

1 What is your name? Theresa

Test of Soundness Description

Consultation Overview

14 Do you have any comments to make on the Consultation Overview chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures::

The COC (consultation overview chapter) if taken at face value, seems sound and necessary, but as a long time resident of Brent, it doesn't really address, or even seek to consider, the root causes of various problems. There is a lot of talk about 'regeneration' - but no-one seems to be asking questions about why there is a need for so much regeneration in the first place. Why has Brent council over recent years/decades allowed things to become so run-down and unpleasant that it has to again draw upon millions of pounds of tax payers money (directly or indirectly) to regenerate it again? (Such as the general state of the streets, the general look/vibe of the borough, public parks, anti-social behaviour, increase in social isolation, crime etc). I have lived in Brent for a very long time and it used to be much nicer - quieter, greener, with people who respected each other and knew how to behave as citizens, making a positive contribution to society. This isn't the first time that Brent has undertaken big regeneration projects in recent years - think of Harlesden City Challenge, think of the previous re-building of Willesden Green library Centre, about 20 years ago, for example. These each cost millions of pounds, so people are entitled to think that the results would last more than 20 years or so. That is not value for money. And here we are again, only 20 or so years later and millions more are needing to be spent on regeneration across the borough! Other parts of the country or other parts of London don't need to be re-generated so extensively and so often, so why can't Brent achieve the same (I'm thinking of the nicer places, like Richmond or Oxford or Hampstead for some random examples - they are nicely maintained areas where the respective councils and residents keep them pleasant. Why can't Brent council and Brent residents do the same? Why are things allowed to get so bad in the first place? You only have to walk around and see the difference - in such simple/obvious ways like the state of the houses, pavements, litter, graffiti etc. I know that Brent council doesn't officially sanction anti-social behaviour, but by not swiftly and publicly addressing it and calling out those that are doing it, it's a kind of denial/unofficial endorsement that allows it to continue and fester. So many things are becoming the norm that only a few years ago would have been deemed outrageous and would have been addressed. I'm thinking of noise, graffiti, the rapidly changing nature of the immediate environment.

Introduction

15 Do you have any comments to make on the Introduction chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures::

2.18: The phrase is "evidence-based" not evidence base documents (which makes no sense). It's a bit embarrassing when official documents get things like that wrong. It demonstrates the decline in the "3 Rs".

2.22: What about Fryent Park or other green areas in Brent. They should be preserved at all costs. If Brent doesn't have any Natura 2000 sites left, it begs the question, why not?

Brent's Characteristics

16 Do you have any comments to make on the Brent's Characteristics chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures::

