

High level feedback from the Housing Sites booklet 2021

We received a total of 33 manual responses and 175 Survey Monkey responses giving a total of 208 responses which represents just over 10% based on the 2000 booklets that we distributed. This is a very good response level and shows a high degree of engagement with the Uppingham public. Only 4 respondents were not residents of Uppingham.

Combining the automated and manual scores we can see that 20% of respondents were not happy with the consultation booklet (giving it a score of 1 or 2), 27% were satisfied (scoring it a 3) and 53% were happy or very happy (scoring it 4 or 5). Therefore we can conclude that at least 80% of respondents were satisfied (or better) with the booklet.

The next question asked about the level of detail given by the developers. In a similar way to the first question about the booklet itself, 24% of respondents were not happy with the degree of detail given by the developers (scores of 1 and 2). 31% of respondents were satisfied (scoring a 3) and 45% were happy or very happy (scoring a 4 or 5). Overall we can therefore conclude that just over three quarters (76%) of respondents were satisfied (or better) with the level of detail given by the developers.

The third general question asked respondents how easy it was for them to give their views. In line with the previous two questions, 20% of respondents were not happy (scoring 1 or 2), 21% were satisfied (scoring 3) and 59% were happy or very happy (scoring a 4 or 5) with the ease of giving feedback. Again this shows that 80% of respondents were satisfied or better with this aspect of the questionnaire.

As well as the quantitative data collected we also received some excellent qualitative feedback with some 84 comments. These can be generalised as follows:-

Site specific comments	17	(20%)
Infrastructure concerns	6	(7%)
Anti all development	11	(13%)
Negative about booklet	16	(19%)
Positive about booklet	6	(7%)
Need for Affordable Housing	5	(6%)
Economic concerns	1	(1%)
Environmental concerns	3	(4%)
Others	19	(23%)

Thus in summary it can be seen that there is a consistent pattern that around 25% of respondents have concerns about either some, or all development proposed and this is reflected to some degree (19%) for those expressing negative views about the booklet (perhaps an element of “killing the messenger?”)

On the counter side of the argument, there would appear to be a majority (75%) who are prepared to countenance some development but who need to be persuaded about the merits of the individual sites. In going forward we need to be very careful not to dismiss the legitimate concerns of the 25% discussed above and one lesson to be learned is that we need to explain the housing numbers procedures and rationale much more widely as “no development” is simply not a legal option available to us.

At this stage, given that the “technical” site assessments are still being finalised it is inappropriate to discuss the feedback and scores for the individual sites put forward but we hope to be able to do this next month.

In addition to the housing sites we also sort feedback on the desirability (or otherwise) of a future by-pass for the town. We received a total of 149 responses (123 on Survey Monkey and 26 manually).

Four key questions were asked and the headline response numbers are as follows:-

Would a by-pass have a desirable or undesirable impact on the town?

42% felt it to be undesirable (scoring 1 or 2), 7% were in the middle (scoring a 3) and 51% felt it to be either desirable or very desirable (scoring 4 or 5).

Would a by-pass have a desirable or undesirable impact on businesses?

48% felt that there would be a desirable impact on businesses with 52% feeling the opposite.

Should a possible line for a by-pass be earmarked in the Neighbourhood Plan?

60% said yes and 40% said no.

Should the Council consider environmental policies to discourage heavy traffic?

89% said yes and 11% said the opposite.

Again there were a lot of excellent comments also received in addition to the scores and these still need to be worked through by the various sub-committees.