

# Feedback

from the Malmesbury Pilot Area Board  
19<sup>th</sup> November 2008

Over 60 people attended the Pilot Area Board meeting held following NWDC's Malmesbury Area Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2008. They included:

Members of the Public  
District Councillors  
County Councillors  
Town Councillors  
Parish Councillors  
Malmesbury & the Villages Community Area Partnership  
Community groups/organisations  
Officers

30 evaluation sheets were returned.

## Feedback from the Evaluation sheets:

Responses were graded 1 to 6 (1 = poor and 6 = good)

	Response rate	Average score
Was the venue appropriate?	30	4.5
Was the room layout appropriate?	30	3.3
Did you feel welcome at the meeting?	30	4.7
Did you feel involved?	29	4.8
Did everyone have the opportunity to speak?	30	4.9
How did you rate the agenda?	30	4.2
How did you find the presentations?	30	3.9
How did the Chair control the meeting?	29	5.1
Was the meeting well publicised?	28	4.3
How did you rate the meeting overall?	30	4.3

## Was tonight's meeting better/worse than the one held in September?

Eight people thought it was better, 4 worse and 2 said there was no change. A minor amendment needs to be made to the January form to allow for a 'no change' option.

## Comments/suggestions received with reference to this meeting are as follows:

### Publicity

- Publicity – not clear (outside of councils) as to what the meeting was for and for whom

### Venue

- Venue parking is an issue!
- Car parking in Cross Hayes very congested due to other users attending other functions in the Town Hall
- The school was a better venue without parking problems
- More cramped (than the School)
- A bit cold
- Too hot

### **Agenda**

- Agenda – too long and ambitious
- Too many items on the agenda
- Too long, but good issue Meeting was a good length – should be ideally 2 Hours (a little over-run probably due to 'slow' Burnham House item)
- Missed time?
- Need a loo break and drink!

### **Chairmanship**

- Not everyone could see/get Chairman's attention
- People need to make their names clear when speaking

### **PA Systems**

- PA system poor
- Poor P.A. system – largely ineffective
- Wireless microphones to aid set up and cut costs
- Room – we need funds to add proper audiovisual staging for Malmesbury Town Hall

### **Meeting**

- Dynamics of workshop very poor
- Burnham House vote was potentially dangerous. Any vote of this nature tends to "lead" future assessments and analysis. Please could there be reassurance that the ad hoc input at this meeting will not reduce proper consultation and/or options considered
- I feel that the presentations about Burnham House and HGVs were poor. This is an area that could be improved
- HGV speaker stood in front of screen blocking the view, why cannot speaker stand to the side?
- Police contribution should be taken first so they can go back to work
- Meeting required better organisation of members – discussion little bit ad hoc – could be more organised

### **General**

- Much slicker and professional
- Good effort. Well done
- Good turn out from Parish Councils and good welcome – thank you

### **Officer observations:**

- 1) The response rate was approximately 50% which was good, although many of the scoring was lower than at the September meeting over all issues. This could have been due to a number of issues:
  - Room too small for capacity turn-out
  - Car parking problematic for some people
  - PA system quite inadequate for the room/community engagement/presentations/roving microphones
  - Room too small for presentations/workshops
  - Presentations lacked clarity and effective engagement

- 2) It may have also been because we asked people to be critical, in order to help us improve matters for the future! Issues scoring highest were those relating to the chairing of the meeting and the opportunity to speak.
- 3) It is recognised that the November meeting was much more ambitious than the September one, with too much on the agenda. It is also recognised that in future the content of all presentations will have to be shared with the Chairman and Area Board Manager 2 weeks before the Area Board meetings and that more guidance should be provided by the Area Board Manager.
- 4) It is difficult to decide whether the café style of seating was considered unfavourably (the lowest score), because of the poor PA system and/or the ability to see the Chairman and other speakers, or whether it was largely related to the cramped conditions or people just do not like sitting in groups for the whole of the meeting.
- 5) Quality assurance guidance needs to be put in place in order to ensure that presentations given at the Area Boards are of the highest quality. There is potential to introduce a section in to the Rule Book to address this matter and this has been suggested.
- 6) Despite improving the meet and greet and providing photos of the pilot Area Board members, this was scored lower, although no suggestions for improvement were provided.
- 7) Poor publicity remains an issue, despite posters having been sent out to numerous contacts for display prior to the meeting. Interestingly only one new person signed up to receive display material. It may simply have been because there was not room to place them close to the reception desk.

**Miranda Gilmour - Project Manager**

Area Boards Development Phase (Malmesbury Community Area)

[mirandagilmour@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:mirandagilmour@wiltshire.gov.uk) Mobile: 07990 505882