It makes for interesting reading, but treats the problems almost as if they are things that just happened for no reason, with no adequate attempt to explain them -for example, the huge reduction in jobs since 1971. The high streets of Brent have massively changed, making it nigh on impossible for people to get what they need locally and forcing them to travel out-of-town or shop online, thus worsening the problem/s. This makes things very difficult for elderly and disabled residents to get what they need, on their doorstep. I can recall and my parents' generation can recall having a Marks & Spencer, Woolworths etc in Harlesden; M&S, Woolies and C & A in Wembley and BhS in Church End for example - high quality stores that have long since disappeared, as Brent's population changed rapidly; and maintaining these shops became economically un-viable, so decades ago, they started closing, one by one. Instead, shops lay empty or smaller shops replaced them, catering mostly to the newer residents and not offering the full range of (quality) merchandise that preceded them. Just around the corner near Church End, used to be shoe shops, hardware shops, butchers, greengrocers, toy shops etc. Now, its mostly "corner" shops/newsagents/pound shops and not much else. If I'm feeling cynical, I'd say it seems like an engineered decline. AND, it is essential to note that while previous stores used to be well maintained, and presentable and pleasant to walk past, most of the replacements are over-cramped, unappealing and inaccessible (eg stepped entrances, shelves stacked too close and poor flooring, with boxes of stock on the floor and also wares on tables outside, which are encroaching on public places and ruining the face of the high street. The stores are run-down and not very clean/appealing. Whereas shop-owners used to take pride in their shops/street/community, now the 'miserly' shop owners won't spend any money or risk a loss of profit, by keeping their store clutter-free, accessible to all, welcoming and pleasant to look at and visit. There is too much 'visual noise' in Brent and the high streets are a major source of this - with too many posters (which are poorly laid out) and street advertising/shop signs etc. Compare it with photos of Brent high streets of 100-40 years or so ago. As now, the streets were still full of people, but the shops kept their merchandise indoors and the shops were neat and tidy (as were the streets). Its been allowed to go so far downhill. Evidence shows that living in run-down, inner city areas is bad for people's mental health. If day-in, day-out, you are forced to look at litter, grafitti, cracked windows/pavings, or walk through broken glass, listen to loud music and rowdy people, etc, then pretty soon it will get you down, especially if you are a law-abiding citizen who has never done this behaviour. Having visited, worked etc in other, nicer parts of London, the difference is stark. Also, why has Brent council allowed/endorsed so many street trees to be cut down, given the many benefits trees bring? (Other high streets and residential streets on other boroughs are much greener - yet Brent has cut down or severely coppiced so many trees, which is a crying shame. As you sow, so shall you reap. Brent council needs to face up to the mistakes of its recent past.

Development Vision and Good Growth in Brent

17 Development Vision: Achieving our Potential

Development vision matrix of choices - How strongly do you agree/disagree with the development vision:

Neutral

Please provide feedback on the vision here:

What is meant by " high amenity trees"? All trees are essential for life on earth!

See previous answers. The increase of green spaces and improving the environment must be a top priority. It is the most important issue facing the world. Brent needs to do far more to encourage (enforce) people to radically reduce their carbon footprint. This is not something that (gentle) education will achieve. It won't be popular, but the planet is dying! There is no time to waste. Rather than building more homes/shops etc to try and meet a growing population, there is no time like the present to try and tackle the rapidly growing population boom. The more you build, the more people will come and it will become an impossible task. Try taking the brave, but vital step of reducing population numbers. This could include encouraging people from all communities to have fewer children and clearly explaining the urgency of this. Also, encouraging people to ditch their cars and foreign holidays. Do more to reduce waste. Encourage people to ditch the 24-hour lifestyles, including the insatiable desire for modern tech (the Western world's demand for tech is ruining parts of the third world and the amount of not-so-old gadgets needing to be disposed of is on the rise. likewise, only use electricity for essentials like heating/lighting, rather than constant re-charging of devices. In terms of improving the health of Brent - the aims are good, but in reality this will be a massive uphill struggle. One of the most important factors for good health is sleep and the 24 hour lifestyles that have permeated in society and especially in Brent mean that anything goes at any time, day or night and Brent has taken a very limited approach to tackling this, historically, presently and going forward. For example, your noise abatement teams work limited hours on weeknights, meaning that if someone is suffering from noisy neighbours, they are not likely to get any meaningful help. (I speak from experience). There is nothing done about noise in the street - eg someone could be parked in a car on a domestic street, blasting music at any time and the Council don't address this. Think of the health of the victims - put that first. Undertake a new approach to educating about this - in schools, colleges, community centres etc. Make it known that noise is BAD and STRONGLY encourage people to be considerate of others. This is not a matter of taste or preference, it is a matter of good health, quality of life and saving the NHS money. Another area that needs addressing is the disrespect people show to public areas, via anti-social behaviour/crime - eg litter, graffiti, vandalism etc. Just living/existing in run down areas is bad for mental health. Where have all the trees gone? Why does Brent fund so much coppicing and felling of trees in residential areas? This just leaves harsh, grey, urban environs that are depressing to be in. There has been a lot of wanton and misguided destruction at the hands of Brent council in recent years and this needs to be counter-acted.

