

| | STRENGTHS | WEAKNESSES | SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>Draft Summary Leaflet</p> | <p>The documents spells out some essential elements of the Core Strategy and is useful as an introduction to the full document.</p> <p>It is encouraging to see the Spatial Vision set out in full in the document.</p> | <p>The document is too general with little content of any use or worth comment. There is no mention of any of the spatially specific elements of the Core Strategy i.e. the summary does not identify the Preferred Options which is the whole point of the exercise e.g. housing and employment sites, canal route, university location.</p> <p>The document does not contain any figures to back up the Core Strategy themes set out in the summary. This further reduces the usefulness of the summary document.</p> <p>The document is presented in isolation and does not state that it is a summary of a full document that is available elsewhere.</p> | <p>Make is clearer that the document is a summary and that the full version is available elsewhere. This source should be stated on the front cover. Some of the group felt it appropriate for this source to be highlighted throughout the document, perhaps on every page.</p> <p>The use of a schematic map of the preferred options sites / growth areas is essential - see "Figure 1 – Core Strategy Key Diagram Displaying Preferred Options" which was recently presented to the Council Committee.</p> <p>The deadline for comments should be on the front page of the document in bold.</p> <p>The availability of the document in other languages should be highlighted on the document, written in those foreign languages in which it could be made available.</p> |
| <p>Draft Response Form</p> | <p>The front of the document was considered clear and containing the right sort of information for the consultee by most of the group.</p> <p>The group were encouraged by the use of "if applicable" after the organisation and agent sections since this can sometimes cause confusion.</p> <p>The heading and sections of the document are useful in guiding the respondent / consultee through the document.</p> | <p>The layout of the response sections with response boxes being quite small could be seen to lead the consultee to write shorter answers. It makes for a closed document in some respects.</p> <p>The "Do you Agree" question might be enhanced with a "Yes/No" tick box.</p> <p>There should be a follow up the above question asking "why" the consultee might not agree with the statement. As it stands these sections are too directed and should be more open as you may agree with a statement but still wish to makes amendments to the document.</p> <p>Some of the group thought that there was too much information on the front cover of the form.</p> | <p>"If applicable" could be in bold.</p> <p>The group suggested that the 'old style' form which allowed for longer answers with the respondent able to indicate which section they were responding to would be better (Appendix 19 of recent Council document presented to the Committee).</p> <p>A separate response form should be used for each section with more space for responses.</p> <p>An electronic response form which can be completed direct on the internet site should be available.</p> <p>Change wording under "Key Issues" section to indicate that the respondent "should" refer to the Core Strategy Document rather than "may wish to".</p> <p>The deadline for comments should be in bold on the cover.</p> |

| | CONSULTATION TECHNIQUE | PUBLICITY | TARGET AUDIENCE (Hard to Reach Group?) | MATERIALS |
|---------|---|--|---|--|
| Example | PARISH COUNCIL MEETING | POSTERS IN PC OFFICE PARISH COUNCILLORS | PARISH COUNCIL RESIDENTS | SUMMARY LEAFLETS AO BOARD RESPONSE FORMS |
| | TALK TO SWINDON COLLEGE | SWINDON COLLEGE | STUDENTS (HARD TO REACH GROUP) | SUMMARY LEAFLETS AO BOARD RESPONSE FORMS AO VISUALS POST IT NOTES |
| 1 | Public Presentation / Stakeholder Event. | ...should be provided for... | The Borough Council's Equality Coalition (Hard to reach groups)... ...and... Swindon Federation of Community Organisations (organised by SBC) | As above with Officers made available for questions. |
| 2 | Consultation events should be arranged for areas directly affected by proposed development as this doesn't appear to have been organised in the full. | Proposed events: Coate e.g. Hospital, or Richard Jefferies Museum EDA e.g. Wanborough Village Hall | Those most affected by the development proposals. | As much as possible. |
| 3 | In general the group considered that Supermarkets had been ignored as suitable venues for particular types of consultation, especially visual presentations with feedback forms made available. | In Supermarkets. | Those not reached by the consultation publicity or unable to attend one of the other publicised events. | Mainly visual with feedback forms made available. |
| 4 | The Group were concerned about existing proposed events limited publicity proposals. There was also concern for restricted times of opening as events should be run all day. | The group considered that website advertising of events only is unacceptable. Other media such as the Borough Council's newsletter or the local and regional press should be used to make residents aware of the events. | The target audience is better accessed by these suggestions. | The group considered a general point in that the full Core Strategy Preferred Options document should be available for attendees to view and take away with them at the proposed events. |

Attendance List

Name

Rosemary Hayward

Lucy Biddle

Alan Webb

Jan Molyneux

Jean Saunders

Jane Leaman

Carol Brownlee

Peter Davidson

Organisation

Croft and LARRA Community Council

RPS

Swindon's Walcot and Parks
Community Group