

QUESTION	1	2	2a	3	3a	4	5	6	7	8
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	I was initially concerned that the time allocated to individuals was cut down as per a letter sent out at short notice. However, as it turned out it appeared that everyone had sufficient time. A well organised, fair meeting. Feedback was also very welcome. Many thanks to all concerned.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	The summary contained inaccuracies ref my submission which I have raised with Jon Durbin in letter dated 25/05/02. Your letter dated 12/03/02 (2 nd para)...exercise would not be to reiterate or restate written submissions....contradicts orange leaflet issued at meeting on 17/04/02 (1 st para). Therefore my written and oral submissions differed but both raised important issues.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	I think this process was very good, however I would have liked to see the panel making key notes – I did not see them do so. How did they remember all the objections or was this just a PR exercise?
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	It would have been a great help if the Council/Panel had explained the basis/legal powers under which the final decision will have to be made, eg., commercial, environmental, land owners permission etc. It would have been helpful if the panel had explained the process/stages which the review has to follow leading to a decision. There was too much use of local government terms that were not explained – acronyms, jargon etc.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	1	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have no way of knowing whether or not the Panel will take any notice of what was said. 2. Yes, provided it can be shown that the past presentation of concerns has had any effect.

QUESTION	1	2	2a	3	3a	4	5	6	7	8
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
	1	Y		Y		Y	Y	2	Y	1. Time will tell. 2. How can one say at this stage? The presentation would have been more useful (and compact), had the attitudes of the relevant 'stakeholders' – viz, owners of the land in question – been established in advance and set out.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	N	Y	Y	The time given to individual speakers was rather short (3 mins), although I appreciate that with the large number of speakers, a number of whom were making the same points, it would have been difficult to do otherwise.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	1	Y	1. I do not know as none of them responded except the chair said 'thank you'.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Y	Y		Y		N	Y	1	Y	1. Listened to – Yes. Understood - ? It would be helpful if presenters could be given time to get used to the facilities prior to making a presentation for the first time.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	?	Y	The size of the venue and the number of people present was a little intimidating. I was unaware that the public would be in attendance, believing it a presentation to the Panel only.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	1	Y	1. Listened to – Yes. Understood – No?
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	It would be helpful if factual questions could be answered by the Panel.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	N	Y	No feedback from Panel so we do not know if Panel consultation was genuine or just window dressing.

QUESTION	1	2	2a	3	3a	4	5	6	7	8
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	I feel more people would have come along from “ <i>location</i> ” if the deadline for comments had not been so soon after Christmas, i.e. 4/01/02. Not many people were aware of the gravel pit proposal at that time because they’d been away or not taken the local paper etc.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Bearing in mind the permission to put one’s views orally was to supplement material previously put in writing, I think the time allotted was sufficient. It would be impractical and probably counter productive to allow people to go on for too long.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	N	?	Y	The format may have been the best possible, given the number of presentations being made. However I doubt if all the points made could be fully considered by a Panel that had to sit and hear so much over so many hours. A fairer hearing may have needed to be spread over several days.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	For newcomers the microphones were a puzzle – thus we wondered whether they had been positioned already in the best place for speaking and we dare not move them! Should we adjust them? Were they really alive or did they need switching on when we were called?
	Y	Y		Y		Y	N	1	Y	1. There is no way we can say that the Panel ‘understood’. I do not know whether the Member who doodled was listening.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	The arena may have been intimidating for some. I think more of a round table format would have been better. Plus an opportunity to ask questions (on general issues) would have been useful at this stage.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	N	Y	Although the Panel may possibly have listened and understood our concerns here in “ <i>location</i> ”, after the aggregates panel meeting on 16 May we do not feel the Council Officers have at all.

QUESTION	1	2	2a	3	3a	4	5	6	7	8
	1	Y		Y		Y	N	2	3	<p>1. Concerned that short presentations should not be used as a substitute for proper consideration of prior submissions on which much time and effort was expended. No proper guidance given on what the Panel wanted or expected. In the letter of 12/03/02 we were told not to re-iterate or re-state written submissions, but in the yellow information sheet at the meeting we were asked to present issues previously raised. This was very irritating and disappointing!</p> <p>2. Difficult to know since no responses or questions from the Panel were allowed. I can only hope so!</p> <p>3. I would be happy to be invited, if the reasons and scope were made clear.</p>
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	The sound system acoustics were poor. The change over from one speaker to the next must be better managed for a smoother continuity. Congratulations to the Chairman for an exceptionally courteous and confident handling of the proceedings.
	Y	Y		N	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	<p>1. Some could make the afternoon but others only the evening. Seating layout in Council Chamber meant not enough people could be accommodated in the evening. Once a location had been dealt with, would it be possible for brief presentations on other areas, specifically where the individuals (not organisations/councils) had indicated they could only make afternoon or evening but the area time-slot was at the 'wrong' time.</p>
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	N	Y	On Question 1 we think that the idea was good but with so many sites to consider it must have been very difficult for the Panel to concentrate throughout the whole presentation. Hence our negative answer to Question 6.

QUESTION	1	2	2a	3	3a	4	5	6	7	8
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
	Y	Y		Y	1		Y	2	Y	1. Time was suitable but would have preferred earlier. 2. This will only be clear once the Panel has considered the issues raised.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Whilst it was a good idea to allow groups to express their views to the Panel, the need to do so was forced upon groups by the decision to adopt a 'broad brush' approach. Many groups appeared to regard the exercise as if an application had already been made.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y*	Y	* Subject to the Panel giving clear reasons for any decision they may make.
	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	1	Y	1. Difficult to gauge because it was a presentation not a discussion. Minutes needed some amendment. Personal verbal representation does provide the opportunity to put case directly to those who will make decision and makes one feel better able to directly make points that letters might not get over.