxed open atmosphere. Excellent facilitation.
- good local exercises to involve local groups/organisations/etc. Was interested in seeing this process in operation
- did feel they really had to push my points to get them noted.
- there was a feeling of being 'managed' at first and (apparently) some reluctance to move away from established principles/usual plan style. Less 'managed' debate in groups helped to consolidate and initiate ideas which seem to have been taken on board.
- not at all convinced that their views and those of the very few involved in this process are really representative of KDC population as a whole.
- concerned at the dearth of presently active business persons in the process.
- the team from KDC have listened, clarified and gently directed the procedure with amazing patience and reliance on rational argument - first class professional and ambassadors for KDC! Their tolerance and professional skill inspires confidence.

Too many meetings or too few?

- not enough meetings and need wider times as never enough time to discuss things.
- too long, would loose its 'punch'

Expectations this time around?

- that we have learnt from past mistakes
- very capable of good consultations as long as the Council don't worry about the cost.
- on a learning curve
- eternally optimistic
- would love to be proud of good LPA practice
- as stimulating, demanding and constructive/challenging focused as last time.

How could things be improved?

- the people the Council use to run topic groups are perhaps not the best people to use. Should consider using outside people to act as facilitators.
- stop paying outside consultants lots of money.
- provide a summary of proposals.
- make things electronically available.

Additional techniques/methods suggested for future consultation

- electronic means of access to all documents
- all planning applications online
- interactive website
- greater use of email
- plan huge developments in inappropriate locations to stimulate debate
- lie detector