18 Good Growth in Brent

good growth matrix of choices - How strongly do you agree/disagree with the vision for Good Growth in Brent?:

Neutral

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons:

There is so much destruction that needs addressing, that I can't help but think it is an unrealistic and impossible task. Brent has spent (wasted?) millions of tax-payers money in recent decades, with no lasting benefit. There is nothing to guarantee or give strong confidence, that the proposed measures will have a lasting/significant positive impact and therefore, can the financial costs really be justified? Who will be accountable, if, in 3-5 or 8-10 years after completion, things start regressing or become run-down again and are not maintained by the local community? I have read nothing about accountability. This should be added .

19 Policy DMP1 (Development Management General Policy):

DMP1 matrix of choices - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

See above answers. In short, Brent council is blinkered if it thinks it can create lasting, wide-scale improvements in the borough. The evidence of recent/past efforts screams otherwise. Creating more green spaces and planting more trees is to be commended and should be relatively low-cost, with good benefits, but as for new buildings etc this will be a waste of money, as there have been so many new blocks of flats that have been built in recent years that already look run down and ugly. The design are poor and they make the streets look worse. There are too many existing eye-sores in Brent, don't create any more.

Places

20 Which Place would you like to comment on? (you will get the opportunity to select additional places to comment on throughout the survey)

Please select a place::

South

South Place

39 Please check the boxes of the soundness test which you believe policy BP5 South does not pass:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

Ditto to above answers. I know Church End very well and it is a mammoth undertaking for Brent council to think it can sustainably revolutionise it into a nice place. It is run down and deprived because that's how (some) locals treat it. Once anything new is built, it won't be long before the graffiti, litter, broken glass etc return and ruin it. This may sound pessimistic, but it's simple reality. This has happened across the borough in recent regeneration projects that never last. If you want to improve Brent, you have to improve people's attitudes. I think there is a lack of appreciation for things - eg how the NHS came to be and what people suffered (from Victorian times, two world wars and rationing etc). Also how the right to vote and free education came about. I suspect most people don't know and don't care, maybe because they don't see it as part of their cultural heritage or maybe they think Britain/London has always been affluent for all. I think this ignorance maybe makes newer residents take things for granted. If people were better educated about the sufferings of working class people in London/Brent, maybe they'd understand why these social essentials are so valuable and maybe then they'd not take them for granted. If people valued how precious (and not guaranteed) the benefits of modern society are, then surely they'd live in ways that prevent things becoming run down in the first place. Maybe then they'd value local services and amenities and then there wouldn't have to be millions spent at regeneration every couple of decades. I agree that Church End is in desperate need of regeneration, but for the plans to be realistic, you have to educate people about how bad things have been. And, please think twice before you undertake any community murals or mosaics - these will be the kiss of death! Think nature, think natural. More trees, flowers etc - as these never look dated or run down. Maybe even some community allotments to help people be self-sufficient and waste less food - but there would have to be security to stop vandalisms and thefts.

40 Please check the boxes of the soundness test which you believe policy BSGA1 Church End Growth Area does not pass:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

