



Spelthorne Together Assembly 2010 Feedback results – specific points/questions

Question	Response
Not well publicised	Suggestions on improving publicity would be very welcome. This year's publicity included articles in the Bulletin, local press, borough e-newsletter, all residents' associations and Neighbourhood Watches were sent invitations and asked to pass on to members and neighbours; all staff, pupils and parents were invited via schools; previous delegates invited; all partner organisations; voluntary organisations and charities which serve the borough were invited and asked to send out invites to all users and contacts; rotary clubs; business forum; public sector organisations including police, NHS, invited and asked to circulate invitations to staff and public; all councillors and county councillors; all churches invited, asked to pass on to congregations.
Who decided which projects were chosen for the £1,000 funding?	Each of the Spelthorne Together theme groups was asked to debate and submit a suitable project. These were Safer Stronger (street parties); Children & Young People (Sunbury Mosaic); Health & Well Being (Big Coffee Morning); Economic Development (Construction safety training); Housing, Infrastructure & Environment (Potholes). The sixth – Community Radio – was chosen because Stanwell is a Priority Place in Surrey and as such is a priority of the Executive of Spelthorne Together.
National Indicator 4 was not ever explained	Page 6 of the programme – sent out to delegates prior to the event – outlines what NI4 is and how the workshops would aim to improve this. It was also outlined in the Assembly invitation letter.
Some difficulty hearing in some parts of the hall; there was no loop system working	There was a loop system working and those delegates who had indicated on the booking form that they had a hearing impairment were seated in the area where the loop was at optimum operation. Others with impaired vision were also seated to accommodate their needs – if they informed us.
Surely the hire of the Leisure Centre (like last year) would have been cheaper?	Not true. Several options were looked into, to save money where possible; the cost per head of the Assembly this year came in at 25% lower than at the leisure. Total bill was lower by 11 per cent this year.
Layout long and narrow – should have been wide and shallow, ie a 90 degree turn. Screen too low.	The back-lit screen needs 4 metres clearance behind; thus it could not be put up against the long right hand wall. However, in future we would look at placing the screen with its back towards the balcony windows, and arrange the tables to avoid people sitting behind pillars. The ceiling height was low at the position chosen this time.

Question	Response
More young people need to be present	Holding the Assembly on a school/college day makes it difficult for them to attend. An afternoon/evening event say, 3.30pm to 7.30pm, might put off older people and those with family commitments. Or we could look at school holiday time – maybe Easter.
More time needed to visit the stands; list of stands should have been publicised	It was good to hear that delegates enjoyed visiting the stands in the format introduced this year; we will certainly aim to build in more time for networking and visiting the stands in future. A list of stands was on the back page of the programme. Details also being published separately to send out with Assembly report.
Same issues come up every year at Q&A time – roads, benches at bus stops	We cannot control the questions people wish to ask; the issues brought up are often not relevant to the Assembly business in hand. We are looking at gathering written questions in the run-up to the Assembly and choosing a selection which reflect topics relevant to the event. General questions on other “chestnuts” could be answered in a written supplement on the day – or individually by letter/email so as to not take up Assembly time.
Same people attend every year; new faces needed; MP should have been persuaded to attend	Apart from Bulletin and newspaper publicity, invitations are sent out (see first Q) to the chairmen of local residents’ associations and other groups such as Neighbourhood Watch, charities and community groups, who we rely on to pass on the message to all members. A very low number of “ordinary” residents appear to be getting the invitations passed to them – an issue we are keen to address. MP Kwasi Kwarteng was invited and accepted, but subsequently sent his apologies.
A pity the event did not coincide with an afternoon’s racing	It did – an announcement was made that delegates were welcome to stay on, at no charge, for the afternoon’s races.