Appendix 1 – Recommendation 2 – Analysis of Consultations

| Consultation Project Title: | Citizens' Talkback Panel Feb/ Mar 2014 | | |
|---|--|---------------|--------------------------|
| Type: | Evaluation | Timeline: | 17/2/14 – 17/3/14 |
| Objective: | To carry out the annual residents' satisfaction survey – Living in Oxford. | | |
| Target: | Oxford Talkback Panel members (991) | | |
| Result: | 340 people responded to the survey. Action plans were developed for areas that needed improving. | | |
| Principle | Application | | |
| Flexibility – appropriate range of engagement methods. | The need to compare performance year-on-year means that the methodology must be consistent. Therefore this consultation was restricted to the mail-out questionnaire to a defined panel. | | |
| Proportionality – to the scale of impact. | The response size means that weighting is not possible and therefore general conclusions about the satisfaction of residents cannot be drawn. | | |
| Transparency & clarity – of scope of consultation; provision of enough information. | Since this is an annual surve to the Panel members. | ey, the quest | ions and scope are clear |
| Timeliness – when in decision-making process, duration and timing. | The field work took place over | er a non-holi | iday four week period. |
| Feedback – results should be published. | A "You Said We Did" report was sent to the Talkback Panel members. | | |
| Inclusiveness & Accessibility. | While the Panel reflects the demographic profile of Oxford residents, the profile of responders does not. | | |
| Lessons learnt/ changes made | The methodology for gathering residents' satisfaction has been changed to a benchmark-able postal survey and the Citizen's Panel has been disbanded. | | |

| Consultation Project Title: | Diamond Place/ Ewert House Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Options | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Type: | SPD Timeline : 3/4/14 - 30/5/14 | | | |
| Objective: | To gather the community's views on the development of the site, which will then be incorporated into the SPD. This consultation is stage 2 of a 3-stage process. | | | |
| Target: | A representative cross section of the Summertown and St Margaret's community and local businesses. Ideally 50-100 people. | | | |
| Result: | 191 people took part in the consultation. Draft supplementary planning document has been subsequently written. | | | |
| Principle | Application | | | |
| Flexibility – appropriate range of engagement methods | A range of engagement methods were used: workshop sessions at NOA on the 2nd April 2014, consultation was placed on the City Council's eConsult system. | | | |
| Proportionality – to the scale of impact | The impact of the decision is very high for the residents concerned, and since they are a relatively small well-defined group of residents concentrated in one area, a face-to-face meeting at a local venue seems to be appropriate | | | |
| Transparency & clarity – of scope of consultation; provision of enough information. | The objectives of the work sessions and boundaries of decisions were clear. Workshop props and facilitators also helped to clarify scope and objectives. | | | |
| Timeliness – when in decision-making process, duration and timing. | The production of a SPD must follow The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 regarding consultation process. The work session took place on one occasion with the on-line consultation available for minimum of 6 weeks. | | | |
| Feedback – results should be published | The results were posted 8 weeks after consultation closed. Residents have been kept apprised of progress through pre-existing meetings. | | | |
| Inclusiveness & Accessibility | Pre-consultation options were developed with the local Neighbourhood Forum steering group. Workshop held in local community centre, publicised through neighbourhood forum. Exhibition and feedback set up in the Ferry Sports Centre. | | | |

Appendix 1 – Recommendation 2 – Analysis of Consultations

| Consultation Project Title: | Hawksmoor Road Flats - improvements to green spaces. | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|--|
| Type: | Operational | Timeline: | 18/11/13 – 06/12/13, events in 2014 | |
| Objective: | To get local residents' feedback on proposed improvements to the outdoor space around Hawksmoor Road flats. | | | |
| Target: | residents of Hawksmoor Road flats | | | |
| Result: | A prioritised list of green space enhancements. The programme of works that were defined as a result of the public involvement are in the process of being implemented. | | | |
| Principle | Application | | | |
| Flexibility – appropriate range of engagement methods | event. | <u>.</u> | n-line survey and a community centre | |
| Proportionality – to the scale of impact | A local approach to a lo | ocal issue. | | |
| Transparency & clarity – of scope of consultation; provision of enough information. | | • | ations with residents. The arly described in letters to residents. | |
| Timeliness – when in decision-making process, duration and timing. | avoiding the seasonal l visit in late January. | holidays. Thi | er a three week period in late Autumn is was followed up with an on-site | |
| Feedback – results should be published | This has been sent by | mail to each | ı flat resident. | |
| Inclusiveness & Accessibility | Meetings, on-line and I | etters sent to | o residents. | |

Appendix 1 – Recommendation 2 – Analysis of Consultations

| Consultation Project Title: | Street Trading Policy | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| Type: | Strategy Timeline : 1/7/14 – 12/8/14 | | |
| Objective: | To get feedback on the revised Street Trading Policy. | | |
| Target: | Street traders, key stakeholders and the general public | | |
| Result: | 58 responses, and recommendation prepared for the General Purposes | | |
| | Licensing Committee, which was approved on 27/1/15. | | |
| Principle | Application | | |
| Flexibility – | This was solely an on-line questionnaire | | |
| appropriate range | | | |
| of engagement methods | | | |
| Proportionality – to | An issue of broad interest. Consultation was widely publicised. | | |
| the scale of impact | 7 (1) 133de of broad interest. Consultation was widery publicised. | | |
| Transparency & | Scope of consultation and public input was defined through the | | |
| clarity - of scope | questions, however clarity could have been improved by looking at the | | |
| of consultation; | language used in the process to make sure it is clear for the general | | |
| provision of | public to understand. | | |
| enough | | | |
| information. Timeliness – | Five week period during the summer holidays | | |
| when in decision- | Tive week period during the suffiller holidays | | |
| making process, | | | |
| duration and | | | |
| timing. | | | |
| Feedback – | Consultation results were posted on line, three months after consultation | | |
| results should be | closed. | | |
| published | | | |
| Inclusiveness & | Paper versions of the revised draft policy available in the Town Hall and | | |
| Accessibility | St Aldates reception areas. Consultation was advertised in local media | | |
| | (website, twitter, facebook), and emails to current Street Trading Consent holders. | | |