Ditto to above answers. I know Church End very well (I work nearby) and it is a mammoth undertaking for Brent council to think it can sustainably revolutionise it into a nice place. It is run down and deprived because that's how (some) locals treat it. Once anything new is built, it won't be long before the graffiti, litter, broken glass etc return and ruin it. This may sound pessimistic, but it's simple reality. This has happened across the borough in recent regeneration projects that never last. If you want to improve Brent, you have to improve people's attitudes. I think there is a lack of appreciation for things - eg how the NHS came to be and what people suffered (from Victorian times, two world wars and rationing etc). Also how the right to vote and free education came about. I suspect most people don't know and don't care, maybe because they don't see it as part of their cultural heritage or maybe they think Britain/London has always been affluent for all. I think this ignorance maybe makes newer residents take things for granted. If people were better educated about the sufferings of working class people in London/Brent, maybe they'd understand why these social essentials are so valuable and maybe then they'd not take them for granted. If people valued how precious (and not guaranteed) the benefits of modern society are, then surely they'd live in ways that prevent things becoming run down in the first place. Maybe then they'd value local services and amenities and then there wouldn't have to be millions spent at regeneration every couple of decades. I agree that Church End is in desperate need of regeneration, but for the plans to be realistic/lasting and value for money, you have to educate people about how bad things have been. And, please think twice before you undertake any community murals or mosaics - these will be the kiss of death! Think nature, think natural. More trees, flowers etc - as these never look dated or run down. Maybe even some community allotments to help people be self-sufficient and waste less food - but there would have to be security to stop vandalisms and thefts. Maybe introduce car-free areas/pedestrianised areas to improve air quality. Also, work with local shops to improve the Church End area as the shops are often grotty, unattractive etc and many have their wares spilling out into the street, which is untidy and encroaching on public streets. The local shops need greater diversity, as they are mostly owned and frequented by newer ethnic groups and don't have a sufficiently broad appeal. There should be a broader range of shops so that people don't have to drive miles to supermarkets. As i said in previous answers, we used to have a local (smallish) supermarket, a clothes shop, hardware shop, butchers, greengrocers, even an Italian restaurant. These are gone now, demonstrating that the decline has become deeply entrenched. Maybe introduce fines for shops/businesses that use/abuse public streets or that don't maintain pleasant facades to enhance the environs.

41 Do you consider the site allocations within the South Place sound?

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA1:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA2:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA3:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA4:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA5:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA6:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA7:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA8:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA9:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA10:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA11:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA12:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA13:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA14:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA15:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA16:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA17:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA18:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

south site allocations test of soundness - BSSA19:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

Please check the criteria boxes for the relevant site allocations you do not believe to be sound::

See previous answers. I noticed that you mentioned funding had been made to the Jewsih cemetery... could you do something to help the Mediaeval Church (from where Church End gets its name). It is now called St. Mary's and is on Neasden Lane. I'm sure they would appreciate a grant to preserve/improve things. It has been there for over 1000 years, which is rare in London and maybe even the UK. It should be Brent's crowning glory, but it seems to be overlooked and ignored. More should be done to celebrate it - its history, beauty etc.

42 Would you like to comment on another place?

No

Themes

47 Which theme would you like to comment on? (you will get the opportunity to select additional themes to comment on throughout the survey)

Please select a theme::

Economy and Town Centres

Economy and Town Centres

68 Policy BE1 (Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities for All):

Agreement matrix BE1 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Disagree

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

The plans to scale down the college of north west london should be opposed. Opportunities for post-16 learning in and around Willesden are getting fewer. (BACES has already mostly or fully ceased to be). The CNWL site in Willesden has a long history and a first rate historical reputation. Unfortunately, this has been systematically dismantled in the last 20 years or so. There was a huge redevelopment in recent years and yet the number and range/levels of courses has reduced, which places local learners in difficulty, as they have to go further afield. CNWL used to attract students from across London (and even beyond) due to its reputation in the field of technology and the trades. Any attempt to reduce this should be wholeheartedly resisted. The council has stated it supports the move to close Willesden branch and consolidate everything at Wembley - this will result in inevitable job losses as it would be impossible to maintain the range of technical courses at Wembley (alongside existing courses there). There have already been curriculum cuts at the Wembley branch - eg hospitality and catering courses and basic skills. Local people will be deterred from 'upskilling' if they have to look further afield. This will likely have a knock-on negative affect on the work-readiness of the local population. The redevelopments that have happened have sadly shifted away from academia/learning towards a more leisure/entertainment feel at CNWL. A cynic would say its part and parcel of a top-down drive to keep people in a state of ignorance. There is a lot of poverty in Brent and education is a key way to break out of that. Brent should do everything in its power to make this as easy as possible for local people, and not endorse any reduction to provision in the Willesden area.

