

SCRATBY COMMUNITY EXHIBITION

Attendance	Friday	26
	Saturday	16
	Total	42
Comments sheets completed		17
Verbal comments recorded instead		10

Summary of comments sheets received

1. Should people be allowed to relocate		Y 15	N 0	NR ¹
2. Do you agree with Roll Back areas ?	Scratby	Y 12	N 3	
	California	Y 12	N 2	
3. Should all affected properties be eligible ? If not what would rule them out ?		Y 14	N 1	Purchased post 1/1/06
4. How do you rate the ideas in the community statement ?	very good	all right	not very good	all wrong
80% of respondents were positive	7 44%	1 ² 6%	4 31%	1 6%
5. Reasons ?	People allowed to stay in village (3) Makes the community stronger		more info	Berm (2)
6. Do you agree with what is valued		Y 13	N 0	
7. Any others ? No response				
8. Do you agree with principles ?		Y 12	N 0	NR 1
9. Any others ? Better drains in Nightingale Close, sea defences more important (several respondents), compensation package, avoid growth turning the village into a town ⁴ , roll back land should be further back/ by the post office, Scratby roll back land should not extend so far south, estate agents are blighting properties, more car parking.				

¹ totals do not always sum due to no response

² One respondent marked it 'good'

³ Two respondents arguing for the extension to the Berm did not complete any other part of the comments sheet.

⁴ Covered by the proposed terms governing roll back.

Additional Comments.

Ten people did not wish to complete a comment sheet but made verbal comments that were recorded.

Roll back land is OK (6)

Extend the berm (4)

Take roll back land back to the shops/post office

Full market value needed for roll back to work

Stop local estate agents distorting prices

Spend money on defences, not consultation (common theme)

The main theme running through these comments – why do this ? - was expressed by the vast majority of people attending the exhibition irrespective of their stance on the community statement. There was near-universal disbelief at the decision to allow the cliff to recede for the want of extending the berm which is regarded as working effectively at the moment.

Some of those attending were unwilling to engage with the issues raised in the statement as they saw that as weakening their basic stance which was to argue for continued protection.

Almost everyone who attended on the day was appreciative of the time and effort taken to explain the situation, present the various arguments and clarify some of the misconceptions and confusion that remained. There were no adverse comments on the CCMA boundary other than in respect of roll back areas (3).

Analysis of results.

1. Strong support for the ideas contained in the community statement. 80% making a positive response and almost 50% rating the statement as 'very good'.
2. General agreement on the location of rollback land, with some minor refinements which will be reflected in the final version of the community statement.
3. Serious concerns about the funding of roll back and a strong sense of injustice over the apparent lack of public financial support. Too little time
4. The CCMA / Roll back approach is universally regarded as a second choice option, the first being an extension of the Berm to at least give more time for the various ideas on roll back to be developed and implemented.

The Wider Community

The numbers attending were not as high as had been hoped. However there are several factors in this case that suggest that the results of the day are valid as a representation of wider community views.

1. The weather was little short of atrocious and would have reduced the willingness of people to attend, especially given the elderly population profile.
2. The response of any community to planning / development proposals is generally acknowledged to be dominated by those opposing the proposals. The rule of thumb is generally a ratio of ten to one and non attendance is seen as more likely signalling agreement than opposition. If there is a problem with what is proposed people usually turn out.
3. The overwhelmingly positive reception given to the ideas is therefore very significant in itself. On the 10/1 basis, the 12 responses that rated the draft statement in a positive way would be taken as the equivalent of something like 120 opposing it. In fact there were only three recorded.
4. The verbal comments noted were broadly in line with the comments sheets, making a total of 25 recorded views leaving 17 people who did not want to engage with the ideas at all in pursuit of their goal of continued defence of the coast. It is significant that they did not express objections to the substance of the statement but to its purpose to accommodate the loss of coast.

Conclusion

Given the effect of the weather and consultation fatigue the very strong positive balance of the responses suggests that the community as a whole is unlikely to have significant objections to the proposed statement, as amended. It should be taken as representative of the community's aspirations for how roll-back should be handled. There was in addition a frequently expressed view in favour of an alternative approach of an extended berm in the short / medium term.

Proposed amendments to the Community Statement

1. Remove the 'sea front' proposal
2. Reduce the Scratby rollback area in size and display it as indicative layout
3. Reduce the California rollback area to a few plots with possible extension along California Road
4. Re order the principles