

## EFDC SCI consultation Q2

Name	If the wording of the document (SCI) is not clear please indicate where the document is not clear
Catherine Booth	questions such as Q11 don't indicate whether you can pick one option or several. Tables could have been printed so that you didn't have to keep turning the document through 180degrees. Q75 is printed on the page before all the options, but asks if relevant options been identified, would have been better if it came after them. Q 79 says if you answered yes to Q75, but in questionnaire it seems as if it refers to question 78. in questionnaires equality form Q3 gives the option 126 -35
George Booth	Too many questions have 'guided answers' in that response opportunities are restricted to a prescribed set of answers - which don't necessarily cover the full range of possibilities. The page layout was annoying in that successive pages of the document did not face the same way meaning it was necessary to turn the book round when reading alternate pages
K A Miller	but complex and too technical. However, 100 in depth questions would undoubtedly deter most householders from spending the long time necessary to read and respond.
Mrs Pam Morfett	The whole layout is not at all user friendly and there are no details at this stage on which to make any useful comments.
Mrs K G Freeman	I found it very tricky !! And not at all clear!! Is it being done to put local people off of the track?
Mr William Freeman	I found it very tricky !! And not at all clear!! Is it being done to put local people off of the track?
Alisa Jones	there is far too much information to take in, it does not allow you to clearly understand exactly what is proposed for your area. I tried to use the internet sites and gave up. It was a night mare!
Mrs Valerie Mavin	I find it very tricky !! And not at all clear!! Is it being done to put people off of the track?
Mr Colin Maccormick	I would like to make the comment that this process is absurd. It is written entirely for your benefit and takes no account of the needs of the public or their ability to respond to a highly complex document of this type. The process deliberately excludes the majority of residents because you have to be very literate, very computer literate and have an enormous amount of free time. Residents have to plough their way through a large amount of detail to make a comment on their area. Surely you could devise a far simpler way for the residents of Theydon Bois and other areas to make their views known about the key items relevant to them. I would hope that the second consultation will be fit for purpose as this clearly is not.
Barbara Seal	not the written assumption that green belt land should be used
Leslie Richard Holliwell	but...many of the questions are multifaceted and complex by their very nature. The issues are clearly laid out, but responding with a simple 'Yes' or 'No' often makes little sense. Identifying an option on the basis of it being 'the least worst' hardly does justice to the respondent.
Mr & Mrs Walker	No. Too technical not in Plain English

## EFDC SCI consultation Q2

Chigwell Residents Action Group	The content of the document is over complicated. Evidence base reference material is inaccessible. The document is written in such a way that only experts in planning or those with an inordinate amount of time on their hands could possibly understand it. It simply cannot be understood or assimilated by the vast majority of residents. These documents should be completely rewritten by someone who understands how to write plain straightforward English.
Dr Tonia Myers	It is not clear the process by which the Forward Consultation Team will 'take account of the comments made and develop the policies with these in mind' (Stage 4-22). Are policy changes driven by the volume of objections or the specifics of the objections - will the process be 'transparent' or behind the scenes. Can the committee just ignore the reasoned objections?? The time scale of the consultation is inadequate - is this six weeks minimum from when its 'announced' or six weeks after the public have been actively informed. This is not the same thing as can be seen in my own case where I was not informed of the plans which affect my immediate environment until very late in the consultation process.
Schwarz	do summaries
Lesley Wagland Member of Chigwell Parish Council and of Chigwell Residents Association	The document is written in the passive tense in key places. It suggests that stages include ones that are past. There is no explanation as to how to ensure that our community knows of the consultation since letters have not been sent. The document contains too many irrelevant matters e.g. "the planning application stage". Its complexity and language is exclusive not inclusive and engaging. This risks the soundness of policy and plan.
Mrs Parminder Channa	Inadequate/no notification. The content of the consultation document is over complicated and not user friendly. Over reliance on internet access. Evidence based reference materials inaccessible. Poor quality diagrams lacking detail and information are misleading. The scope of the document means that the sites put forward are very limited, leaving out numerous better sites, and ignoring possible approaches relating to London and areas outside the Green Belt.
Edie Bow (Chairman) Chigwell Residents Association	The content of the document is over complicated, and not user friendly. Over reliance on internet access. Evidence base reference material inaccessible. Poor quality diagrams, lacking detail and information (misleading). The scope of the document means that the sites put forward are very limited, leaving out numerous better sites, and ignoring possible approaches relating to London and areas outside the Green Belt.
Mrs Lisa Berry & Mrs A McCarthy	cross referencing and two of the booklets not available