69 Policy BE2 (Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL) and Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS):

Agreement matrix BE2 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons:

There is no mention of anything to address the high levels of unemployment experienced by disabled people. This should be a priority in any plans that seek to maintain or improve employment/businesses in the borough. As a local disabled person with past work experience in supporting disabled people, I can attest to the fact that many local businesses are not accessible to disabled people - as customers or employees. It is a shame that there is no mention of this in the plans . It should be a requirement that businesses operating in Brent have clear/transparent plans to improve their access to disabled people as staff and employees. Consider the 'purple pound'. Consider the disability employment gap and the disability pay gap. Also look at the number of unemployed people in Brent who are disabled - not just those on ESA, but those on other benefits and those who don't claim any benefits at all, but are struggling in their current roles or struggling to find work. Consult with local/regional/national disability charities and also Disability Employment Advisors at job centres to get more detail about this. Maybe hold a consultation event aimed specifically at disabled people. Does Brent have a disability forum they could consult?

70 Policy BE3 (Local Employment Sites and Work-Live):

Agreement matrix BE3 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

There is no mention of anything to address the high levels of unemployment experienced by disabled people. This should be a priority in any plans that seek to maintain or improve employment in the borough. As a local disabled person with past work experience in supporting disabled people, I can attest to the fact that many local businesses are not accessible to disabled people - as customers or employees. It is a shame that there is no mention of this in the plans . It should be a requirement that businesses operating in Brent have clear/transparent plans to improve their access to disabled people - as staff/employees and customers and if these are not put into place, there should be penalties. Consider the 'purple pound'. Disabled people are often forgotten about, which is why there is so much discrimination and poverty among this group. Consider the disability employment gap and the disability pay gap. Also look at the number of unemployed people in Brent who are disabled - not just those on ESA, but those on other benefits and those who don't claim any benefits at all, but are struggling in their current roles or struggling to find work. Consult with local/regional/national disability charities (eg Brent carers centre, Mencap, Mind etc) and also Disability Employment Advisors at job centres to get more detail about this. Maybe hold a consultation event aimed specifically at disabled people. Does Brent have a disability forum they could consult? (It seems that Brent sadly closed down - or allowed to close down - the Brent Association of Disabled People which used to be based at Willesden Centre for Health and Care).

71 Policy BE4 (Supporting Strong Centres Diversity of Uses):

Agreement matrix BE4 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons:

As above.

72 Policy BE5 (Protecting Retail in Town Centres, Betting Shops, Adult Gaming Centres and Pawnbrokers):

Agreement matrix BE5 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Agree

Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons:

I think Brent is very wise to be mindful of these things, but could go even further, given the poor physical, mental and financial health of its residents (which adds a huge burden to the NHS and state benefits). There has been a spike in betting shops, chicken shops etc. Maybe Brent council should ask why other types of businesses/stores don't want to open up in the borough. Many parts of Brent are very run down - see previous answers. This does not attract a mix of independent shops to open or big/well known stores - think of all the closures in recent decades in Church End and Harlesden (eg M&S, woolworths, BhS, Lyon's tea house, to name a few). There has been a managed decline that will be impossible to fully repair.

73 Policy BE6 (Neighbourhood Parades and Isolated Shop Units):

Agreement matrix BE6 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons:

See previous answers.

74 Policy BE7 (Shop Front Design and Forecourt Trading):

Agreement matrix BE7 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Agree

Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons:

6.4.51 - It would be good if Brent council could have specified what sort of steps would be taken. Whenever I walk around Brent, I can't help but see stores with ugly/run down frontages and untidy displays that spill out onto the street. Any actions to improve this would overdue and welcome. (Please also bear access for disabled people in mind, as many shops do not have step-free entrances).

