

## APPENDIX 2

### *Consultations*

**- were as follows:**

#### **Results from First Issues Consultation Feb/March 2015**

The First Issues Consultation took place between 24th February and 13th April 2015. The consultation documents were hosted on the Strategic Planning Consultation Portal with pdf copies sent to respondents upon request. An easy to read version was also made available to encourage responses.

**The consultation responses received through the consultation portal were as follows:**

<b>Total representations made</b>	268
<b>Total individual respondents</b>	23
<b>Total Parish Council respondents</b>	7
<b>Total County Council Respondents</b>	2
<b>External Agency Respondents</b>	6
<b>Local Trust/Society Respondents</b>	1
<b>Resident Respondents</b>	6
<b>Elected Member Respondents</b>	1

A number of representations were made by written responses, which have been included in the numbers above.

#### **Additional Consultation**

We received feedback from 3 individual workshops that were facilitated by HDC Equalities Officer during March and April 2015

The workshops were as follows

<b>Workshop name</b>	<b>Harborough Action Team</b>
<b>Date</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> March 2015
<b>Details</b>	9 female, 1 male 6 people with long term health problem or disability All aged 18+ All white British Responding to easy to read version

**Workshop Name**  
**Date**  
**Details**

**HFT**  
15<sup>th</sup> April 2015  
14 Respondents

Gender - 10 x female & 4 x male  
Age - 3 x 30 year olds, 2 x 34 year olds, 3 x aged between 30-40, 1 x 40 year old,  
1 x 46 year old, 2 x 50 year olds, 1 x 59 year old & 1 x 69 year old  
Ethnic group – 14 x white  
Health problem/disability – 3 x No, 7 x Yes, limited a little & 3 x Yes, limited a lot  
Carers – 11 x No, 2 x Yes, care for someone for 20-49 hours a week, 1 x Yes car for someone for 50+ hours a week

**Workshop Name**  
**Date**

**Sherrard Road Park**  
14<sup>th</sup> April 2015  
3 Respondents

Gender - 3 x male  
Age - 3 x 13 year olds  
Ethnic group – 3 x white  
Health problem/disability – 2 x no, 1 x yes, limited a little  
Carers – 3 x no

A summary of the main issues that were raised in the responses is below:

- Location of Open Spaces is important
- Easily accessible Open space is required
- Biodiversity and habitat provision needed
- Provision of SUDs on open space and for wildlife is important
- The Aims as listed were supported overall
- Civic Spaces and greenways should be included as a typology
- Assurance that an open space will be suitably maintained in the future is required
- A aspiration to provide a series of greenways for walking and cycling is well supported
- Improvement and connecting up of existing 'greenways' was considered important
- A series of visions was suggested for different typologies
- Consideration should be given to communities determining the type of Open Space they require
- Protection of Open Space against development is paramount

- Provision of on site open space except in extenuating circumstances
- Many local respondents supported that the District Council should adopt and maintain open space.
- Some local respondents supported community management where the community is able to undertake this responsibility.
- Recognition from external agency respondents that community management of open space should be considered where possible
- The wishes of the community are paramount in the decision making process for open space provision.
- The provision standards for open space were considered to still be appropriate
- Consideration should be given to increasing the commuted maintenance time period
- The consultation document was considered too long and detailed. The public respondents and Parish Council much preferred the easy to read version, and encourage the District Council to take this approach in the future

The workshops facilitated by HDC Equalities Officer resulted in the following main issues being raised:

- Cycle ways are a good idea for exercise, health and as a safe route.
- Cycling on paths in parks is a problem – have proper cycling places
- Good signage and promotion of cycle routes/ open spaces needed as some respondents did not know about existing provision.
- Make sure that routes are safe
- Teenage provision is generally poor
- Dog fouling is a nuisance – more dog walking areas
- Will cycle further to a destination park
- Open space on bus routes is good, although some respondents did not use buses
- Vandalism and graffiti is bad at some parks; makes youngsters feel unsafe
- Broken play equipment is disappointing
- Provision of benches needs to be better in some parks (WP tennis, Square)
- Bring back the crazy golf.

### **Initial Assessment of Need**

- Consultations have been carried out with many organisations and individuals through various methods such as one-to one meetings, telephone calls, questionnaires and by email. Consultations were undertaken with the following:
  - consultation with departments to establish how open space and sport and recreation provision affects each department and the key issues for each section

- workshop consultation with Harborough District Council members and Harborough Town Councillors, establishing their perceptions of open space and sport and recreation provision within the district
- consultations with Parish Councils representing the needs, attitudes and expectations of the local communities through two detailed questionnaires taking into account open spaces and sport and recreation facilities and attendance at the February Parish Council liaison meeting. A freephone number was set up and a help desk established to answer queries
- questionnaire consultations with external agencies and providers
- drop in sessions located in five dispersed geographical areas of the district to obtain views of the general public
- consultations with sports clubs regarding the existing facilities and their opinions of such facilities by means of questionnaire
- further opportunities for comments from the public were provided through a dedicated e mail address and the provision of the freephone number.

## **Auditing local provision**

2.1 The following organisations assisted in auditing open space across the District of Harborough:

- **92 Parish and Town Councils**  
PPG17 states “consulting local communities in rural areas is potentially more onerous than in urban ones and by far the best way of doing it is usually through Parish Councils”. Parish Councils provided the main data and analysis in each rural parish through two detailed questionnaires and a mapping exercise.
- **District Council**  
The District Council provided detailed copies of the local plan. Internal Officers were consulted on the audit of the urban area of Market Harborough, and contributed to the ratings of site quality, accessibility and usage
- **External Agencies**  
Some agencies have provided details of sites they own or manage across the district
- **PMP and Bob Littler, PPG17 Ambassador for Harborough District Council**  
the accuracy of the audit as far as possible was ensured by cross checking all maps received from parishes, completing the audit for areas where no response had been received and undertaking the audit for the Market Harborough Town Centre.

A number of cross checking exercises were undertaken to ensure the audit was as comprehensive as possible. These included:

- follow up phone calls to Parish Clerks regarding any ambiguity in sites identified and/or where no open space was indicated
- cross-checking with Harborough District Local Plan particularly where any ambiguity existed in identified open space sites
- cross-checking with a database of sites developed from all sources of documentation in order to ensure all sites had been included within the analysis for this strategy
- ensuring consistency of categorisation of open space sites into the PPG17 typologies.