75 Policy BE8 (Markets and Car Boot Sales):

Agreement matrix BE8 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Agree

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

76 Policy BE9 (Visitor Accommodation and Attractions):

Agreement matrix BE9 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Agree

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

77 Would you like to comment on another theme?

No

Delivery and Monitoring

97 Do you have any comments to make on the Delivery and Monitoring chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures::

HOUSING - it is a shame that Brent is constricted by various factors in terms of being able to meet the expected population growth. Maybe Brent should look into discouraging the population boom in Brent, rather than having to be responsive and struggle to meet growing needs. (The more houses you build, the more houses you will need to build - it is a never-ending spiral). Is anything being done in this area? Maybe an education programme to discourage people from having more than two children - this will have additional benefits to the planet in the long run and to people's finances in the short- and long-term. It may seem controversial, but given that environmental Armageddon is the most serious matter facing humanity, there has never been more urgency to do this. Unfortunately, people are slow to act and largely in denial about the impending cataclysm, but Brent should not shy away from this issue. It would be a practical way of dealing with long-term housing needs. In the short term, PLEASE re-consider the type of flats that get built, as they are ugly and quick to become run down. In London (including Brent) we are building upwards and reducing people's ability to see the sky. This may seem like a frivolous concern, but as we become more boxed-in, cramped and living in closer proximity, the quality of life goes down and people's mental health suffers and in turn so too their physical health. People need to slow down and look up to see the sky - it gives a sense of freedom etc. Also, please ensure any new-built homes (or council homes that are refurbished) have solar energy, and are as energy efficient as possible. Please treat the environment/GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE - as your top priority - see above answer for details. More green spaces, more trees and education/activity programmes to ensure that residents appreciate our fragile planet more. It should be at the heart of everything the council does. See earlier answers - suggestions include community gardens/allotments. All public spaces to have posters/displays encouraging people to become greener - eg less consumerism. All public spaces to use green energy and avoid energy waste - eg the trend for having flat screen displays at the civic centre, community hubs etc - these are energy inefficient.

CULTURE - I support the idea that Brent needs more arts/culture - but it is a shame that Bridge park has to be re-done. This is another example of a recent large-scale development that has had a short 'shelf-life' - ie arguably a waste of public money. Brent needs to be more careful with public money and projects/buildings should be made to last at least 50 years. This should be written into the contract, so that developers make buildings/structures that are fit for purpose and last a lot longer.

EDUCATION - closing the Willesden branch of CNWL will be a mistake - see previous answer. Reducing people's access to local education will be a bad thing and will have a knock-on effect on people's employability. Reducing CNWL to one site only will cause job cuts and means there is no post-16 education provision in and around Willesden. 7.1.14 - you say this will improve teaching facilities - what about the huge amount of money that went into the Telford building at CNWL Willesden - about 8 years ago? Or the re-development happening at Willesden in the last 2 years or so. This will all have been another waste of public money if Willesden branch closes! Brent (and CNWL) has got to stop this sort of thing. Public money does not grow on trees. How can such a huge spend, with such a short 'shelf-life' be justified?! A cynic would say its been in the offing for many years. What will become of the Willesden site - more ugly flats? No thanks! This doesn't bode well for the Wembley site - how long before that closes. CNWL used to have three sites. There was a HUGE spend about 10 years ago on redeveloping the Kilburn site and this only lasted a few years before it was closed. This is outrageous! Down with this sort of thing. No wonder Brent is so strapped for cash!

Appendices

98 Do you have any comments to make on the Appendices chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures:

Integrated Impact Assessment

99 Do you have any comments to make on the Integrated Impact Assessment?

Please make sure you reference the section you are commenting on:

Yes - its far too long. You should have included an abridge version. Most people won't have time to read and digest all of that!

Survey Feedback

100 Please provide feedback on the format and content of this survey below:

Feedback on survey:

It was very long. Maybe you could have done an abridged version (as well, not instead). Also, you need to have things available in other formats, to be more inclusive. Eg Easy Read, large font, etc. Maybe also have some outreach consultation events at the Community Hubs.

Fair Processing Statement

101 Would you like for your personal data to be used for reasons other than identifying your representation and for contact in relation to this?

No